

JERUSALEM AS A PLACE OF EXILE DURING THE MAMLUK ERA

Maher Y. Abu-Munshar*

Abstract

Jerusalem fell to the Mamluks in the year CE 1260. Up until then the Ayyubids had been ruling the holy city ever since Salah al-Din had liberated it from the Crusaders in CE 1187. Under Mamluk rule, which lasted for nearly 250 years, Jerusalem's centrality and importance were restored, though they had greatly diminished under some Ayyubid rulers. While the Mamluks made substantial contributions to Jerusalem by building and maintaining mosques (*masajid*), convents (*zawaya*), Sufi centres (*khawaniq*), schools (*madaris*), hospitals and hospices, under their jurisdiction Jerusalem also became a place of temporary or permanent exile for out-of-work dignitaries and retired princes, army commanders and others who had lost favour with the sultans. In this article I present a critical analysis of their reasons for choosing Jerusalem as a place of exile and focus on the following questions. When and why did the Mamluks designate the city as a place of exile? Who was exiled, when, and why? How dangerous were the exiles? And what, if any, contribution did they make to Jerusalem's development at that time?

Keywords: Mongols, Mamluk sultanate, Revolt, Sultan al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub, Al-Aqsa Mosque

Introduction

The Mamluks – under Sultan Baybars' leadership – were only able to wrest Jerusalem from what remained of Ayyubid rule in CE 1260, immediately after they decisively defeated the Mongols at the Battle of 'Ain Jalut in northern Syria. From the first day of their rule, the Mamluks approached Jerusalem with care and consideration. It has been argued that because the Mamluks had at one time been slaves, religious factors played an important part in strengthening their power.¹ In Islam, the caliph, sultan or ruler of a Muslim state had to be of Qurayshite descent and a free man,² but the Mamluks met neither criterion. The problem was sorted out when, in the revival of the Abbasid caliphate in 659 AH/CE 1261, the caliph delegated the authority to Sultan Baybars.³ Even so, the Mamluks still wanted to incorporate religion into their rule and considered themselves protectors of Islam and the guardian of its safety. One way to implement this was to take utmost care of the most holy Muslim places in Makkah, Madinah and, in particular, Jerusalem.⁴ Consequently, during the Mamluks' reign, Jerusalem enjoyed sustained growth and development in all religious, intellectual, economic and political aspects of life,⁵ with the large number of educational, religious and political institutions built and sustained in Jerusalem during their period a testament to their commitment.⁶

However, despite all this respect and reverence, the Mamluk sultans chose Jerusalem as a place of exile. It is unknown when exactly the Mamluks started sending exiles to Jerusalem, but it seems that it happened shortly after they took over the city. 'Ali,⁷ who studied this phenomenon and provided list of names for many of those who exiled to Jerusalem, considered Amir (prince) 'Ala' al-Din Aydughdi al-Kabki (d. 688 AH/CE 1289), as the first person to be exiled to Jerusalem. However, having studied

* Maher Y. Abu-Munshar (Ph.D) (corresponding author), Associate Professor, Humanities Department, College of Arts and Sciences, Qatar University, Qatar. Email: m.abumunshar@qu.edu.qa

¹ 'Ali al-Sayyid 'Ali (1986), *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, Cairo: Dar al-Fikr Lidirasat wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi', p. 26.

² Abu-al-Hasan Al-Mawardi (1996), *The Ordinances of the Government. A translation of Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyya w' al-Wilayat al-Diniyya*, Wahba, W. H. (trans.), Reading: Garnet Publishing Ltd, p. 21.

³ Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattah 'Ashur (1983), "Ba'd Adwa' Jadida 'Ala Madinat al-Quds fi 'Asr Salatin al-Mamalik," in Al-Bakhit M.A. (ed), *Al-Mu'tamar al-Duwali al-Thalith Litarikh Bilad al-Sham (Falastin) (al-Quds)*, Jordan: Jordan University and Al-Yarmuk University, Vol. 1, p. 88.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁵ Donald P. Little (1990), "Jerusalem under the Ayyubids and the Mamluks 1187–1516 AD," in Asali, Kamil. J. (ed.), *Jerusalem in History*, New York: Olive Branch Press, p. 191.

⁶ Yusuf Darwish Ghawanma (1982), *Tarikh Niyabat Bayt al-Maqdis fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, Al-Zarqa'-Jordan: Dar al-Haya Lilnashr wa al-Tawzi', pp. 141-180; See also Kamil J. al-'Asali, "al-Madaris wa Ma'ahad al-'Ilm wa al-'Ulama' fi Falastin (al-Qarn al-Khamis-al-Thani 'Ashar lihijra/al-Qarn al-Hadi 'Ashar - al-Thamn 'Ashar Lilmilad," in Dajani-Shkeel, H. and Dajani, B. (eds.), *al-Sira' al-Islami al-Faranji 'ala Filastin fi al-Qurun al-Wasta*, Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, pp. 494-529.

⁷ 'Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 295.

the source on which ‘Ali relied for this judgement; it would appear that the historian Ibn Habib (d. 779 AH/CE 1377) never said that Prince ‘Ala’ al-Din was exiled to Jerusalem but merely stated that in that year (688 AH) he had died there.

Despite its political importance, exile to Jerusalem has been a neglected topic in modern scholarship and, therefore, it raises many questions. Why, for example, was the city of Jerusalem in particular chosen to serve that purpose, especially given that the Ayyubid sultan al-Mu‘azzam Issa had destroyed its protective walls in 1219?⁸ Who were the exiles? How dangerous were they? Was there any specific period for this exile? Was it really exile in the literal sense of the word? I shall attempt to answer these and other questions in this article.

Historical Background

It seems useful here, to make a brief historical background about the Mamluk Saltanat, this is because, knowing its history, the nature of its political system and how it had ruled, might help us later on, to understand the reasons behind the emergence of the exile phenomenon in this state, unlike other political regimes that ruled the Islamic world before and after the Mamluks. Interestingly, after the assassination of Sultan Turanshah, the last Ayyubid sultan, in 648 AH/CE 1250, a new state was established in Egypt⁹, which lasted more than 250 years, in fact until the Ottomans dismantled it in CE 1517. Before analysing the above questions, however, it would be helpful to give a brief overview of the Mamluks’ origins and of how they came to power. According to Burgoyne, a Mamluk is:

...a person imported before he has reached mature years from beyond the boundaries of the Islamic world, to be turned into a good Muslim, to serve at court or in the army. Where with his fellows he helped to form a trusty power base for his master, devoid as he was of any previous social or political ties, bound into a cohesive group through shared experience and interest with his immediate fellow Mamluks, and exercising his admired talent for the art of Turkish warfare, namely as a mounted archer.¹⁰

Mamluk regiments formed the backbone of the previous Ayyubid army. Each sultan and high-ranking amir had his private corps, and Sultan al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub (who ruled from 1240 to 1249) especially relied on this means to maintain power. ‘Ashur, quoting the historian al-‘Ayni (d. 855 AH/CE 1453), claims that Sultan al-Salih Ayyub was the person behind establishing the Bahriyya Mamluks who played such an important role in history. This group of Mamluks ruled until CE 1381. Al-‘Ayni reported that al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub introduced the highest number of Mamluks insofar as Mamluks made up most of his army¹¹. Sadeque explains that the reason behind naming them Bahriyya Mamaliks (*al-Mamalik al-Bahriyya*), is probably because the sultan chose al-Rawda island in the River Nile (called Bahr al-Nil) to be their centre.¹² Sadeque went on to say that the Bahriyya regiment was from Kipchak Turk land (north of the Black Sea) and from the Caucasus near the Caspian Sea.¹³ Consequently, irrespective of what internal and external circumstances existed in Egypt, by the end of the Ayyubid era these Mamluks were capable of seizing power in Egypt.

During their reign, more than twenty Mamluk sultans came to power.¹⁴ Of these, Izz al-Din Aybek (CE 1250–57), founder of the Mamluk sultanate, and Sayf al-Din Qutuz, who played a decisive role in laying and strengthening the foundations of the Mamluk sultanate, despite his short reign (CE 1259–60), made the most impact. He led the war against the Mongols.¹⁵ Another two prominent sultans in the history of the Bahriyya Mamluks were Sultan Baybars and Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad Ibn Qalawun. The former expanded the Mamluks’ sultanate, fought the Crusaders and secured his eastern

⁸ Mujir al-Din Al-Hanbali (1999), *Al-Uns al-Jalil Bitarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil*, Abu Tabbana Y. (ed.), Vol.1 Hebron: Maktabat Dandis, p. 550.

⁹ Al-Sayyid al-Baz al-‘Irayni (1967), *Al-Mamalik*, Beirut: Dar al-Nahda al-‘Arabiyya Litiba’a Walnashr, p. 46.

¹⁰ M. H. Burgoyne (1987), *Mamluk Jerusalem: An Architectural Study*, London: The World of Islam Festival Trust, p. 53.

¹¹ Sa’id ‘Abd al-Fattah ‘Ashur (1986), *Al-Haraka al-Salibiyya, Safha Musharifa fi Tarikh al-Jihad al-Islami fi al-‘Usur al-Wsta*, Cairo, Maktabat al-Anjlu al-Masriyya, Vol. 2. p. 850.

¹² Syedah Fatima Sadeque (1956), *Baybars I of Egypt*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 32.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-33.

¹⁴ David Nicolle (2005), *The Mamluks 1250-1517*, Oxford-UK: Osprey Publishing, p. 5.

¹⁵ Reuven Amitai-Preiss (2004), *Mongols and Mamluks: The Mamluk-Ilkhanid War 1260-1281*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 41.

frontiers against invasions from Ilkhanid Mongols of Persia¹⁶ whereas the latter ruled the sultanate for nearly half a century (1294–1340) and it was during his reign that the sultanate reached its peak.¹⁷

Bahriyya Mamluk rule came to an end when another group, the Burji Mamluks, came to power in CE 1382. Al-Zahir Sayf al-Din Barquq was proclaimed the first sultan of this group and he ruled for 17 years. As Irwin explains, the reason behind this name is that they were billeted in towers (*buruj*) in the Jabal Citidal (*Qal'at al-Jabal*) in Cairo.¹⁸ This group was of Caucasian/ Circassian ethnicity.¹⁹ There is general agreement among scholars that the peak of the Mamluks' 'reign was during the Bahriyya period, whereas under the Burji Mamluks the sultanate fell into a prolonged phase of decline. Their rule was particularly turbulent until the fall of the sultanate at the hands of the Ottomans in CE 1517.²⁰

The End of the Mamluk Sultanate

No doubt, both internal and external factors played a part in the collapse of the Mamluk state. It can be argued that one reason for its fall might well have been that the Mamluk system provided no clear regulation for the transfer of power. For example, when a sultan died, only power determined who ruled thereafter and, as he points out, this resulted in a number of coups and assassinations during the two Mamluk periods – the Bahriyya and the Burji.²¹ As I shall discuss later, many of the structural problems that arose over successions in Mamluk society can be traced to the nature of the Mamluk institution itself.²² Also, as Little mentions, the revolt by the Bedouins, whom the Mamluks could not control, provided an external dimension to the collapse of the sultanate over and above its economic problems, the outbreak of plague and the Ottoman incursions.²³ Qasim points to the occurrence of natural disasters such as the plague, which hit the sultanate many times. The plague, known as the 'black death', wiped out large sections of the population, which in turned weakened the state's economy and eventually made it more vulnerable to external enemies²⁴. Ayalon believes that internal mismanagement of the sultanate played a part in allowing inflation to get out of hand during the rule of Sultan al-Nasir Faraj when prices rose and heavier taxes were imposed, but with no services offered to the people. All these factors played a role in the rise of internal insurgencies and revolts in different parts of the state. The rise of Portuguese naval power, resulting in an economic challenge to trade, and Egypt's growing dependence on the powerful Ottoman Empire for naval supplies and military technology, also contributed to the Mamluks' collapse.²⁵

Last but not least was the decisive military battle of Marj Dabiq on 24 August 1516 in which the Mamluks suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Ottomans who captured and later killed their sultan. This paved the way for the Ottomans to capture Syria, including Jerusalem and, later in 1517, Egypt. By this time the Mamluk sultanate had come to an end²⁶.

Jerusalem as a Place of Exile

Although many recent historians have mentioned Jerusalem's status as a place of exile during the long period of Mamluk rule, few of them have come up with any explanation of why the Mamluk sultans chose it for that purpose, or of who those exiles were and the reasons for their exile. Burgoyne suggests that individuals may have been accorded that status because they had fallen out of favour through illness or incompetence, adding that when a sultan wished to remove individuals from the political scene to a quiet backwater, Jerusalem was the best place.²⁷ Singer argues that the Mamluk

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 106 & p. 123. See also, Nu'man Jubran and Muhammad. H. al-'Amadi (2000), *Dirasat fi Tarikh al-Ayyubiyin wa al-Mamalik*, Irbid-Jordan: Mu'assasat Hamada Lidirasat al-Jami'iya wa al-Nashr, pp. 290-295.

¹⁷ Nu'man Jubran and Muhammad. H. al-'Amadi, *Dirasat fi Tarikh al-Ayyubiyin*, p. 235.

¹⁸ Robert Irwin (1986), *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate 1250-1382*, London & Sydney: Croom Helm, p. 69.

¹⁹ Ibid., p.158.

²⁰ Qasim Abdo Qasim (1994), *Asr Salateen al-Mamalik*, Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, p. 190.

²¹ 'Ashur, Ba'd Adwa' Jadida, p. 114.

²² Amalia Levanoni (1995), *A Turning Point in Mamluk History: The Third Reign of al-Nasir Muhammad Ibn Qalawun 1310-1341*, Leiden - the Netherlands: E.J. Brill, pp. 14-27.

²³ Little, Jerusalem under the Ayyubids and the Mamluks, p. 196.

²⁴ Qasim Abdo Qasim. *Asr Salateen al-Mamalik*, pp. 159-190.

²⁵ David Ayalon (1993), "Some Remarks on the Economic Decline of the Mamluk Sultanate," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Vol. 16. pp. 112-123.

²⁶ P.M. Holt (2001), "The Last Mamluk Sultan: Al-Malik al-Ashraf Tuman Bay," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Vol. 25. pp. 240-245.

²⁷ Burgoyne, *Mamluk Jerusalem*, p. 61.

sultans preferred to banish their princes and commanders to Jerusalem because, while not being far, it was isolated and lacked a strong garrison or fort from which to base a revolt.²⁸ Although I largely agree with Singer, I disagree that Jerusalem was isolated. On the contrary, Jerusalem was a lively centre of learning, religion and cultural activities during the Mamluk period.²⁹ I believe that such an environment might be a strong reason for choosing it as a place of exile. Singer does, however, mention that the princes and ‘commanders favoured Jerusalem as a place of exile for its climate and the concentration of religious sites and scholars there’.³⁰ This preference was also demonstrated by Burgoyne, who stated that, for the exiled, Jerusalem was clearly deemed preferable to other places such as Makkah or Madinah, and people requested transfers to it.³¹ One historian in particular, ‘Ali provided a list of the names of some of those who exiled to Jerusalem. Nevertheless, I notice that he often confused the date of the person’s death in exile with the actual date of the exile, which makes it difficult to know to which date he is referring. In addition, I suspect that the difficult writing style of the literature may have confused him because he listed a number of people who, I was able to discover, were not exiled to Jerusalem at all. Although these names are written in Arabic, I found it difficult to read some of them because they were not always written in standard Arabic and the style was hard to follow. Finally, ‘Ali’s work has many alternative spellings of the names of those exiled. It seems that this occurred as the names of the Mamluks were mainly non-Arabic.

The works of historians living during the Mamluk sultanate, including Ibn Habib (d. 779 AH/CE 1377), al-Maqrizi (d. 845 AH/CE 1441), Ibn Qadi Shahba (d. 851 AH/CE 1448), Ibn Hajar (d. 852 AH/CE 1449), Ibn Taghribardy (d. 874 AH/CE 1470), Mujir al-Din al-Hanbali (d. 927 AH/CE 1521), Ibn Iyyas (d. 930 AH/CE 1524) and Ibn Tulun (d. 953 AH/CE 1546), provide a good survey of the names of people exiled to Jerusalem or to other places. Unfortunately, in most cases these historians mentioned the name of the exiled person, the date of exile and in some cases the date of the death of that person but, except in a few cases, without illustrating or mentioning a direct reason for that exile. Without sufficient information about the reason for exile I was forced to look at the circumstances in which the exile took place to see if a reason could be derived from that. The following table contains a list of all the people I was able to come across who had been exiled, the date of their exile and the reason for it. Before discussing each case it is important to clarify two terms. The first is amir (‘prince’). This does not necessarily mean a someone who is part of the ruling family. As in the Mamluk state, the term in this context means that the person holds an official position in the state, and is responsible for certain tasks. Secondly, battal بَطَّال (‘unemployed’), derived from the Arabic word batala بَطَّل (‘unemployment’), was used by historians to describe the new status of those who were exiled to Jerusalem. In a nutshell, they were sent to Jerusalem (battaleen) بَطَّالين without having official jobs in the state after being removed from their jobs.

Table 1. The Exiled (*battaleen*) People

Name of exiled person	Date of exile	Reason for exile if known
1. Prince (<i>amir</i>) Yalbugha al-Turkumani and Prince Khas Turk ³²	698 AH/CE 1298	Ibn Taghribardi mentioned that in this year, there was a revolt by some of the princes against princes who were working closely with the Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad Ibn Qalawun, they incited the sultan against other princes. As a result of this revolt and public request, two of the princes involved in this incitement were exiled to Jerusalem as <i>battaleen</i> .
2. Prince Karay ³³	707 AH/CE 1307	According to al-Maqrizi, this prince came back to Cairo from Upper Egypt. He was ill and hence unable to go to the citadel where the sultan was. He asked the sultan to be freed from his post and to be

²⁸ Amy Singer (1994), *Palestinian Peasants and Ottoman Officials: Rural Administration around Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 3.

²⁹ Mariam Rosen - Ayalon (1995), “Between Cairo and Damascus: Rural Life and Urban Economics in the Holy Land during the Ayyubid, Mamluk and Ottomans Periods,” in Levy, Thomas E (ed.) *the Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, p. 518.

³⁰ Singer, *Palestinian Peasants and Ottoman Officials*, p. 3.

³¹ Burgoyne, *Mamluk Jerusalem*, p. 61

³² Jamal al-Din Yusuf Ibn Taghribardi (n.d.), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Amah Lilita’lif wa al-Tarjama wa al-Tiba’a wa al-Nashr, Vol. 8. p. 173.

³³ Taqi al-Din Ahmad Al-Maqrizi (1941), *Kitab al-Suluk Lima’rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, Ziyada M.M. (ed.), Cairo: np, Vol. 2. part 1. p. 27.

		exiled to Jerusalem. His request was accepted.
3. Prince Nasir al-Din Muhammad Ibn Kundak ³⁴	733AH/ CE 1333	This prince was working as the <i>Dawadar</i> (holder of the inkbottle) of prince Sayf al-Din Tankiz (governor of Damascus). He was tortured, beaten by his master, imprisoned and then exiled to Jerusalem. No reason was given for why he was dealt with like this.
4. Al-Wazir Abdullah Ibn Taj al-Riyasa ³⁵	741 AH/ 1340CE	According to Ibn Qadi Shahba, this fair and just minister who worked for 7 years was sacked from his post and exiled to Jerusalem. No reason is given except he was in a very high position.
5. Prince Saruja al-Muzauri ³⁶	743 AH/CE 1342	He was a prince in Egypt. After being in prison for 20 years he was appointed ruler of Safad and in this year (743 AH/CE 1342) he was exiled to Jerusalem. It seems that his strong relationship with Prince Tankiz, who was not on good terms with the sultan, was the reason behind the exile.
6. Al-Tawashi Kafur al-Hindi ³⁷	747AH/CE 1346	According to al-Maqrizi, Sultan al-Malik al-Nasir Qalawun intended to confiscate the wealth of this Tawashi (a person responsible for serving the wives of the sultan and supervising new Mamluks), but instead exiled him to Jerusalem. Al-Maqrizi mentioned that this person had very close relations with the sultan. No documentation exists on why he was targeted.
7. Al-Tawashi ‘Anbar al-Sahra ³⁸	749 AH/CE 1348	According to al-Maqrizi, this Tawashi held a high position in the army. He was sent (not exiled) to Jerusalem but without saying why he was sent there. From Jerusalem he travelled to Makkah for the hajj without getting permission from the sultan. On his return to Cairo from the hajj, the sultan confiscated his money and exiled him to Jerusalem because he was angry with him for not getting permission to take the trip.
8. Prince Sayf al-Din Arghun al-Kamili ³⁹	758 AH/CE 1357	No clear reason, except that he was the Na’ib (viceroy) of Aleppo before exile.
9. Al-Wazir Fakhr al-Din Majid Ibn Khasib ⁴⁰	762 AH/CE 1361	According to Ibn Iyyas, the wazir (minister) Fakhr al-Din Majid Ibn Khasib, was arrested and exiled to Jerusalem. He stayed there for four years and then died. His brother, assistants and brothers-in-law were also arrested. A lot of money was confiscated

³⁴ Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Qadi Shahba (1994), *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Darwish ‘A. (ed.), Damascus & Limasoul: Al-Ma’had al-‘Ilmi al-Faransi LilDirasat al-‘Arabiyya & Al-Jaffan wa al-Jabi Liltiba’a wa al-Nashr, Vol. 2. pp. 175-176.

³⁵ Ibid., Vol. 1. p. 163.

³⁶ Ibid., Vol. 1. p.329.

³⁷ Taqi al-Din Ahmad Al-Maqrizi (1958), *Kitab al-Suluk Lima’rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, Ziyada M. M. (ed.), Cairo: n.p., Vol. 2. part 3. p. 706.

³⁸ Ibid., Vol. 2. part 3. p. 760.

³⁹ Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar Al-‘Asqalani (1966), *Al-Durar al-Kamina fi A’yan al-Ma’ah al-Thamina*, Jad al-Haqq M.S. (ed.), Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Haditha, Vol. 1. p. 375; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p.122. Ibn Qadi Shihba stated that the exile took place in 756 AH.

⁴⁰ Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyyas (1982), *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur fi Waqa’i’ al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 1. part 1. p. 574; See also Taqi al-Din Ahmad Al-Maqrizi (1971), *Kitab al-Suluk Lima’rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, ‘Ashur, S. A. (ed.), Cairo: n.p., Vol. 3. part 1. p. 58.

		from him. No documented reason for why this happened.
10. Prince Taz ⁴¹	762 AH/CE 1361	Taz revolted against the sultan and formed groups to help him. As a result, he was arrested and exiled to Jerusalem.
11. Prince Manjak ⁴²	763 AH/CE 1362	According to Ibn Qadi Shahba, Manjak was in prison in Alexandria; he was released and then exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for why this happened.
12. Prince Taybugha al-Tawil ⁴³	767 AH/CE 1366	He participated in revolts against the sultan. Ibn Iyyas mentioned that the sultan exiled him but provided him with an allowance sufficient for his needs.
13. Prince Aghun al-Qushtamri ⁴⁴	768 AH/ 1367CE	Aghun was Amir <i>tablakhana</i> (a music band that used to play drums at the gate of the sultan's palace) but no documented reason on why he was exiled.
14. Prince Nasir al-Din Muhammad Ibn Aqabgha Aas ⁴⁵	778 AH/CE 1376	There is no documented reason why he was exiled except that he was working as the chief of the royal savants. Ibn Qadi mentioned that in that year he was arrested, his belongings were confiscated and he was exiled to Jerusalem.
15. Prince Batat al-Uljay ⁴⁶	779 AH/CE 1377	There is no documented reason why he was exiled but Ibn Qadi said that his brothers and assistants were arrested too. He was exiled to Jerusalem then later to al-Karak. During his exile to Jerusalem he was granted a village with an annual income of 200,000 dirhams.
16. Prince Buri al-Ahmadi ⁴⁷	780 AH/CE 1378	According to al-Maqrizi, this was the year that this prince was exiled to Jerusalem. He added that the sultan appointed him as a superintendent of the two mosques (al-Aqsa and Ibrahimi) in Hebron. No documented reason for the exile.
17. Prince Tamerbay al-Dimirdash ⁴⁸	780 AH/CE 1378	This prince was in prison, then released and exiled to Jerusalem.
18. Prince Ishqatamr al-Mardani ⁴⁹	780 AH/CE 1378	He was imprisoned in Alexandria, then released and exiled to Jerusalem. In fact, He was exiled to Jerusalem on a number of occasions. No documented reason for the exiles.
19. Prince Baydamr al-	781 AH/CE	No clear reason, but he was in prison, released from

⁴¹ Al-'Asqalani, *Al-Durar al-Kamina*, Vol. 2. pp. 314-315; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p.182.

⁴² Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p. 202.

⁴³ Al-Hasan Ibn 'Umar Ibn Habib (1976), *Tadhkitat al-Nabih Fi Ayyam al-Mansur wa Banih*, Amin, M.M and 'Ashur, S.A. (eds.), Cairo: Matba'at Dar al-Kitab, Vol. 3. p. 292; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p. 276; Ibn Iyyas, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad (1983), *Badai' al-Zuhur fi Waqai' al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay' al-Misriyya al-'Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 1. part 2. p. 29.

⁴⁴ Al-'Asqalani, *Al-Durar al-Kamina*, Vol. 1. p. 376.

⁴⁵ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. 508.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2. p. 553.

⁴⁷ Al-Maqrizi, *al-Suluk*, Vol. 3. part 1. p. 338.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 3. part 1 p. 337; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p. 574.

⁴⁹ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol.2. p. 575; See also, Shihab al-Din al-'Asqalani (1986), *Inba' al-Ghumr Bi Abna' al-'Umr fi al-Tarikh*, Khan M. (ed.), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, Vol. 1. p. 271.

Khawarizmi ⁵⁰	1379	the Alexandrian prison and then exiled to Jerusalem
20. Prince Tamerbay ⁵¹	781 AH/CE 1379	According to Ibn Hajar, he was exiled to Jerusalem in this year. No documented reason for the exile.
21. Prince Baydamar ⁵²	781 AH/CE 1379	According to Ibn Hajar, he was exiled to Jerusalem in this year. No documented reason for the exile.
22. Prince Tashtamar al-Dawadar ⁵³	782 AH/CE 1380	According to Ibn Hajar, in this year this prince was made viceroy of Safad. Two months later, he asked to leave this post and to be exiled to Jerusalem. His request was accepted. No documented reason for why he requested this.
23. Prince Taghri Birmish ⁵⁴	782 AH/CE 1380	The reason for his exile is that he became an ascetic and left his post without getting permission from the great prince. He was asked to return back to his post but he refused at the beginning. He was punished by being sent into exile to Jerusalem.
24. Prince Tashtamar al-Dawadar ⁵⁵	784 AH/CE 1382	He was the viceroy of Safad and then was exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
25. Prince Tashtamar Ibn 'Abdullah ⁵⁶	887 AH/CE 1482	According to Ibn Taghribardi, he was in a very high position within the Mamluk system. He was the first appointed Dawadar before he became the viceroy of al-Sham. After that he was appointed as the leader of the army in Egypt. Ibn Taghribardi added that, as soon as al-Zahir Barquq became the sultan, this prince was arrested and then exiled to Jerusalem. It seems that al-Zahir Barquq perceived this prince as a threat and a rival to the position to which he himself was to be appointed.
26. Prince Shaykh al-Safawi ⁵⁷	792 AH/CE 1390	According to Ibn Taghribardi, this prince was sacked from his post as the viceroy of Gaza. He asked to be exiled to Jerusalem. His request was granted.
27. Prince Qudayd ⁵⁸	792 AH/CE 1390	This prince was sacked from his post as the viceroy of Alexandria and was exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
28. Prince Qunqubay ⁵⁹	796 AH/CE 1394	He was the prince of Nuba. He refused the order of the sultan to become viceroy of Karak. As a result, he was exiled to Jerusalem. He was given <i>Khuz/Iqta</i> ' (fife) to earn 20,000 dirham every year.

⁵⁰ Al-Maqrizi, *Kitab al-Suluk*, Vol. 3. part 1. p. 360; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 3. p. 8.

⁵¹ Al-'Asqalani, *Inba' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 1, p. 300.

⁵² Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 300.

⁵³ Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 9.

⁵⁴ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 3. p. 65.

⁵⁵ Ibid., Vol. 3. p.87.

⁵⁶ Jamal al-Din Yusuf Ibn Taghribardi (1950), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: Matba'it Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, Vol. 11. p. 304.

⁵⁷ Jamal al-Din Yusuf Ibn Taghribardi (1956), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: Matba'it Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, Vol. 12. p. 71.

⁵⁸ Ibid., Vol. 12. p. 67.

⁵⁹ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 3. p. 502.

29. Prince Qudayd al-Qalmatawi ⁶⁰	799 AH/CE 1397	He was the viceroy of Alexandria then exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
30. Prince Baklamish al-‘Ala’i ⁶¹	800 AH/CE 1398	No reason for exile except that Ibn Qadi Shuba mentioned that in this year this prince was released from the prison in Alexandria and was sent to Jerusalem and was granted by the sultan half of Bethlehem and half of Bayt Jala.
31. Prince ‘Ala’ al-Din Ibn al-Tablawi ⁶²	801 AH/CE 1399	Ibn Hajar mentioned that during the reign of sultan al-Zahir Abu Sa’id Barquq, this prince was released from the prison and moved to a house of Yalabgh al-Majnun al-Istadar. Later on he was exiled to al-Karak but he went to Jerusalem instead.
32. Prince Aqabgha al-Atrush ⁶³	802 AH/CE 1400	Al-Maqrizi mentioned that this prince, who was the viceroy of Aleppo, was released from the prison in Damascus on the day of ‘Arafa and was exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
33. Prince Taghribardi ⁶⁴	802 AH/CE 1400	Al-Maqrizi mentioned that this prince was released from the prison in Damascus on the day of ‘Arafa and was exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
34. Prince Aqabgha ⁶⁵	804 AH/CE 1402	Al-Maqrizi stated that there was no reason to exile him to Jerusalem except that his post as viceroy of al-Sham was given to someone else.
35. Prince Sayf al-Din Aqabgha ⁶⁶	806 AH/ 1403CE	Ibn Taghribardi mentioned that this prince was the viceroy of Damascus. He was sacked from his post and exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
36. Prince Nawruz al-Hafidhi ⁶⁷	808 AH/CE 1405	No clear reason. Ibn Tagribardi mentioned that the sultan sent him a letter instructing him to travel immediately to slamic Jerusalem, which would be his place of exile. The sultan threatened him if the prince delayed implementing this order.
37. Prince Jaribash Kabbasha ⁶⁸	817 AH/CE 1414	According to Ibn Taghribardi, in this year the sultan was suffering from severe pain due to osteoarthritis. The sultan was unable to do his normal work and stayed in the sultan quarter in the citadel in Cairo. Ibn Taghridardi added that shortly after that, the sultan issued an order to exile this prince to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile but it

⁶⁰ Ibid., Vol. 3. p. 615; See also al-‘Asqalani, *Inba’ al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3. p. 330.

⁶¹ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 3. p. 666, See also al-‘Asqalani, *Inba’ al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3. p. 394.

⁶² Al-‘Asqalani, *Inba’ al-Ghumr*, Vol. 4. pp. 17-18.

⁶³ Taqi al-Din Ahmad Al-Maqrizi (1971), *Kitab al-Suluk Lima’rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, ‘Ashur, S. A. (ed.), Cairo: Matba’at Dar al-Kutub, Vol. 3. part 3. p. 1023.

⁶⁴ Ibid., Vol 3, part 3. p. 1023.

⁶⁵ Ibid., Vol 3, part 3. p. 1087.

⁶⁶ Jamal al-Din Yusuf Ibn Taghribardi (1971), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Muhraz J. M and Shaltut F. (eds.), Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Amah Lilta’lif wa al-Nashr, Vol. 14. p. 36.

⁶⁷ Jamal al-Din Yusuf Ibn Taghribardi (1970), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Shaltut F. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Amah Lilta’lif wa al-Nashr, 1970), Vol. 13. p. 49.

⁶⁸ Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. p. 23.

		could be that the sultan feared this prince would use his illness to pave the way to his throne.
38. Prince Arghamun Amir Akhur Kan ⁶⁹	819 AH/CE 1414	Ibn Iyyas did not mention any reason for this exile except stating that this prince died in Jerusalem while in exile.
39. Prince al-Tanbagha al-‘Uthmani ⁷⁰	820 AH/CE 1417	No reason except that he was in prison in Alexandria. He was released and then exiled to Jerusalem. But around the date, Ibn Taghribardi recorded that the sultan was told that Aqbay, one of the princes in al-Sham, was preparing to make a coup once the sultan became ill again. In addition, Aqbay appointed in his services some of the sultan’s enemies.
40. Prince Baysaq al-Shaykhi al-Zahiri ⁷¹	821 AH/CE 1418	Ibn Iyyas did not mention any reason for the exile. Nevertheless, he stated that this prince was one of the best; he was the one who was appointed to rebuild and refurbish the Haram Mosque in Makkah after the fire.
41. Prince Qara Murad Khaja ⁷²	822 AH/CE 1419	This prince was the viceroy of Safad, then sacked and exiled to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
42. Prince Sarghamatsh Ayamish al-Khudari ⁷³	825 AH/CE 1422	According to Ibn Iyyas, in AH 825, Prince Sarghatamsh Aytamsh Al-Khudari was exiled to Jerusalem. The reason is that Sarghatamsh had a great influence on the people during the reign of al-Zahir Tatar.
43. prince Sawdun al-Faqih al-Jarkasi ⁷⁴	826 AH/CE 1423	Ibn Iyyas did not mention any reason for this exile except to state that this prince died in Jerusalem in exile.
44. Prince Iynal al-Jakmi ⁷⁵	827 AH/CE 1424	According to Ibn Taghribardi, in this year, Prince Iynal al-Jakmi was called back from Jerusalem where he was exiled. No documented reason for the exile. However, Ibn Taghribardi added that, after exile, he was granted by the sultan the <i>Iqta’</i> (fife) of Baybugha al-Muzafari who was sacked from his post as the Atabek (commander in chief) of the Egyptian army. Ibn Taghribardi added that this prince was appointed as Amir Majlis (guard of Sultan’s seat and bed).
45. Prince Tarabay ⁷⁶	828 AH/CE 1425	According to Ibn Taghribardi, Prince Tarabay was in prison in Alexandria before he was released as a gesture of goodwill from the sultan. He was then

⁶⁹ Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyyas (1984), *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur fi Waqa’i’ al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 2. p. 29.

⁷⁰ Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. p. 59.

⁷¹ Ibn Iyyas, *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur*, Vol. 2. p. 38.

⁷² Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. p. 90.

⁷³ Ibn Iyyas, *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur*, Vol. 2. p. 78

⁷⁴ Ibid., Vol. 2. p. 85.

⁷⁵ Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. p. 269.

⁷⁶ Ibid., Vol. 14. p. 277.

		exiled to Jerusalem with no restriction on his freedom of movement (<i>ghayr mudayaq 'alayh</i>) after he was given 1000 dinars from the sultan. Ibn Taghribardi added that no one was expecting the sultan to release Tarabay as he had challenged the legitimacy of the sultan's rule (<i>'Anadahu fi al-Mulk</i>). Also Prince Tarabay was in a very high position within the Mamluk system.
46. Prince Uzbuk al-Muhammadi ⁷⁷	831 AH/ CE 1428	According to Ibn Taghribardi, in 831 AH the sultan arrested the prince Uzbuk al-Muhammadi and exiled him that night to Jerusalem. The sultan also arrested some of his assistants and friends. The reason for this is that the sultan received news that Prince Uzbuk and his men would lead a coup against the sultan and they would kill him. Ibn Taghribardi added that when the sultan interrogated Uzbuk's men about whom they would appoint as sultan had they succeeded, they answered that it would have been Prince Uzbuk.
47. Prince Aytamash al-Khudri ⁷⁸	836 AH/CE 1433	According to Ibn Taghribardi, this prince was working as an <i>Astadar</i> (chief of the royal servants). He was sacked by the sultan and then exiled to Jerusalem. No further details are known.
48. Prince Khaja Sawdun ⁷⁹	842 AH/CE 1438	According to Ibn Iyyas, the sultan sent Prince Dimirdash to arrest Prince Khaja Sawdan who disobeyed the sultan in Aleppo. Khaja was arrested and exiled to Jerusalem. He stayed there until he died.
49. Al-Zayni 'Abd al-Rahim Ibn al-Kuwayz ⁸⁰	846 AH/ 1442CE	According to Ibn Iyyas, the sultan changed his attitude towards Al-Zayni Abd al-Rahman Ibn al-Kuwayz for no apparent reason. The sultan arrested him and sacked him from his post. He confiscated a part of his wealth then exiled him to Jerusalem.
50. Prince Taghri Birmash ⁸¹	851 AH/CE 1447	According to Ibn Iyyas, this prince was exiled to Jerusalem in this year without giving any reasons.
51. Prince Iynal al-Abu-Bakry ⁸²	852 AH/CE 1448	According to Ibn Iyyas, Iynal al-Abu-Bakri was exiled to Jerusalem and later sent to prison with Shad Bek al-Jikm (one of the princes). One year later he was exiled to Jerusalem once again (852 AH). No documented reason for the exile.
52. Prince Iynal al-Abu-Bakry ⁸³	854 AH/ 1450CE	According to Ibn Iyyas, in this year Iynal al-Abubakri died in Jerusalem during exile. He was one of the top men of Sultan al-Ashraf. No documented reason for the exile.

⁷⁷ Ibid., Vol. 14. p. 321; See also Ibn Iyyas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, Vol. 2. p. 121.

⁷⁸ Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. pp. 372-373.

⁷⁹ Ibn Iyyas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, Vol. 2. p. 200.

⁸⁰ Ibid., Vol. 2 p. 235.

⁸¹ Ibid., Vol. 2 p. 257.

⁸² Ibid., Vol. 2. p. 265.

⁸³ Ibid., Vol. 2. p. 277.

53. Prince Jawhar Al-Nawruzi ⁸⁴	855 AH/ 1451CE	According to Ibn Iyyas, Jawhar al-Nawruzi was exiled to Jerusalem after his post in the army was given to Prince Murjan al-‘Adili. No documented reason for the exile.
54. Prince Qaraja al-Khazindar ⁸⁵	857 AH/CE 1453	According to Ibn Iyyas, Prince Qaraja al-Khazindar was exiled to Jerusalem in this year. Ibn Iyyas mentioned that this prince had not committed any crime and he was exiled because his post was given to somebody else.
55. Prince Timraz Al-Ashrafi ⁸⁶	858 AH/ 1454CE	According to Ibn Iyyas, the sultan exiled prince Timraz al-Ashrafi, who was the holder of the sultan’s ink, to Jerusalem. Ibn Iyyas says that Timraz was a stupid man, with bad manners and was disliked by people.
56. Large group of exiles ⁸⁷	872 AH/CE 1467	According to Mujir al-Din, when Sultan Qaytabay Ibn Abdallah al-Zahiri became the sultan in 872 AH/CE 1467, he ordered the return of exiled princes from Jerusalem, namely Baybars Khal al-Amir, Baybars al-Tawil, Jani Bek al-Mashad, among others, to Cairo. Mujir al-Din added that before those princes arrived in Cairo, the sultan made another order to exile them once again to Jerusalem. The sultan exiled more princes and sent them to Jerusalem. These were Yashbak al-Faqih al-Dawadar al-Kabir, Janbek Kuhiya al-Dawadar al-Thani and Maghlabay al-Muhtasib and others. No documented reason for the exile.
57. Prince Tani Bek al-Mu‘alam ⁸⁸	873 AH/CE 1468	According to Ibn Iyyas, in this year, the sultan instructed his army to arrest this prince and to exile him to Jerusalem. No documented reason for the exile.
58. Prince Mughlabay Azn Suql al-Khashqadmi ⁸⁹	874 AH/CE 1469	According to Ibn Iyyas, Prince Maghlabay Uzn Suql al-Khashqadmi died during his exile in Jerusalem. Before exile, he was in a high position within the Mamluk military system. He was also a religious man.
59. Prince Hasan Ibn Ayyub ⁹⁰	880 AH/CE 1475	According to Mujir al-Din, Prince Hasan Ibn Ayyub was promoted to several positions within the Mamluk government, such as Na’ib of Jerusalem in 857 AH, during the reign of Al-Ashraf Iynal. When the latter died and al-Zahir Khashaqdam became the new sultan, he sacked Hasan Ibn Ayyub from his post several times. When al-Ashraf Qaytbay became the sultan, prince Hasan was made the viceroy of

⁸⁴ Ibn Iyyas, *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur*, Vol. 2. p. 287.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2. p. 312.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2. p. 319.

⁸⁷ Mujir al-Din Al-Hanbali (1999), *Al-Uns al-Jalil Bitarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil*, al-Ka’abina M. (ed.), Hebron: Maktabat Dandis, Vol. 2. pp. 407- 409.

⁸⁸ Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyyas (1984), *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur fi Waqa’i’ al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay’a al-Misriyya al-‘Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 3. p. 18.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 3. p. 39.

⁹⁰ Al-Hanbali, *Al-Uns al-Jalil*, Vol. 2 . p. 405.

		Karak and later on was sacked and exiled to Jerusalem.
60. Prince Qunswah al-Yehyawī ⁹¹	886 AH/CE 1481	Participation with others in killing al-Dawadar Yashbak al-Dhahiri.
61. Group of the Sultan's Mamalik ⁹²	903 AH CE 1498	Participation in a revolt against the sultan
62. Group of princes from al-Sham ⁹³	905AH/CE 1500	Participation in a revolt against the sultan
63. Na'ib (viceroy) al-Karak ⁹⁴	912AH/CE 1506	According to Ibn Iyyas, the Na'ib of Karak (no name was given) was exiled to Jerusalem as a result of his bad attitude towards the people of Kark. Ibn Iyyas mentioned that this viceroy was newly appointed and he tried to make people fear him. He executed the doorkeeper of his court (<i>hajib of Karak</i>), his brother and children. People complained to the sultan, who exiled him for these reasons.
64. Al-Shaykh Burhan al-Din Ibn Abi Sharif ⁹⁵	919 AH/CE 1513	According to Ibn Iyyas, the sultan sacked al-Shaykh Burhan al-Din Ibn Abi Sharif from his post as the shaykh (master) of his school and exiled him to Jerusalem. The reason for that was the disagreement between the sultan and shaykh and some other scholars regarding a fatawa issued by this Shaykh about <i>ruju' al-mu'tarif bijarimat al-Zina</i> (withdrawing a testimony about committing adultery). The sultan became very angry and exiled this shaykh.

Discussion

Interestingly, 'Ashur and 'Ali were among the historians who discussed the exile phenomenon and they interpreted it as an attempt to restrict the movement of people whom sultans did not wish to have them around rather than as actual imprisonment. Many of these exiles took their families with them to Jerusalem and even worked there and earned money. The whole idea behind the exile was to punish them for certain acts but not to the extent of imprisoning them.⁹⁶ Simply, it can, as Ghawanma put it, be described as a comfortable exile.⁹⁷ For example, when Prince Qunqubay was exiled to Jerusalem, the sultan gave him a *Khubz/Iqta'* (fife) to earn 20,000 dirham a year.⁹⁸ When Prince Baklamish al-'Ala'i was exiled to Jerusalem, however, the sultan granted him half of Bethlehem and half of Bayt Jala,⁹⁹ but when Prince Taybugha al-Tawil was exiled there, the sultan provided him with an allowance sufficient for his needs.¹⁰⁰ As 'Ashur and 'Ali pointed out, Jerusalem was not the only place in the sultanate that was used for exile – Makkah, Madinah, al-Shawbak and al-Karak (in southern modern Jordan) were also used, though 80 per cent of the exiles were sent to Jerusalem.¹⁰¹

⁹¹ Shams al-Din Muhammad Ibn Tulun (1962), *Mufakahat al-Khilan fi Hawadith al-Zaman (Tarikh Misr wa al-Sham)*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Mu'assasa al-Misriyya al-'Amah Lilita'lif wa al-Tarjamah wa al-Tiba'a wa al-Nashr, Vol.1. p. 51.

⁹² Ibid., Vol. 1. p. 188.

⁹³ Ibid., Vol. 1. p. 226.

⁹⁴ Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyyas (1984), *Bada'i' al-Zuhur fi Waqa'i' al-Duhu*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 4. p. 94.

⁹⁵ Ibn Iyyas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, Vol. 4 p. 345.

⁹⁶ 'Ashur, *Ba'd Adwa' Jadida*, p. 112; 'Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 37; see also, Ghawanma, *Tarikh Niyabat Bayt al-Maqdis fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 131.

⁹⁷ Ghawanma, *Tarikh Niyabat Bayt al-Maqdis fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 131.

⁹⁸ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 3. p. 502.

⁹⁹ Ibid., Vol. 3. p. 666. See also al-'Asqalani, *Inba' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3. p. 394.

¹⁰⁰ Ibn Habib, *Tadhkitat al-Nabih*, Vol. 3, p. 292; See also Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. p. 276; Ibn Iyyas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, Vol. 1, part 2. p. 29.

¹⁰¹ 'Ashur, *Ba'd Adwa' Jadida*, p.112; 'Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, pp. 37-38.

‘Ashur and ‘Ali were in agreement that Mamluk sultans used to send their less dangerous exiles to Jerusalem, whereas the more dangerous ones were imprisoned under harsher conditions in other areas, including Alexandria and Damietta.¹⁰² Burgoyne also mentions that Jerusalem was far from being the only place of exile and that there was no reason why any city should not be chosen as a residence for exiled princes.¹⁰³ Exiled personnel were able to move freely within the walled city of Jerusalem but could not leave the city without the sultan’s permission. In some cases, there was an exemption from such restriction: Ibn Taghribardi, for example, mentioned that when Prince Tarabay was exiled to Jerusalem in 828 AH/CE 1425 he was exiled with no restriction on his freedom of movement (*ghayr mudayaq ‘alayh*) in and outside Jerusalem.¹⁰⁴

Who Were the Exiled?

It is clear from the table above that the majority of those exiled to Jerusalem were princes (amirs) holding senior posts in the Mamluk state. Many of them were in high military positions and viceroys (*nuwwab*) in some of the most important parts of the state, including al-Sham, Damascus, Karak, Jerusalem and Safad. At least two of the exiles, Fakhr al-Din Majid Ibn Khasib and Abdullah Ibn Taj al-Riyasa, were ministers and one, Al-Shaykh Burhan al-Din Ibn Abi Sharif, was a very senior jurist (*faqih*). As mentioned earlier, no reasons were given for exiling some of them while, in other cases, the reasons were mentioned only briefly. It is well-known that a viceroy (*Na’ib al-Saltana*) in the Mamluk system had almost the same status as the sultan. In most cases, when a sultan wanted to replace a viceroy, the previous one would be exiled to Jerusalem. As Al-Maqrizi reported, ‘Prince Aqabgha was exiled to Jerusalem for no reason except that his post as viceroy of al-Sham was given to someone else.’¹⁰⁵ It is unclear why, but I would guess that the sultan was trying to prevent any potential problems arising between the incoming and outgoing viceroy. It seems also that, to safeguard their own position and to ensure that no viceroy could pull the rug from under their feet, Mamluk sultans developed a propensity to keep changing the positions of those in high office. It is interesting to note that people in high positions were often exiled to Jerusalem when a new sultan was appointed, presumably because the incoming one felt uncomfortable about being surrounded by princes who had served a previous sultan.

It is interesting that many of the exiles had previously been imprisoned in either Alexandria or Damietta and only on their release they had been sent to Jerusalem. This raises the question of whether Jerusalem was indeed meant to be just another prison. I would think not because I came across numerous examples of people specifically requesting to be exiled to Jerusalem after they had been imprisoned in or exiled to a different part of the Mamluk state. Ibn Qadi Shahba, Ibn Iyyas and al-Maqrizi all cite examples of princes asking to be sent to Jerusalem in preference to anywhere else.¹⁰⁶

It is clear that exile to Jerusalem was meant both to restrict the exile’s movements and to create an opportunity for the exile to make a contribution towards developing various aspects of life in Jerusalem. If, however, any exile behaved inappropriately, the sultan would have him removed from Jerusalem to protect the sanctity and holiness of the city. Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani reported that when people complained to the sultan that Al-Shaykh al-Safawi was behaving improperly towards women and their children during his exile in Jerusalem and spending his time indulging in inappropriate pleasure, Sultan al-Zahir had, without delay, ordered his viceroy in Jerusalem to arrest Al-Shaykh al-Safawi and remove him from Jerusalem to another place.¹⁰⁷

Rosen-Ayalon argues that, although exile can be seen as a negative phenomenon, the presence of exiled princes and army commanders in Jerusalem resulted in some major developments there and Jerusalem profited greatly from their personal involvement in its affairs. She added that their involvement had helped to ensure the provision of all the necessary installations, services and public

¹⁰² ‘Ashur, *Ba’d Adwa’ Jadida*, p. 113; ‘Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-‘Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 38.

¹⁰³ Burgoyne, *Mamluk Jerusalem*, p. 61.

¹⁰⁴ Ibn Taghribardi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira*, Vol. 14. p. 277.

¹⁰⁵ Al-Maqrizi, *al-Suluk*, Vol 3, part 3. p. 1087.

¹⁰⁶ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 1. pp. 158 and Vol. 3. pp. 87, 144, 392, 649; Ibn Iyyas, *Bada’i’ al-Zuhur*, Vol. 1. part 1. p. 581; Al-Maqrizi, *al-Suluk*, Vol. 2. part 1. p. 27.

¹⁰⁷ Al-‘Asqalani, *Inba’ al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3. p. 394.

buildings befitting an organised medieval city.¹⁰⁸ For example, the historian Ibn Qadi Shahba reported that Prince Sayf al-Din Arghun al-Kamili had built a number of places in Jerusalem during his exile, including a school, Dar Qur'an (a place in which to teach the Qur'an) and a hospice for the needy and poor.¹⁰⁹

Motivations for Exile

All Mamluk rulers, especially senior princes, considered themselves social equals because, as discussed above they all shared the same slave origins. Nevertheless, some of them were more capable than others, which meant that they were appointed to senior positions from which one of them would be selected to become the next sultan. The absence in the Mamluk system of a clearly regulated transfer of power would create bitterness among senior princes when one of them was eventually selected as the sultan. Those who were unhappy about the choice of a new sultan, or who personally aspired to become the sultan, would select a city within the al-Sham region from which to base their revolt, especially cities such as Damascus, Aleppo or Safad, which were fortified and had complex topographies. 'Ashur and 'Ali believed that the Mamluk sultans were generally aware of this ploy, which explains why so many of the senior princes who had been appointed as viceroy to those places were later exiled to Jerusalem.¹¹⁰ 'Ashur and 'Ali added that the viceroys' secretaries usually worked as spies for the sultan, informing him of their employer's plans and intentions.¹¹¹ Once again, this could provide the rationale for sacking, imprisoning or exiling a viceroy to Jerusalem and then replacing him with another one.

Conclusion

While there is no doubt that the walled city of Jerusalem served as a place of exile during the Mamluk period and, as discussed above, there were several reasons why it was deliberately chosen for that purpose, I should like to add here that the Qur'an¹¹² clearly singles out the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem as the centre of the *Barakah* (expansion, growth, blessing).¹¹³ Immediately after the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem in 16 AH/CE 637, great numbers of Muslims, men and women, started either visiting or settling there.¹¹⁴ This phenomenon stopped when the Crusaders occupied Jerusalem in CE 1099, but resumed after Sultan Salah al-Din liberated it in 583 AH/CE 1187.¹¹⁵ Exiling princes, army commanders, ministers and others to this spiritually-rich location benefited both the exiled and the sultans. The exiles would be living in an environment that encouraged piety and allowed them to help develop the economic, cultural and educational life of Jerusalem, while the sultan was assured that they were no longer in a position to cause him any more trouble. For reasons already discussed, Jerusalem was a place of exile for people considered relatively harmless. The more dangerous opponents were either imprisoned, in place such as Alexandria, or exiled to rougher, harsher locations such as Makkah, Madinah, al-Karak and al-Shawbak. In short, exiling adversaries to Jerusalem kept them out of the state capital where the decisions were normally made and gave the sultan, especially a newly-appointed one, enough time to consolidate his position and strengthen his power base. This could explain why many of the exiles were eventually called back from Jerusalem and promoted to positions that were even more senior than the ones they had previously held.

In addition, there is no evidence in the literature of the period of any exile-led Jerusalem-based revolt against a sultan. The walled city of Jerusalem was not a fortified city and had no natural resources on which to rely in the event of an external siege or attack. Moreover, most of the people living in Jerusalem at that time were pilgrims, visitors, students or tutors.

¹⁰⁸ Rosen - Ayalon, *Between Cairo and Damascus*, p. 518.

¹⁰⁹ Ibn Qadi Shahba, *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Vol. 2. pp.122-123.

¹¹⁰ 'Ashur, *Ba'd Adwa' Jadida*, pp. 113-114; 'Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, p. 38.

¹¹¹ 'Ashur, *Ba'd Adwa' Jadida*, pp. 114; 'Ali, *Al-Quds fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, pp. 38-39.

¹¹² Qur'an 17:1 'we have surrounded with Barakah'.

¹¹³ Abd al-Fattah El-Awaisi (2019), *Nathariyat wa Namazaj Bayt al-Maqdis: Tafsir al-Ahdath al-Mu'asira wa Tawjihatiha wa Sina't al-Tarikh al-Mustaqbali*, Istanbul: Dar al-Usul al-'illmiya pp. 156-162.

¹¹⁴ Al-Hanbali, *Al-Uns al-Jalil*, Vol. 1. pp. 385-394.

¹¹⁵ Yitzhak Reiter (2008), *Jerusalem and its Role in Islamic Solidarity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 83.

This article is intended not as an all-inclusive treatment of the topic, but rather as a beginning for further investigations into the phenomenon of exiling political opponents to Jerusalem. To sum up, it seems that fear, rivalry and the sultan's anxiety about his position were the main reasons for exiling his potential rivals to Jerusalem.

References

- ‘Ali, al-Sayyid ‘Ali (1986), *Al-Quds fi al-‘Asr al-Mamluki*, Cairo: Dar al-Fikr Lidirasat wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi‘.
- ‘Asali, Kamil J. (1994), “Al-Madaris wa Ma‘ahad al-‘Ilm wa al-‘Ulama’ fi Falastin (al-Qarn al-Khamis - al-Thani ‘Ashar lihijra/al-Qarn al-Hadi ‘Ashar - al-Thamn ‘Ashar Lilmilad)”, in Dajani-Shkeel H. and Dajani B. (eds), *al-Sira‘ al-Islami al-Faranji ‘ala Filastin fi al-Qurun al-Wasta*, Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 494-529.
- ‘Ashur, Sa‘id ‘Abd al-Fattah (1986), *Al-Haraka al-Salibiyya, Safha Musharifa fi Tarikh al-Jihad al-Islami fi al-‘Usur al-Wsta*, Cairo: Maktabt al-Anjlu al-Masriyya.
- ‘Ashur, Sa‘id ‘Abd al-Fattah (1983), “Ba‘d Adwa’ Jadida ‘Ala Madinat al-Quds fi ‘Asr Salatin al-Mamalik”, in al-Bakhit M. A. (ed.), *Al-Mu‘tamar al-Duwali al-Thalith Litarikh Bilad al-Sham (Falastin) (al-Quds)*, Jordan: Jordan University and Al-Yarmuk University, Vol.1.
- Al-‘Asqalani, Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar (1966), *Al-Durar al-Kamina fi A‘yan al-Ma‘ah al-Thamina*, Jad al-Haqq M.S. (ed.), Cairo: Dar al-Kutub al-Haditha.
- Al-‘Asqalani, Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar (1986), *Inba‘ al-Ghumr Bi Abna‘ al-‘Umr fi al-Tarikh*, Khan M. (ed.), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.
- Al-‘Irayni, Al-Sayyid al-Baz (1967), *Al-Mamalik*, Beirut: Dar al-Nahda al-‘Arabiyya Litiba‘a Walnashr.
- Al-Hanbali, Mujir al-Din (1999), *Al-Uns al-Jalil Bitarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil*, Abu Tabbana Y. (ed.), Hebron: Maktabat Dandis, Vol.1.
- Al-Hanbali, Mujir al-Din (1999), *Al-Uns al-Jalil Bitarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil*, al-Ka‘abina M. (ed.), Hebron: Maktabat Dandis, Vol 2.
- Al-Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din Ahmad (1941) *Kitab al-Suluk Lima‘rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, Ziyada M.M. (ed.), Cairo: n.p., Vol. 2. part 1.
- Al-Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din Ahmad (1958), *Kitab al-Suluk Lima‘rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, Ziyada M. M. (ed.), Cairo: n.p.
- Al-Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din Ahmad (1971) *Kitab al-Suluk Lima‘rifat Diwal al-Muluk*, ‘Ashur, S. A. (ed.), Cairo: Matba‘at Dar al-Kutub, Vol 3, part. 3.
- Al-Mawardi, Abu al-Hasan (1996), *The Ordinances of the Government*. A translation of Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyya w’ al-Wilayat al-Diniyya, Wahba W. H. (trans.), Reading: Garnet Publishing Ltd.
- Amitai-Preiss, Reuven (2004), *Mongols and Mamluks: The Mamluk-Ilkhanid War 1260-1281*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ayalon, David (1993), “Some Remarks on the Economic Decline of the Mamluk Sultanate,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Vol. 16, 108-124.
- Burgoyne, M. H. (1987), *Mamluk Jerusalem: An Architectural Study*, London: The World of Islam Festival Trust.

- El-Awaisi, Abd al-Fattah (2019), *Nathariyat wa Namazaj Bayt al-Maqdis: Tafsir al-Ahdath al-Mu'asira wa Tawjihatiha wa Sina't al-Tarikh al-Mustaqbali*, Istanbul: Dar al-Usul al-'Ilmiya.
- Ghawanma, Yusuf Darwish (1982), *Tarikh Niyabat Bayt al-Maqdis fi al-'Asr al-Mamluki*, Al-Zarqa'-Jordan: Dar al-Haya Lilnashr wa al-Tawzi'.
- Holt, P.M. (2001), "The Last Mamluk Sultan: Al-Malik al-Ashraf Tuman Bay," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Vol. 25, 234-246.
- Ibn Habib, Al-Hasan Ibn 'Umar (1976), *Tadhkitat al-Nabih Fi Ayyam al-Mansur wa Banih, Amin, M.M and 'Ashur, S.A. (eds.)*, Cairo: Matba'at Dar al-Kitab.
- Ibn Iyyas, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad (1982), *Bada'i' al-Zuhur fi Waqa'i' al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 1. part 1.
- Ibn Iyyas, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad (1983) *Badai' al-Zuhur fi Waqai' al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Ama Lilkitab, Vol. 1, part 2.
- Ibn Iyyas, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad (1984), *Bada'i' al-Zuhur fi Waqa'i' al-Duhur*, Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Ama Lilkitab, Vols. 2, 3 & 4.
- Ibn Qadi Shahba, Abu Bakr Ahmad (1994), *Tarikh Ibn Qadi Shahba*, Darwish 'A. (ed.), Damascus & Limasoul: Al-Ma'had al-'Ilmi al-Faransi Lildirasat al-'Arabiyya & Al-Jaffan wa al-Jabi Liltiba'a wa al-Nashr.
- Ibn Taghribardi, Jamal al-Din Yusuf (1950), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: Matba'it Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, Vol. 11.
- Ibn Taghribardi, Jamal al-Din Yusuf (1956), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: Matba'it Dar al-Kutub al-Masriyya, Vol. 12.
- Ibn Taghribardi, Jamal al-Din Yusuf (1970), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Shaltut F. (ed.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Amah Lilta'lif wa al-Nashr, Vol. 13.
- Ibn Taghribardi, Jamal al-Din Yusuf (1971), *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Muhraz J. M and Shaltut F. (eds.), Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Amah Lilta'lif wa al-Nashr, Vol. 14.
- Ibn Taghribardi, Jamal al-Din Yusuf (n.d.) *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa al-Qahira*, Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Amah Lilta'lif wa al-Tarjama wa al-Tiba'a wa al-Nashr, Vol. 8.
- Ibn Tulun, Shams al-Din Muhammad (1962), *Mufakahat al-Khilan fi Hawadith al-Zaman* (Tarikh Misr wa al-Sham), Mustafa M. (ed.), Cairo: al-Mu'assasa al-Misriyya al-'Amah Lilta'lif wa al-Tarjamah wa al-Tiba'a wa al-Nashr.
- Irwin, Robert (1986), *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate 1250-1382*, London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Jubran, Nu'man and al-'Amadi, Muhammad H. (2000), *Dirasat fi Tarikh al-Ayyubiyin wa al-Mamalik*, Irbid-Jordan: Mu'assasat Hamada Lidirasat al-Jami'iyah wa al-Nashr.
- Levanoni, Amalia (1995), *A Turning Point in Mamluk History: The Third Reign of al-Nasir Muhammad Ibn Qalawun 1310-1341*, Leiden - the Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Little, Donald P. (1990), "Jerusalem under the Ayyubids and the Mamluks," 1187-1516 AD, in Asali K. J. (ed.), *Jerusalem in History*, New York: Olive Branch Press.
- Nicolle, David (2005), *The Mamluks 1250-1517*, Oxford-UK: Osprey Publishing.

Qasim, Abdo Qasim (1994), *‘Asr Salateen al-Mamalik* (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq.

Reiter, Yitzhak (2008), *Jerusalem and its Role in Islamic Solidarity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosen-Ayalon, Mariam. (1995), “Between Cairo and Damascus: Rural Life and Urban Economics in the Holy Land during the Ayyubid, Mamluk and Ottomans Periods,” in Levy, Thomas E. (ed.), *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Singer, Amy (1994), *Palestinian Peasants and Ottoman Officials: Rural Administration around Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

