

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

THE MAMLUK STATE OF SALHIA 652-658 AH / 1254-1259 AD
(A HISTORICAL STUDY)

Husain Dakhil Al. Bahadly¹, Atyaaf Rofat Akram²

^{1,2} Aliraqia University, College of Arts

Email: dr.hussainbahadly@gmail.com , atyaafrofat12@gmail.com

Husain Dakhil Al. Bahadly Atyaaf Rofat Akram. The Mamluk State of Salhia 652-658 AH / 1254-1259 AD (A Historical Study) -- PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 18(9). 1696-1707. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Mamluk State of Salhia

ABSTRACT

The Salhia Mamluk state lasted from the year (652-658 AH / 1254-1259 AD) for about seven years and had a prominent impact on the scene of historical events. They are equal in rights and entitlement, and the ruling must devolve to the strongest, following the principle of ruling for the one who prevails. The importance of the research came to shed light on the motives that prompted the Mamluk princes to choose Izz al-Din Aybak, who is one of the Mamluks of Salhia and assuming the position of the Sultanate in Egypt, and they called him King al-Muizz, even though al-Muizz Aybak is from a different sect. The research dealt with talking about the historical sequence of the state since the death of Al-Salih Najm Al-Din Ayoub, and the nature of the subject necessitated dividing it into four axes: the first: Shajarat al-Durr and the handover of the reins of government, the second, the rise of al-Muizz Aibak, the Sultanate of Egypt, and the third: the fourth, the ascendancy of Sultan Qutuz, the Sultanate of Egypt. In completing it, we relied on some of the sources, the most important of which are the book of Al-Maqrizi (845 AH / 1441 AD) in his book "Al-Suluk to Know the Countries of the Kings", and Ibn Taghri Bardi (T.: 874 AH / 1469AD) in his book The Stars in the Kings of Egypt and Cairo, as well as on the most important references Saeed Abd Al-Fattah Ashour: The Mamluk Era in Egypt and the Levant.

Shajarat al-Durr and the transfer of the reins of government to the Mamluks

The naval princes met in the year 648 AH / 1250 AD, and they agreed on the enthronement of Shajarat al-Durr the throne of the Egyptian Sultanate, and Izz al-Din Ibek , al-Jashankir , the Turkman, one of the princes of Salhia, was in mourning for the military , and historical sources mention that the tree of al-Dur in terms of origin and upbringing, She is the first female Sultana of Turkish origin to assume the Sultanate of Egypt, as al-Qalqashandi mentions what it says: "There is no other woman in Egypt in Islam". Al-Salihya and Al-Bahriya

to win them over to its side on the one hand in its continuous struggle with the Ayyubids of the Levant, who see that they are more entitled to the throne of the Egyptian Sultanate.) in relation to her son from the righteous king Najm al-Din Ayyub, who died young during his father's life, and it appears that her taking this nickname is to win the affection of the Ayyubid princes , and the text of the supplication for her on the pulpits was "God preserve the high authority, the queen of Muslims, infallibility." The world and religion, Umm Khalil Al-Musta'simiyah, the owner of the righteous king" and her sign was Khalil's mother, where they inscribed on the tracks his manasah (((Al-Musta'simiyah, the Queen of the Muslims, the mother of Khalil, the Commander of the Faithful))).

Shajarat al-Durr, while assuming the throne of the Sultanate, faced opposition from the sects of Egyptian society, as these sects considered that the assumption of a woman on the throne of the Sultanate would be a departure from the accepted principle and a violation of the conditions of the jurists, the most important of which is masculinity, i.e., a man taking over the reins of government, and the matter did not stop at this point. It faced another problem, which was the failure of the Ayyubid princes in the Levant to recognize its sultanate, as historical accounts mentioned that Prince Jamal al-Din Yusuf bin Yaghmour, who was the deputy of the Sultanate in Damascus, strongly refused her assumption of the rule of Egypt, and the Qaymariyah princes supported Prince Jamal al-Din in his refusal. and expressly declared their refusal to take it.

Perhaps the strongest opposition to her taking it was from the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim Billah who sent a letter to the people of Egypt in which he said: "If men are absent with you, then inform us so that we can send a man to you", and in this regard, Judge Ezz Al-Din Bin Abd Al-Salam issued a fatwa, about what may afflict Muslims. From the mandate of a woman. And when the opposition intensified to Shajar al-Durr assuming the rule of the Sultanate, the Mamluk princes of Bahri and Salhia gathered together in an attempt to solve this problem, and they unanimously agreed among themselves on the nomination of one of the Mamluk princes whose word they agreed upon, so they chose Izz al-Din Ibek for the throne of the Sultanate, and I abdicated to him Shajarat al-Durr after about eighty days of sitting on the throne of the Sultanate of Egypt.

2. Tasneem of Sultan al-Muizz Ibek al-Turkmani (648-655 AH/1250-1257)

The marine Mamluk princes agreed to choose Izz al-Din Aybak, one of the Mamluk princes of Salhia in the year 648 AH / 1250 AD, for the position of the Sultanate in Egypt, and they called him the king.

Al-Moez , which is the first to be named from the Mamluks in Egypt .The question that arises for discussion here, why did the marine Mamluk princes choose a owned property other than their sect?

In fact, answering this question requires delving into the potentials of the political scene at the time to reveal the motives for this choice:

The first motive: that the supreme interest of the maritime Mamluks required that the current circumstance is not suitable for choosing one of their princes for the position of the Sultanate, as there is a dangerous competition among them to seize the position of the Sultanate, which may undermine their actual control over the reins of power in Egypt, and to prevent the situation from turbulence, especially since the country faces internal challenges And externally, and that the choice of APIC for the position of sultanate from their point of view represents a compromise solution, and what confirms this is what Ibn Taghri Bardi said:

The second motive: The choice of Aybak, even if he was not from the marine Mamluk sect, represents a real choice of the Mamluks in the administration of the state and the affairs of government.

As for the third motive: it is to feel the pulse of the sects of the Egyptian society and the Ayyubids of the Levant, as well as the Abbasid Caliph Al-Mu'tasim Billah to ascend Mamluk to the position of the Egyptian Sultanate and the positions they support or oppose so that they can evaluate these positions to take the next step.

The Fourth Motive:

The choice of a Mamluk from the Salhia indicates that the project of officially declaring the state of the Maritime Mamluks has not yet taken root in the minds of the marine Mamluk princes, and what confirms this is their choice after a short period of Aybak assuming the position of the Sultanate, one of the young princes of the Ayyubid house, Sultan of Egypt, and the request from Aybak Relinquishing the position of the Sultanate to the former and for him to submit to him, and although this waiver is a formality to win the friendship of the opponents of the Mamluks from the Ayyubids of the Levant and in response to the desire of the sects of Egyptian society not to take possession of a slave who lost one of the most important conditions considered which is freedom to rule their country, this confirms the That the naval Mamluk princes, even if they were forced to do so because of the military pressure exerted on them by the Ayyubids of the Levant, are still under the auspices of the Ayyubid state, and that their project in declaring their state has not yet matured.

Apart from these motives, the choice of Aybak was not in accordance with the principle (rule for the one who prevailed), as he was not the strongest and did not come to rule by force according to their principle, as mentioned by Ibn Taghri Bardi the above-mentioned narration, and that the higher interest of the maritime Mamluks required his selection for the position of the Egyptian Sultanate In these extremely complex political and military circumstances.

In any case, at the beginning of its ascension to the position of the Sultanate, APIC faced several challenges, the most important of which was the failure of the Egyptian community to accept the ascension of slaves to the position of the Egyptian sultanate, as well as the refusal of the Ayyubid princes to take this position on the grounds that APIC is one of their kings on the one hand; And because the rule of the Sultanate in Egypt is a legitimate right for them on the

other hand, and also, this rule from their point of view may establish a large Mamluk state that extends from Egypt to their areas of control in the Levant on the other hand, so they worked to abort the Mamluk project to establish a state for them in Egypt in order to restore what they believe their legitimate right to rule Egypt.

The historical events in the first four years after the death of Sultan Najm al-Din Ayyub have proven that the Naval Mamluks acted in accordance with their supreme interests, and dealt realistically with the internal and regional challenges they faced during this period, especially the sects of Egyptian society or what is related to the claim of the Ayyubids of the Levant to rule the Egyptian Sultanate. Considering that they are the heirs of the Ayyubids, and what confirms this is their request from Aybak to cede the position of the Sultanate to one of the young princes of the Ayyubid house, Al-Ashraf Musa bin Al-Malik Al-Nasir Yusuf.), which is a high position following the position of the sultan in terms of rank, and similar to the position of the regent. Through the accession of Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi, the Mamluks sought to achieve three things:

1. Gaining the support of the sects of the Egyptian society, considering that Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi is the person to whom everyone gathers to obey him, as Al-Aini mentions his saying “so that everyone gathers to obey him and the dispute rises.”
2. Delivering a message to the Ayyubids of the Levant that they are still under the control of the Ayyubid state.
3. Restricting the authority of Aybak, who was not from their sect, through a boy who commands their orders, and perhaps what Al-Yunini confirmed confirms this, as he said what he said:

Historical events have proven that choosing Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi for the position of the Egyptian Sultanate in these circumstances did not achieve the goal that the marine Mamluk princes sought to gain effective control over the reins of power in Egypt. On the other hand, the choice of this boy did not discourage the Ayyubids of Bilad al-Sham from continuing their military pressure on Egypt.

A quick look at the available historical sources may give a clear picture of the political and military circumstances that accompanied the selection of Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi as the Egyptian Sultanate, and the results that emerged from him later.

First of all, Aybak's abdication of the position of the Egyptian Sultanate was a formal procedure, and this confirms his continuation as the actual ruler of Egypt, and as for Al-Ashraf Musa, he had nothing in the rule but a symbolic presence such as mentioning his name in the sermon, coining and participating in the sultanate occasions in which all of APIC participated with him. , and the matter was not limited to this extent, as APIC took advantage of the young age of Al-Ashraf and based on the available historical accounts, he was six years old during his tenure of the position of the Egyptian Sultanate to strengthen his

position in the state and expand his powers. One of the researchers updated to a strange phenomenon that occurred for the first time, which is the participation of two sultans in ruling Egypt, and most of all, the latter announced that he derives his legitimacy in ruling as a representative of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim by God.

As for the Ayyubids of Bilad al-Sham, they considered that the position of the Sultan in Egypt was their right, and their Mamluks had nothing to do with this matter, and this was confirmed by their sending a military campaign to Egypt in the year 648 AH / 1250 AD, which the Mamluks managed to defeat in the battle that was known as the Battle of Al-Abbas.

The Abbasid incident represented an important event in the course of the conflict between the Ayyubids of the Levant and the Mamluks, as it was the first direct military conflict between them, and one of the most important results of the Ayyubids realizing the Levant's strength was the strength of their Mamluk opponents, as well as the impossibility of a military solution to return Egypt to the Ayyubid rule of the power of the Mamluks of Egypt, and the caliphate realized The Abbasids are the seriousness of this conflict, especially since the Arab and Islamic nation is exposed to two most powerful attacks from the East and the West, namely the Mongol threat and the ongoing Crusades against the Levant and Egypt.

The available historical accounts mentioned that the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim Billah dispatched a messenger in the year 650 AH / 1252 AD, namely Najm al-Din al-Badra'i to mediate between the Ayyubids of the Levant and the Mamluk princes in Egypt in order to settle their dispute and devote themselves to confronting the Mongol threat , and al-Badra'i succeeded in his mission and was able to An agreement was concluded between the two parties, according to which the regions of the Levant and Egypt were divided between them as follows: Egypt, Jerusalem and Nablus to the Mamluks of Egypt, and the rest of the Levant to the Ayyubids of the Levant , and the Mamluks of Egypt agreed under this agreement to release the Ayyubid princes and leaders of their campaign who were captured in his battle Al-Abbas , and in fact, this agreement established the rule of the Mamluks in Egypt and some areas of the Levant, as the Ayyubids of the Levant recognized the legitimacy of their rule over them .

The Mamluks led by Aybek faced a serious rebellion in Upper Egypt led by Hisn al-Din Ibn Thalab, as the latter managed to gather a number of Upper Egypt Arabs who opposed the rule of the Mamluks under the pretext that they were not of free origins, and Aybek was able to put an end to this rebellion after winning He was arrested in the fortress of Al-Din, and he was arrested in the Citadel of the Mountain, then he was transferred to the port of Alexandria, where he was imprisoned.

And when the Mamluks were assured that things were going according to what they had planned, and there was only one step left for them in declaring their state, which is to instruct Aybak to isolate Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi and establish himself as sultan over Egypt under the pretext of the former's inability to defend the country and in these circumstances it needs to A strong sultan who

can defend it and stand against the Mongol danger, and with this pretext, Aybak got rid of this Ayyubid boy, so he dismissed him in the year 652 AH / 1254 AD , and exiled him to the land of al-Ashkari .

Perhaps it is important to point out that the removal of Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi from the position of the Egyptian Sultanate and the sole ruling of Aybak does not mean, from a political point of view, the establishment of the state of the Bahri Mamluks. The establishment of the Salih Mamluk state that lasted for six years during which Aybak ruled and after him his son according to the principle of succession subject to the guardianship system. Only one year, when he was killed in 658 AH / 1259 AD, at the hands of Baybars al-Bandaqari, and Baybars al-Bandaqari is the actual founder of the Bahri Mamluk state, and this is what we will discuss later.

And after the matter was established in Egypt by Ibek in the year 654 AH / 1256 AD, he sent a messenger to the Caliph Al-Musta'sim Billah, seeking legal authorization from him so that his emirate over the rule of Egypt would be legitimate. The Ayyubids of the Levant tried to take advantage of the political conditions in Egypt and the preoccupation of Ibek with his opponents

The Mamluk naval princes to restore their rule over Egypt, so they sent a campaign led by King Al-Nasir Al-Ayyubi, but this campaign failed and was unable to achieve its goal, and the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim was forced to intervene again in an attempt to end the dispute between the two parties, and his messenger Sheikh Najm Al-Din was sent Al-Baradiri, who succeeded in dissuading King Al-Nasir from continuing his advance to Egypt after his armies reached Gaza, the latter responded to the reconciliation in the year 654 AH / 1256 AD, according to which the regions of the Levant and Egypt were re-divided between them.

The goal of the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim in God's granting of the legal mandate to Aibak to rule Egypt was to win the latter and ensure his loyalty on the one hand; And because he was certain that the scattered Ayyubids divided into small states could not defeat the Mamluks on the other hand, and at the same time he did not want the Ayyubids to lose in these circumstances that the Arab and Islamic nation were exposed to the danger of the Mongols, so he sent to their sultan a mandate to rule some areas of the country Al-Sham, however, his action had no effect in those circumstances, as the Mongol invasion was quicker to him than the rescue he expected from the Ayyubids and the Mamluks.

Apparently, the success of APIC in expelling the senior Mamluk emirs from Egypt and his monopoly in ruling according to the principle of seizing by force or ruling for those who prevail combined with the authorization from the Abbasid Caliph Al-Musta'sim, and the Ayoubi's acquiescence in the Levant does not mean that the situation in Egypt has been completely settled for him, as it has emerged He had a serious family problem, and he did not manage to act with the cunning and cleverness with which he was known, and she is his second wife, Shajar Al-Durr. Since his political marriage to her in the year 649 AH / 1251 AD, he found himself subject to her actions, whether in the affairs of the state or within the framework of the family. Barada Shajarat al-Durr

remained responsible for Aybek in all his cases, and she had no words..." In addition, Aybek was aware of the influence of the Mamluk Bahri princes on her, as they were the ones who stood by her, whether during the reign of her first husband, Sultan Najm al-Din Ayyub, or the assassination of his son, Sultan Turan. Shah in the year 648 AH / 1250 AD or during her assumption of the position of the Egyptian Sultanate for a short period, In addition, Sultan Aybak was fed up with her behavior, whether in the state or the family, and he first worked to reduce her political influence in the state after the killing of Faris al-Din Aktay and the dimensions of her senior friends princes of Marine Mamluks, and then put an end to her family behavior after fulfilling her request to divorce his first wife, Umm Ali, secondly.

And if Shajarat al-Durr had accepted the fait accompli, whether with regard to the limitation of her powers in the state or in the continuation of Aybak with his first wife or Ali, but that she took on Aybak neglecting her as a wife after he deserted her for a period of time, and her psychological condition worsened when the news of Sultan Aybak's engagement to her from The daughter of the owner of Mosul, Badr al-Din Lulu, who was found in this marriage, whether or not she was insulted, to reduce her prestige and position, and she was apparently possessed by jealousy and began to plan under a psychological circumstance to lure Aybak to Cairo to kill him with the help of some of her friends, the Mamluks of the sea in the country Al-Sham, and when Aybak learned of this plan, he decided to get rid of it, but when she learned that Aybak intends to get rid of it, she pretended to conciliate and heal the rift. The year 655 AH / 1257 AD, after a rule that lasted about less than seven years.

And when the news of the killing of Abik became known, the Mamluks of Al-Mu'izzi rushed to the palace, and arrested the harem and the servants, and they confessed the plot. As she was killed by Umm Ali in a painful way, and she was thrown from the wall of the castle into the ditch, and she remained in this trench for a period of time, then was buried after a few days.

3. Tasneem Al-Mansur Noor Al-Din Ali Ibn Aibak Al-Sultanate (655 AH-657 AH / 1257-1259 AD)

After the killing of their master and founder of their state, Sultan Ibek, the Mamluk princes of Al-Mu'izz agreed to:

The appointment of his son, Nur al-Din Ali, as Sultan of Egypt, and they called him King al-Mansur and appointed one of his father's mamluks, Seif al-Din Qutuz, as his deputy.

What concerns us here is that Nur al-Din Ali is the first Mamluk sultan to assume the position of the Egyptian Sultanate, and the circulating sources did not indicate the reasons why the Mamluk princes al-Mu'izz resort to this principle, although it was not in their political creed and the Mamluk creed in general, which is based on the principle of rule for the one who prevails. What are the reasons that prompted the comforting Mamluks in this circumstance to resort to the principle of succession?

In fact, the extrapolation of the political and intellectual conditions of the circumstances in which Nur al-Din Ali took power indicates that the comforting Mamluks acted in accordance with the political and intellectual developments at the time, so the sudden assassination of Sultan Aybak, and the fear of exploitation by the marine princes of the Mamluks, especially after the nomination of Shajar Al-Durr before killing one of their princes, which is Sanjar al-Halabi for the position of the Egyptian Sultanate, made them set their affairs in motion and nominate the son of their master and founder of their state, Sultan Aybak, for the position of the Egyptian Sultanate.

In any case, Sultan Nur al-Din Ali was not qualified to rule the Egyptian Sultanate in these circumstances because of his young age first, and his departure for fun and playing with the servants secondly, and the actual rule was for his mother by limiting her powers as she is his guardian, and his deputy, Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz, with regard to his mother, she controlled, as mentioned by the circulating sources, the affairs of the state, and it was, as Ibn Duqmaq mentions, "the management of the king's order is the management of women", and Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz was meanwhile engaged in a conflict with the marine Mamluk princes who tried to exploit The circumstances to return to Egypt, especially since they had obtained military support from the distressed Emir Omar, the owner of Karak, and headed to Egypt with the aim of eliminating the rule of the comforting state.

From what appears, the victory of Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz in this battle made him aspire to rule the Egyptian Sultanate, and he was waiting for the appropriate opportunity to seize power by force, and the opportunity was created for him after the news of the Mongols' takeover of Baghdad in 656 AH / 1258 AD and the fall of the Abbasid Caliphate, A year had not passed since this date until Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz seized the rule of the Egyptian Sultanate by force on the pretext that Sultan Nur al-Din Ali was a boy and had no ability to defend the country and stand in the face of the apparent Mongol danger, and that it needed a strong sultan capable of defending it in these circumstances. So, Sultan Nur al-Din Ali, his mother and brother, Prince Nasir al-Din Qaan, were arrested and exiled to Damietta and it was said to the country of Shukri. Sultan Seif al-Din Qutuz's conquest of the Sultanate in the year (657-658 AH / 1259-1260 AD)

Seif al-Din Qutuz assumed the position of the Egyptian Sultanate according to the principle of governance for those who prevailed in the year 657 AH / 1259 AD, and he is the third sultans of the Mamluk state al-Mu'izz. From what appears in the historical sources in circulation, Sultan Seif al-Din Qutuz did not obtain a legitimate mandate for his rule from the Abbasid Caliphate because of its fall at the hands of the Mongols and the killing of its last caliphs 656 AH / 1258 AD.

At the beginning of his assumption of the position of the Egyptian Sultanate, Sultan Saif Qutuz faced an opposing coalition of the Ayyubids led by the ruler of Karak Omar Al-Mughith and some marine Mamluk princes residing in the Levant. This alliance was held in the year 657 AH / 1259 AD, which ended with the flight of the marine Mamluk princes to Karak, and this victory is the second after the first victory he achieved against the alliance in the year 655 AH / 1257

AD, when he was the deputy of Sultan Nur al-Din Ali bin Aybak .

In any case, the course of historical events confirmed that the reign of Sultan Seif al-Din Qutuz is one of the glorious eras, not the Mamluk and Egyptian dates, but in Islamic history in particular. Levant one after the other after they increased the killing of its inhabitants and the displacement of another part of them, and their plan was not limited to the occupation of the Levant, but rather to go to Egypt and eliminate the Mamluk state, which confirms this the message that Hulagu sent to Sultan Saif al-Din Qutuz in which the latter and Egypt promised the same fate. Which they practiced in the Arab and Islamic cities that they desecrated in the east of the Arab Islamic state and the Levant in particular.

The course of historical events confirmed that Sultan Seif al-Din Qutuz acted in accordance with the supreme interest as an Islamic leader, so he decided to end the enmity with the Ayyubids and the marine Mamluk princes residing in the Levant. The Mamluks of the sea and invited them to return to Egypt, and granted them fiefs.

Then he went to prepare a strong army to confront the Mongols in the Levant before they headed to Egypt, and he united his efforts with the Ayyubids to stop the rapid Mongol advance in the Levant. In the south, and the Islamic army led by Sultan Qutuz was able to achieve a great victory over the Mughal army, and this battle changed the balance of power at that time in favor of the Muslims and reduced the power of the Mongols. Moreover, this battle broke the psychological barrier that the Mongols tried to impose as a fait accompli, which is that they are an unbeatable people, and perhaps it is appropriate here to refer to the defeat of the Mongols in Ain Jalut, which is the first against an Islamic army since the era of its founder Genghis Khan.

The victory of the Muslims did not stop at Ain Jalut. Sultan Qutuz took advantage of the collapse of the Mongol army after this battle and gave orders to pursue its collapsed remnants throughout the Levant. The navy, Baibars al-Bandaqdari at the head of an army to liberate Homs, Aleppo and the rest of the cities of the Levant, and the latter was able to accomplish the task in a period not exceeding a few weeks from the battle of Aingoliath, after that, Sultan Qutuz announced the unification of Egypt and the Levant in one state under his leadership, which is the first time in ten years that these two states are united under the banner of the Mu'izz Mamluks specifically.

And the historical accounts mention that Sultan Qutuz promised Prince Baybars al-Bandaqari in the Emirate of Aleppo, that the latter would be able to expel the Mongols from it, but he fulfilled his promises and entrusted them to the son of the governor of Mosul, Ala al-Din bin Badr al-Din Lulu', which made Baybars al-Bandaqari guarantee him hatred , The latter decided to kill him when you allowed him, and it did not take a short period of time until he implemented the plan he had drawn during the return of Sultan Qutuz to Egypt. Aktay and killed him in the year 658 AH / 1260 AD , who lasted his rule over Egypt for a period of eleven months and seventeen days .The sources mention that Baibars was the one who killed him himself, and thus his rule ended and the Salih Mamluk state disappeared after about six years of its establishment.

CONCLUSION

1. After the death of Sultan Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub, the Mamluk princes of Salhia agreed to take over the wife of their teacher Shajarat al-Durr for two reasons, the first being that she was the widow of their teacher, and the second making it a means to transfer the Sultanate to the Mamluks from the Ayyubids, and the second reason making it a means of transferring the Sultanate to the Mamluks.
2. Isolation of Shajarat al-Durr according to the opposition of the Abbasid Caliphs and the Ayyubids because she was a woman
3. The naval princes agreed on choosing Izz al-Din Aybak al-Turkmani, even though he was not from their sect.
4. One of the most important motives in which Al-Mu'izz Ibek was chosen as sultan over Egypt necessitated that the circumstance the state was going through was not suitable for choosing one of their princes for the position of the Sultanate due to the dangerous competition among them, in addition to the fact that the country was facing internal and external challenges and that his choice was a compromise that satisfies All Parties.
5. The choice of a Mamluk from the Salhia indicates the project of declaring the state of the Maritime Mamluks, which has not yet taken root in the minds of the Maritime Mamluk princes.
6. The choice of APIC was not in accordance with the principle of judgment for the one who prevailed.
7. The dismissal of Al-Ashraf Musa Al-Ayyubi from the position of the Sultanate and the monopoly of Ibek in the ruling does not mean, from a political point of view, the establishment of the Mamluk Bahri state. What took place in the year 652 AH / 1254 AD is the establishment of the Salih Mamluk state, which lasted for six years, during which Aybak and after him his son ruled according to the principle of succession subject to the guardianship system.

REFERENCES

- Ibn Taghri Bardi, Yusuf bin Taghri Bardi bin Abdullah (874 AH / 1469 AD), Al-Manhal Al-Safi, edited by Dr. Mohamed Amin, published by the Egyptian General Book Authority. And the shining stars in the kings of Egypt and Cairo, Dar Al-Kutub, (Cairo, 1963).
- Ibn Khaldun, Abdul Rahman bin Muhammad bin Muhammad (d. 808 AH / 1405 AD), The History of Ibn Khaldun named The Lessons and the Diwan of the Beginner and the News in the History of the Arabs, the Berbers and Their Contemporaries with the Greatest Concern, investigation, Khalil Shahada, Dar Al-Fikr, (Beirut, 1988 AD).
- Al-Dawadari, Abu Bakr bin Abdullah bin Aybak (736 AH / 1335 AD), Treasure of Al-Durar and the Mosque of Al-Gharar, investigated by Ulrich Harmann, (Cairo, 1971 AD).
- And Al-Dhahabi, Shams Al-Din Abu Abdullah Muhammad (748 AH / 1348

- AD), *The History of Islam and the Deaths of Celebrities and the Media*, achieved by Omar Abdel Salam Al-Tadmari, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, (Beirut, 1993). And *Biography of the Nobles' Flags*, 3rd Edition, Investigated by Shuaib Al-Arnaout and others, Al-Resala Foundation, (Beirut, 1985).
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal Al-Din Abdul Rahman bin Abi Bakr (d. 911 AH / 1505 AD), *Hasan al-Mahazar fi History of Egypt and Cairo*, investigation, by Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, House of Revival of Arab Books, (Cairo, 1967).
- Ibn Al-Taqtaki, Muhammad bin Ali bin Tabataba (709 AH / 1209 AD), *The Honorary of Royal Literature and Islamic Countries*, investigated by Abdul Qadir Muhammad Mayo, Dar Al-Fikr, (Beirut, 1986 AD).
- Al-Aini, Badr Al-Din Mahmoud (d. 855 AH / 1451 AD), *The Juman Contract in the History of the People of Time*, investigated by Muhammad Amin, Dar Al-Kutub Press, (Cairo, 2010).
- Al-Fassi, Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Ali (832 AH / 1432 AD), *Healing Love with News of the Sacred Country*, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, (No, 2000 AD).
- Abu Al-Fada, Imad Al-Din Ismail bin Ali bin Mahmoud (d. 732 AH / 1347 AD), *Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar Al-Bishr*, Al-Hussainiya Egyptian Press, (Cairo, DT).
- Al-Qalqashandi, Ahmed bin Ali bin Ahmed (d. 821 AH / 1418 AD), *Sobh Al-Asha in the Construction Industry*, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya (Beirut, DT).
- Al-Ketbi, Muhammad bin Shaker bin Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Shaker (d. 764 AH / 1362 AD), *Fatwas of Deaths*, Investigated by Ihsan Abbas, Dar Sader, (Beirut, 1974 AD)
- Ibn Katheer, Ismail bin Omar bin Katheer (d. 774 AH / 1372 AD), *Interpretation of the Great Qur'an*, investigated by Muhammad Husayn Shams al-Din, (Beirut, 1992).
- Al-Maqrizi, Ahmed bin Ali bin Abdul Qadir Taqi Al-Din (d. 845 AH / 1441 AD), *The statement and the expression of the Arabs in the land of Egypt*, achieved by Fernando Aston Field, Göttingen, (Germany, 187 AD). And *Behavior in Knowing the Countries of Kings*, investigated by Muhammad Abdul Qadir Atta, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, (Beirut, 1997). And *Al-Maqfi Al-Kabir*, Dar Al-Gharb Al-Islami, 2nd Edition, (Beirut, 2006).
- Al-Mansoori, Pierce Al-Doudari, Rukn Al-Din bin Abdullah Al-Khattai (d. 725 AH / 1324 AD), *The Mamluk Masterpiece in the Turkish State*, investigation by Dr. Abdel Hamid Saleh Hamdan, The Egyptian Lebanese House (Cairo, 1978).
- Al-Nuwairi, Ahmed bin Abdul-Wahhab bin Muhammad bin Abdul-Daim (d. 733 AH / 1333 AD),
- 19- *The End of the Lord in the Arts of Literature*, Dar Al-Kutub, (Cairo, 1990).
- Ibn Wasil, Muhammad bin Salem Nasrallah bin Salem (697 AH / 1397 AD), *Mufarrej al-Karub in the news of Bani Ayyub*, achieved by Jamal al-Din al-Shayal, House of Books and Documents, Amiri Press, (Cairo, 1957 AD).
- Ibn Al-Wardi, Omar bin Muzaffar bin Omar bin Muhammad (d. 749 / 1348 AD), *Tarikh Ibn al-Wardi*, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, (Beirut, 1996 AD).

Al-Yunini, Abu Al-Futuh Qutb Al-Din Musa bin Muhammad (d. 726 AH / 1325 AD), *The Tail of the Woman of Time*, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Islami, (Cairo, 1993).

Third: secondary references

Ahmed Mukhtar Al-Abadi, *Abbasid and Fatimid History*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, (Beirut, Pla. T).

Jamal Al-Din Al-Shayal, *The entire history of Damietta*, Library of Religious Culture, (Port Said, 2000 AD).

Hassan Pasha, *Islamic Titles in History, Documents and Archeology*, Dar Al Fannia, (Cairo, 1989).

Said Abdel Fattah Ashour, *The Ayyubids and the Mamluks in Egypt and the Levant*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, (Cairo, 1996).

27- *The Mamluk Era in Egypt and the Levant*, 2nd Edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya (Cairo, 1976).

Shafeeq Jaser Ahmed, *The Maritime Mamluks and their Elimination of the Crusaders in the Levant*, published by the Islamic University (Al-Madina Al-Munawwarah, 1988 AD).

Abdel Aziz Salem, Sahar Salem, *History of the Ayyubids and Mamluks*, University Youth Foundation, No, (Alexandria, 2004).

Abdel Moneim Maged, *The Political History of the State of the Mamluk Sultans in Egypt*, Anglo-Egyptian Library, (Cairo, 1988).

Muhammad Kurd Ali, *Plans of the Levant*, Al-Nouri Library, 2nd floor, (Beirut, DT).

Noureddine Khalil, *The Mamluks who slandered them Shajar al-Durr, the conqueror of kings and the savior of Egypt*, Dar al-Kutub al-Masryah, (Egypt, 2005 AD).

Wafaa Muhammad Ali, *The Abbasid Caliphate in the Era of Buyid Domination*, Modern University Office, (Alexandria, 1991).