

## History of Mamluk Rebellions Model of the Rebellions of Tagribermiş and Aynal el-Cekemî

**Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdullah Mesut AĞIR**

*Batman Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü, BATMAN*  
[amesut.agir@batman.edu.tr](mailto:amesut.agir@batman.edu.tr)

**Okt. Sedef GÜNEŞ**

*Batman Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü,  
BATMAN*  
[sedef.gunes@batman.edu.tr](mailto:sedef.gunes@batman.edu.tr)

### ABSTRACT

Many rebellion took place in the center and in the provinces of Mamluk Empire. One of the centers of rebellion was Syria had sometimes been a starting point and sometimes a shelter for rebels who were against the current Sultan. Two of these rebellions were Tagribermiş, Viceroy of Aleppo, and Aynal el-Cekemî, Viceroy of Damascus. Both of these viceroys rebelled on the pretext that Sultan Yusuf, the son of Sultan Barsbay, had been dethroned by Çakmak. In fact, their aim was to seize the throne. Moreover, they did not build an alliance among themselves for this reason. In addition, neither could these rebels get the other viceroys in Syria to their sides nor provide support of Anatolian Turcoman. In this case, they could not be successful.

**Key words:** Mamluks, Sultan Çakmak, Amir Tagribermiş, Amir Aynal el-Cekemî, Syria, Turcoman

### ÖZET

Memlûk Devletinin merkez ve bazı vilayetlerinde isyanlar meydana gelmiştir. Bu isyanların merkezlerinden birisi olan Suriye, bu başkaldırıların başlangıç noktası olmuş bazen de sultana karşı olan ayaklananlar için sığınak görevi görmüştür. Bu isyanlardan birisi Halep Nâibi Emir Tagribermiş ve diğeri de Dimaşk Nâibi Aynal el-Cekemî'nin isyanlarıydı. Her iki vali de Sultan Barsbay'ın oğlu Aziz Yusuf adına isyan etmiş ve Yusuf, Sultan Çakmak tarafından tahttan indirilmiştir. Gerçekte bunların amacı, tahtı ele geçirmektir. Dahası, bu amaç doğrultusunda bunlar birbirleriyle de ittifak yapmadı. Buna ek olarak, bu Suriye valileri ne diğer bölgelerdeki valileri ne de Anadolu Türkmenlerini taraflarına çekmeyi başarabilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Memlûklar, Sultan Çakmak, Emir Tagribermiş, Emir Aynal el-Cekemi, Suriye, Türkmenler

## 1. Introduction

The history of Mamluk Empire is the history of rebellions when considered with Cairo and its provinces. One of the most important centers of these rebellions was Syria (Bilâd eş-Şam).<sup>1</sup> However, there is also something to be mentioned at this point; the common feature of many of the rebellions that occurred in Syria was that they all started when the dynastic struggles in Cairo spread to Syria. As the candidate succumbed on the struggle for the throne in the capital would go directly to Syria and aimed to get power and then continued to struggle against new sultan.

The other reason Syria being the center of the rebellions was that; at that time in Syria, following the changes of sultans took place in Cairo, the amirs, who thought they were worthy enough to be sultan and who had worked at high-level authorities like viceroy, started rebellions in provinces where they were by exploiting the authority gap in the government.

The rebels got support of the people in Damascus province and Anatolian Turcoman was the reason why the rebels often occurring in Syria were so effective. The purpose of the Turcoman who supported these rebels was to strengthen their positions in the government. Even by this way, the Anatolian Turcomans aimed to be independent political power by dissociate the relations with government. Thus, the history of Mamluks is full of examples for Anatolian Turcomans supporting the rebels occurred in Syria. As an example for this, we can take Rebellion of Amir Canbeg es-Sûfî (1436–1437) as it took place in a near period to the one that we will deal with (İbn Tagriberdi, byy: XV, 65-68,71; Holt, 1999: 191; Yinanç, 1989: 52). In this rebellion Canberg fought against Sultan Barsbay and mostly got the support of Dulkadirids.

In the region of Mamluk, many rebellions were experienced during the history and two of them occurred at the end of the second half of the 15th century. These rebellions were Amir Tagribermiş's, Viceroy of Aleppo and Amir Aynal el-Cekemî's, Viceroy of Damaskus. These two rebels occurred approximately at the same time. In our study, as described in the introduction, we will deal with these rebellions which show many

---

<sup>1</sup> Syria, named above, it is *Bilâd eş-Şam* in Arabic primary sources. *Bilâd eş-Şam* divides into five quarters: *Palestine, Jordan, Dimashk, Hums, Kinnesrin*, see, Ahmed b. Ali el-Kalkaşandî, *Subh el-A'şâ fî Sînâat el-İnşâ*, c. IV, yay. Muhammed Abdurrasul İbrahim, Cairo, 1913-1920, s. 88.

similar features with the other ones occurred in Mamluks. Our goal is to explain the rebellions in detail and to make some inferences in the conclusion.

The rebellions of Amir Tagribermiş and Amir Aynal el-Cekemî were organized against Sultan Çakmak. Sultan Barsbay, the predecessor of Çakmak, had willed his son accede to throne after his death. And his will was carried out. However, after a short time Amir Çakmak unthroned the fourteen-year-old Melik el-Aziz Cemaleddin Yusuf and declared his own sultanate, September 9, 1438. For this reason, Sultan Çakmak had to struggle against various rebellions occurred in the country (İbn Tagriberdi, byy: XV, 256-257; Hasan-ı Rumlu, 2006: 331-332; Koprman, 1992: 520-522). However; Sultan Çakmak had to cope with the rebel of Amir Korkmaz eş-Şa‘bânî before the other rebellions subject to our study. Amir Korkmaz did not accept Çakmak being Sultan and turned his coat and by the provocation of former sultan, Barsbay and el-Eşrefiyye Mamluks, he soared on Sultanate and rebelled. Nevertheless; the real aim of Eşrefiyye, who promised to support him in the state of emergency, was to bring el-Azîz Yusuf, the son of Sultan Barsbay, to the throne back. By this way they would keep on their high positions in the government. However during the rebellion, Sultan had el-Eşrefiyye Mamluks turned their coats for him in return for financial profit and this brought the end of the rebellion and Amir Korkmaz who was pushed into loneliness found remedy in fleeing. Then he was caught and executed. Suppression of the rebel ensured calm for a period of time in Egypt (Perho, 2000: 119).

## **2. The Rebellion of Amir Tagribirmiş**

During the Mamluk history, civil conflicts were the specific features constantly occurring among the Mamluks. In March 1, 1439, Kanibay el-Hamzavî Viceroy of Hama Sultanate delivered the news to Sultan Çakmak who just suppressed the rebellion of Korkmaz that Amir Tagribermiş, Viceroy of Sultanate of Aleppo, would start rebellion (İbn Hacer, 1986: 53). There were some rumors that he had already been in such an attitude. The letter from Hama confirmed these rumors partially. In fact, Tagribermiş started to establish various plans for the rebellion after the death of Barsbay. The remarkable point was that on the death of Barsbay he didn't occupy the city when he arrived at Aleppo with his Mamluks but waited as a precaution till the Egyptian army

left (Ağır, 2010: 38). He occupied the city on the withdrawal of troops from Aleppo and then he began to make plans of how he could change the conditions for his own favor. He was a Turcoman and he called many of his Turcoman sympathizers for help in his struggle (İbn Tagriberdî, 1986: IV, 61-62; Glubb, 1973: 338).

An important reason for the rebellion of Tagribermiş was that he believed he was superior than Sultan Çakmak. In an expedition to Anatolia, during the rebellion against Amir Canıbeg es-Sûfî at the period of Barsbay in 1436, Tagribermiş was the commander of the army in which Çakmak was under his command and this was the reason why Tagribermiş thought himself superior than Çakmak (Sayrafî, 1994: II, 352-353).

Tagribermiş had a belief in Dehr so he was atheist (Ağır, 2010: 38). He did know nothing about Islam. There was no one better than him in finding solutions to issues as he was intelligent, talented, and ambitious; but he had a cold attitude towards society and had a rough way of speech. A while ago, the numbers of mamluks increased under the leadership of Tagribermiş who got positive responses from most of the Turcoman Amirs (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 284). The followers of him were Syrian Turcoman. Anatolian Turcoman supported him as well as Syrian Turcoman. Thus, Varsak Beyi Musa, who had been supposed to subject to Ramazanoğulları but did not obey them, helped Tagribermiş. His goal was to pave the way for his own viceroy. However Ramazanoğlu Yülük bey contacted to Sultan Çakmak and fought against Musa Bey (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1185-1186; Sayrafî, 1994: IV, 172-173). Tagribermiş, Sultanate Viceroy of Aleppo, showed of loyalty at first by wearing the hilat sent by Çakmak (İbn Tagriberdî, 1986: IV, 62; Sayrâfî, 1994; IV, 43) but then he rebelled (Muir, 1968: 150). Having been uncomfortable with his actions, Sultan commissioned the amirs of Aleppo to catch him. For all that, Tagribermiş had heard this commandment in advance. This turned out a good opportunity for him to reveal his rebellion plan and to perform it. Anyway he showed his rebellious attitude by arresting some amirs from Aleppo (‘Aynî, 1989: 531; İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 53). Tagribermiş intended to dominate Aleppo entirely because, if he carried out his wish, he would have had the opportunities to turn the conditions for his own favor. In other words, he would be able to control the forces under his entourage and fortify his castle and strenghten it. He would be able to resist against any army easily if happened. Regarding the possibility of losing his struggle,

Tagribermiş, with a sufficient number of forces, planned to escape to the regions where Turcoman were in majority as he had great influence and prestige on Turcoman (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 285). Besides Mamluks who were under the control of Tagribermiş, many Turcoman would be on his side to support him during the rebellion (Sayrâfî, 1994: IV, 43). The historian İbn Tagriberdî reports that; Sultan had been extremely irritated because of the rebellion of İbn Tagribermiş and he was not more irritated when Aynal el-Cekemî rebelled in Damaskus after a short time (Ağır, 2010: 39). First of all Tagribermiş planned to seize the castle by fighting against Amir Hatat, Viceroy of Aleppo Castle, who was by the side of Sultan. But when he failed to achieve his aim he intended to seize the castle by trickery. Amir Hatat realized it and after consultations with amirs of Aleppo, he decided to fight against Tagribermiş and then they started a relentless war (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 285). Many people from the public joined to Aleppo umera to support them who fought against Tagribermiş (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 73).

At the intense moments of the war, while Amir Hatat was shooting on Tagribermiş (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1111) and his soldiers from the walls of the castle by the help of catapults, Berdîbek el-Acemî el-Cekemî and Amir Katak min Temrâz from the amirs of Aleppo started attacking on Tagribermiş by weapons, together with his soldiers (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 285). But these amirs were defeated by the forces of Tagribermiş. Whereupon, Amir Katak escaped to near Bîre while Amir Berdîbek directed to near Hamâ with his small number of soldiers. After a period of time, Sultan Çakmak consulted with his amirs on the rebellion by gathering assembly. In this consultation, amirs insisted on taking Tagribermiş out of Aleppo but Sultan wanted to follow the developments in Aleppo for some time in accordance with the news from Syria as rumors were spreading in Cairo that; Amir Aynal el-Cekemî negotiated with Tagribermiş and called him to obey Sultan and compromised with him. For this reason, Sultan never attempted at preparations of a war. However, on 26th February, 1439 Sultan Çakmak sent a letter to Tarabulus and informed that he had appointed Amir Culbân to viceroy of Aleppo in place of Tagribermiş. This decision of Sultan meant that he discredited Tagribermiş completely. Berdîbek el-Acemî el-Cekemî was appointed to viceroy of Tarabulus in place of Amir Culbân (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 285). After a while, the news was received in Cairo that Amir Katak reached Hamâ and Tagribermiş

conquered the castle and the city of Ayn Tâb. In the conquered Ayn Tab castle, with the amirs who had been arrested by Aynal el-Cekemî, Damascus Nâzır el-Ceyşi Yusuf b. es-Safî el-Kerekî and Kâtib es-Sırr Kadı Bahâ ed-Dîn Muhammed b. Hâcı were prisoners there as well.

On the 22nd, January 1439 Amir Tagribirmiş sent a letter to Sultan Çakmak. By this attitude, he was trying to explain to the people in Cairo that he had not been responsible for the actions ongoing in Aleppo and also trying to acquit himself from the activities near Syria.

In his letter Tagribirmiş put into words that: When Tagribirmiş saw the Viceroy of Aleppo Castle Amir Hatat fortifying the castle and making the weapons put into walls of castle, he asked by sending a message to Amir Hatat why he behaved in that way but Hatat did not reply to him. After some time, fightings occurred between Tagribirmiş and the residents of the castle and then Amir Berdibek el-‘Acemî and Amir Katak were defeated and they fled. Tagribirmiş asked Viceroy of Castle Amir Hatat to explain why he behaved in this way by sending him another message and Amir Hatat replied him that Berdibek el-‘Acemî took a written order from Sultan about catching him so he behaved in this way (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1111; İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 286). In his letter, he also stated that he was always loyal to Sultan and obeyed him. By sending a letter containing above mentioned events to kadıs of Aleppo, Tagribirmiş told that he did not have any hostility against Çakmak, conversely he was under the obedience of Sultan and he even supported this. But Sultan Çakmak did know what Tagribirmiş thought indeed, so he showed that he did not trust Tagribirmiş by not taking his letter seriously.

In the meantime, Viceroy of Damascus, Aynal el-Cekemî started a rebellion, which proved that Sultan had been quite right on this issue (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 289). Then, after receiving the news of this rebellion, Tagribirmiş invited Turcoman to Aleppo considering it as an opportunity. Many Turcoman responded positively to his invitation and arrived at Aleppo (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1115). From this moment on, a violent struggle would start between two sides (‘Aynî, 1989: 531; İbn Tagriberdî, 1986: IV, 63). Balls made of bell metal were prepared by Tagribirmiş to hit the walls of Aleppo castle and he surrounded the castle simultaneously. When Viceroy of Aleppo Castle, Amir Hatat learned that somebody made a deal with Tagribirmiş, he made these

people caught and threw them in front of Tagribermiş by placing them into the catapults while having some of them cut their head and hanged to the walls of the castle. Tagribermiş got full of fury about it (Ağır, 2010: 40).

When Tagribermiş was about to take the castle over, some close people told him that the people of Aleppo would go against him and this made Tagribermiş flurried. These people also recommended Tagribermiş to announce to the people that they were in safe. The people of Aleppo learned that Tagribermiş would plunder the city with Turcoman. Faced with this situation, nobody relied on the statement of Tagribermiş “ the people is in safe”. Then people of Aleppo got their arrows and swords and walked over where Tagribermiş and his forces were settled in and they killed most of them including Turcoman (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 73). In his work, Ibn Tagriberdi pointed this issue by following statement; “God inspired the people of Aleppo to fight against him”. Especially people from sheikhes of Aleppo and ulema encouraged the Aleppo people for fighting against Tagribermiş (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 323).

Though he was known to be a cunning and clever person who could change the conditions for his own favour by smart plans, Tagribermiş had a coward and anxious personality when he faced with enemy. In fact, his plan of rebellion was very wisely considered and had an excellent diplomacy. However; it brought his end to share his ideas with ignorant people (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 293). Learning Aleppo people revolted against him, Amir Tagribermiş was anxious and he decided to leave the city. He had many Mamluks who were gorgeous-dressed and with superior weapons. But these Mamluks had no experience to resist against Mamluks of Sultan in case of a war. In addition, these forces of Tagribermiş neither had been in a serious struggle nor had a great success. When Viceroy of Damascus Aynal el-Cekemî, rebelled too, Sultan Çakmak activated the Mamluks of Sultan intending to suppress the rebellion ongoing in Syria. Then armies of Tagribermiş left their master into loneliness by fleeing without struggling against the armies of Sultan. However Tagribermiş had been very generous to his Mamluks and fulfilled everything what they wished. Tagribermiş surrounded the castle of Aleppo for 30 days with a certain determination but he had to retreat to Tarabulus with nearly forty horsemen for some reasons like that (İbn Tagriberdî, 1986: IV, 63; Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1115); the Mamluk forces set off Cairo and he could not find the strength and courage of himself to struggle against the people of Aleppo that

came together against him. Amir Culban who had been appointed as viceroy to Tarabulus by Sultan Çakmak, was afraid and immediately abandoned Tarabulus and fled to the region of Remle<sup>2</sup> when he learned that Tagribirmiş was approaching (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 294). After he had left Aleppo, Tagribirmiş, taking his goods and horses, went to around Hama and settled down the mount Akra in the aforementioned towns (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 56). But there he was attacked by Turcomans opponent to him and was caught by Turcoman Chief Ahmed b. Kasım. After the situation was reported to Amir Culban, he commissioned a few men as officers for the purpose on fetching Tagribirmiş. After a while the commanders who got him from Turcoman, brought him to Aleppo (Sayrâfî, 1994: IV, 118; ‘Aynî, 1989: 531). After Tagribirmiş, who was chained, was brought to the city and handed over to the viceroy of castle.

Seyf ed-Dîn Hoşkadem from the ez-Zahiriyye Mamluks, brought the good news to Cairo. Sultan was delighted with the news and after he dressed the harbinger a hil’at, the event was heralded in Kal’atul Cebel and Cairo. Rebellious Amir Tagribirmiş was killed and his property that was about 50.000 dinar was confiscated (Sayrâfî, 1994: IV, 119). The cut-head of Tagribirmiş, whose death penalty was enforced by shotting in the neck, was brought to Cairo from Aleppo and hanged over at Bab Zuveyle<sup>3</sup> (İbn İyâs, 1983: 334).

As known Tagribirmiş was a Turcoman originated amir (Sümer, 1963: 79). His father was Ahmet b. el-Mısri and he served in the army of Mamluk. While he was carrying out his duty amir of horse, he was appointed to viceroy of Aleppo after Aynal el-Cekemi was passed on to one of the cities of Syria (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 58). When Sultan Çakmak became emperor, though he tended to Yusuf, he seemed obedient to Çakmak. He dressed the hilat that the Sultan sent for him, but then he disavowed the reign of Çakmak and rebelled.

It also brought his tragic end when the conditions turned against him (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 60). Essentially the fact that he appeared to be follower of Barsbay’s son Yusuf was

<sup>2</sup> Remle, a city on the way of Jerusalem, see, Yâkût, *Mu‘cam el-Buldân*, c. III, s. 399.

<sup>3</sup> Bâb Zuveyle, was situated in the South parth of Cairo and was built by Fatimids, see. Makrîzî, *Hitat*, I, s. 380; W. Popper, *Egypt and Syria Under the Circassian Sultans 1382-1468 A.D. Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghrî Birdî’s Chronicle of Egypt*, University of California Publications, cilt: 15-16, California 1957, s. 24.

also about that he had designs on the throne (Aynî, 1989: 521-532). Yet, as it is known, there was no reign of Mamluks. After the death of the current Sultan, the Mamluk who came into prominence with his power, would overwhelm the others and ascend the throne. Nevertheless this process would take a long time.

In such cases the son of the former Sultan would accede to the throne. Mainly this attitude was about that Mamluks, who were struggling, were not able to eliminate their rivals yet.

### **3. Amir Aynal el-Cekemi Rebellion**

Another rebellion that was seen in Syria in 1439 was the rebellion of Amir Aynal el-Cekemi Viceroy of Damascus. Aynal el-Cekemi, who was from the Mamluks of amirs of treasure Amir Cekem's Avad ez-Zahiri, was sent into exile to Syria after serving as the keeper of treasury amirs of treasure and as a saki during the time of el-Melik el-Mueyyed Şeyh. After short-exile period, he was summoned back and served as amirs of tablhane. After Tatar appointed him as amirs of hundred, el-Cekemi began to upgrade swiftly and served as reis nevbet en-nuvvablık, viceroy of Aleppo and after being deposed from this duty he served as amirs of arms (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 469; Sehâvî, byy: II, 327).

He was imprisoned with el-Mueyyediyye Mamluks at the age of el-Eşref Barsbay, however, after Muhammed b. Muncuk en-Nasîri interceded he was released and at first he went to Hejaz and then Jerusalem. For a while he resided there, and he could only return to Cairo after the death of Barsbay. In the reign of Sultan Çakmak, the most important reasons why el-Cekemî in the viceroy of Damaskus rebelled there were the son of Barsbay having been dethroned and Korkmaz eş-Şa'bânî having been murdered (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 61; İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 468; Burns, 2005: 221). After ascending to the throne Çakmak sent several emissaries to Syranian viceroy to herald his Sultanate. Sending a hilat to Amir Aynal by the delegation of embassy under the leadership of Nâsır ed-Dîn Muhammed b. Muncuk, Çakmak showed his contentment about his administration and progression in Damascus ('Aynî, 1989: 522; İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 287). Sultan Çakmak also ordered his emissaries to provide the support of Viceroy of Damascus by talking to him for the rebellion of Amir

Tagrıbermiş. Amir Aynal met the emissary who came on the 21st February in 1439. Receiving the hilat sent by Sultan, Amir Aynal kissed the floor and showed his loyalty by entering into the castle on his horse sent along with the hilat. This attitude of him showed the rumor, which Viceroy of Damacus would rebel and had made Çakmak anxious when reached Cairo, was like untruthful (Ağır, 2010: 44).

But this good intention of Cakmak toward Aynal el-Cekemî turned out useless. That is it; two days after the return of delegation of embassy came from Cairo to Damascus, Amir Aynal el-Cekemî entered into his palace by riding his horse through the procession as usual.

After him, all the amirs and state officials of Damascus entered into the palace belonged to the Viceroy. As soon as Aynal settled his place in the assembly he made all the doors of the palace locked and all the amirs and state officials arrested (İbn Tagrıberdî, by: XV, 288). In piece of Ibn Hacer, the following was given as a reason why the amirs were arrested: When some amirs from the umera coming from Cairo came to negotiate with Aynal el-Cekemî, the Viceroy of Damascus, on rebellion of Amir Tagrıbermiş, Aynal el-Cekemî thought this was something against him and they had been sent by Sultan Çakmak to arrest him. However the Amirs were planning to get support of Aynal by talking to him on catching the Viceroy of Aleppo who had rebelled. Moreover; Aynal captured their goods as well as he got the leading merchants of the city arrested and got their property unrequited. Amir Yusuf from the amirs informed the other Amirs about the issue by returning to Cairo (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 61, 62). The Sultan getting too upset because of this attitude of Viceroy of Damascus summoned his commanders and organized an assembly. When Çakmak asked what should be done about Aynal el-Cekemi and Tagrıbermiş rebellions, his commanders said it would be appropriate to set out a expedition to Syria to procure tranquility in the region. At that moment Cakmak remembered what Akboğa et-Temrâzî said him before. Because et-Temrâzî had suggested Çakmak to go to Syria and get oath of loyalty from the administrators before he ascended the throne but he ignored this. It did not help him that umera repeated it in the assembly again (İbn Tagrıberdî, by: XV, 288). In fact, Syria had been a problem both during the periods of Ayyubids and Mamluks and the future of the state underwent hardships because of that. Problems, mostly from Syria, came one after other in the first months of the reign of Sultan Cakmak (Ağır, 2010: 45).

At first, the rebellion of Tagribirmiş Viceroy of Aleppo and the fleeing of Yusuf, who was dethroned and prisoned in one of the rooms of Harem, with the help of common-law wives and chief of eunuchs; and then the rebellion of Aynal El Cekemi, who put in a claim for the throne of Sultanate and rebelled by abusing the authority gap with the death of Barsbay (İbn Hacer, 1986: IX, 61; Burns, 2005: 221; Clot, 2005: 122). Amir Aynal rebelled in Damascus under the pretext of Yusuf and on behalf of him. Kadı Takîy ed-Dîn b. eş-Şuhba who supported Yusuf had the khutba read at Emevi mosque for him. And this was the last straw. Çakmak who had decided an expedition to Syria equipped a lot of Mamluks led by some Amirs from distinguished people of Umera to go to Damascus. He appointed Akboğa Et Temrazi as a Viceroy to Damascus as well (‘Aynî, 1989: 522; İbn İyâs, 1983: I, 334; İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 290). Also, Aynal el- Cekemi set free the Amirs who had been put into prison in return for their allegiance to Yusuf and Kanibay en-Nasiri commander of Damascus witnessed this allegiance. The most important reason why Aynal released them was from the desire of providing their support during his rebellion. But Ibn Tagriberdi stated that this release of the Amirs did not help Aynal and this made his plans upside down (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 291). Aynal El Cekemi, who fell to hardship as he could not get any support he wished, tried to get Amir Aynal el-‘Alâî en-Nâsirî Viceroy of Safed to his own side by various promises. But Amir El Alai refused his unity offer as he did not count on his words.

After this news was reached to Cairo, Çakmak became glad about the event so he sent a letter to the Viceroy of Safed and thanked him for his loyalty and attitude. Sultan Çakmak added 330 Mamluks to the other soldiers whom he had equipped to send to Syria and he gave 80 dinar to each of these Mamluks (İbn Tagriberdî, byy: XV, 292). So the number of Mamluks who set out for Syria increased to 652 (Glubb, 1973: 339). A few days later, the news, which Aynal El Cekemi in Damascus prepared to leave the city, reached to Cairo (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1123; Burns, 2005: 221). Upon that, Amir Kanibay el Behlevan el Atabek from Umera with a few Amirs and Mamluks along with them followed Aynal el-Cekemî and fought against him outside of Damascus. But there was no result of the struggle. There were dead and injured people between the sides. However, the final result was gained after Sultan Mamluks and Aynal fought against each other and defeated him on 16th April 1439.

Çakmak also sent Amir Hoşgeldi Viceroy of Safed Castle to attack Aynal (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1124). The victory was heralded in Cairo to the Sultan with the letter of Viceroy of Gazza (Makrîzî, 1973: IV/3, 1125). This news was met with joy in the city. After a period of time, Viceroy of Damascus Amir Akboğa et- Temrazi sent a letter to Çakmak, telling how Aynal El Cekemi was caught and the war occurred. Briefly, the war occurred so: Sultan Mamluks leaving from Cairo went ahead and gathered in Gazza and Remle then. After exploratory troops sent in advance returned and reported Aynal was nearside, the preparations for war started. While Amir Akboğa et-Temrâzî, Viceroy of Aleppo Amir Culbân, Viceroy of Safed Amir Aynal el-‘Alâî, Viceroy of Gazze Amir Tûh Mâzî, Viceroy of Jerusalem Amir Togan el-Osmânî ve Viceroy of Malatya Gars ed-Dîn Halîl b. Şahin were leading Sultan Mamluks, Viceroy of Baalbek<sup>4</sup> Amir Kansuh en-Nevruzî and 1000 cavalries composed of Bedouins and the foremost Turcoman were in the side of Aynal el Cekemi. Aynal was badly defeated after a tough war in the north of Damascus (Sayrâfî, 1994: IV, 106). There were a lot of dead in the war from both groups. Kansûh en-Nevrûzî, Amir Tanem el-‘Alâî, Amir Hayrbek el-Kavâmî and Amir Bayram et-Türkmânî who were fighting for Aynal were caught. Then the envoy who came from Damascus to Cairo told the sultan the news that Aynal was caught. Çakmak, glad with the news, gave 40 dinars to the envoy (Sayrâfî, 1994: IV, 107; Burns, 2005: 221). Amir Aynal El Cekemi was executed like the other rebellious Amirs and his cut-head was sent to Cairo (Burns, 2005: 221). The news was met with joy in Syria and Egypt because the peoples in these provinces had gone through many hardships financially and morally. Especially, during the rebellion in Aleppo a lot of civilian died, the rebellion of Amir Aynal broke the peace in Damascus and after the fleeing of Aziz Yusuf from the castle, Sultan Çakmak declared martial law and forbade the people to go out of their houses for a certain time and the doors were locked (Takkûş, 1997: 460).

<sup>4</sup> Baalbek is the city set up at the Bikâ Valley which is at the west part of Anti-Lebanon Mountains, see; İdris Bostan, “Ba‘lebek”, *İ.A.*, T.D.V. yay., c. 5, İstanbul 1992, s. 9.

#### 4. Conclusion

Viceroy of Aleppo and Damascus seemed as they favored Yusuf after he was dethroned. However they were essentially planning something about sultanate. The security of Syria was guaranteed after the suppression of their rebellions which were widely spoken. This success was achieved with an expedition to Syria and this was what should be done. This expedition, carried out on Syria by Sultan Çakmak, was the most important stage of his long-running Sultanate. Especially by the suppression of the rebellions of viceroys of Damascus and Aleppo who were dominant amirs, the sovereignty of Çakmak started to strengthen more and more by 1439 (Sobernheim, 1965: 6). These two emir, who were unsuccessful, failed to provide the support of the other viceroys of Syria like Safed, Hama, and Gaza. Moreover; Tagribermiş could not be successful on getting umera and people of Aleppo to his own side. Apparently, he only relied on the support of the Syrian Turcoman. In addition it cannot be observed any support of Anatolian Turcoman in these rebellions.

Tagribermiş had a connection with Varsak Beyi Musa bey from Cukurova Turcoman, but Musa did not have enough power and stayed off soon so this left Tagribermiş without help from Anatolia. All these reasons prevented the two rebellious' from performing something effectively on the way of Sultanate. If they had connected with Anatolian Turcoman as much as they did with the viceroys and the people of Syria, they could have been more efficient and even successful. During the first reign of Sultan Berkuk Yelboğa en-Nâsirî, Viceroy of Aleppo, rebelled against Berkuk and he succeeded to get support of other viceroys of Syria as well as Kadı Burhaneddin and Dulkadiroğlu Seveli Beg from Anatolia. As a result of this alliance Berkuk was dethroned (Solak, 2011: 158-163). Along with that, we can see that the rebellious' did not act together in these two rebellions which intersected in terms of time and space. In the case of Tagribermiş and Aynal, who governed two most important provinces like Aleppo and Damascus of Mamluk Empire, had built an alliance against Sultan Çakmak, there would have come about various results. Indeed both of them claimed that they had been fighting on behalf of Yusuf. Essentially this was a pretext, and both of them had designs on the throne. And this was probably the reason why they did not come together.

When we had a look at the rebellions in the history of Mamluk we conclude that a Syria expedition was organised against most of them. These sefers were sometimes commanded by Sultans themselves. So Sultan Berkuk set out for an expediton to Syria immediately after he ascended to the throne for the second time. We observed that Sultan Çakmak did not participate in Syria expedition organized against these two rebellions. However, the expedition was successful. In fact this occasion shows that; although these rebellions took place at the same time they did not have a great effect on Cairo.

## NOTES

- Ağır, A. Mesut, *Memlûk Sultanı el-Melik ez-Zâhir Seyf ed-Dîn Çakmak Dönemi*, Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, İzmir 2010.
- El -‘ Aynî, Bedreddin (1989), *‘Ikd el-Cumân fî Târih Ehl ez-Zamân*, nşr. ‘Abd er- Râzik et-Tantâvî el-Karmût, Cairo.
- Burns, Ross (2005), *Damascus: A History*, New York.
- Clot, Andre (2005), *Kölelerin İmparatorluğu Memlûkların Mısırı*, tras.: Turhan Ilgaz, İstanbul.
- Glubb, Sir John (1973), *Soldiers of Fortune: The Story of the Mamlukes*, New York.
- Holt, P.M (1999), *Haçlılar Çağı 11. Yüzyıldan 1517’ye Yakınođu*, tras. Özden Arıkan, İstanbul.
- İbn Hacer el-‘Askalâni Ebû’l-Fazl Şihâb ed-Dîn (1986), *İnbau’l-Gumr bi-Enbai’l- ‘Umr fî’-Târih*, ed.: Dâr el-Kutub el-‘İlmiyye, IX, Beyrut.
- el-Hamavî, Yâkût (1866-1870), *Mu ‘cam el-Buldân*, II., Leipzig.
- İbn İyâs, Muhammed b. Ahmed (1983), *Bedâyi‘ ez-Zuhûr fî Vekâyi‘ ed-Duhûr*, yay. Muhammed Mustafa, I/2, Cairo.
- İbn Tagriberdî, Ebû’l Mehâsin Yusuf, *en-Nucûm ez-Zâhire fî Mulûk Mısır ve Kâhira*, XV, yay. İbrahim Ali Tarhân, Cairo.
- İbn Tagriberdî, Ebû’l Mehâsin Yusuf (1986), *el-Menhel es-Sâfi ve’l-Mustevfi Ba ‘de’l-Vâfi*, yay. Muhammed el-Emîn, IV, Cairo.
- el-Kalkaşandî, Ahmed b. Ali (1913–1920), *Subh el-A ‘şâ fî Sinâat el-İnşâ*, IV, yay. Muhammed Abdurrasul İbrahim, Cairo.
- Koprman, Kazım Yaşar (1992), “Mısır Memlûkleri (1250-1517)”, *Doğuştan Günümüze Büyük İslâm Tarihi*, Çağ yay., 6, İstanbul.
- el-Makrîzî, Takîy ed-Dîn Ahmed b. ‘Alî (1973), *Kitâb es-Sulûk li-Ma ‘rifet Duvel el-Mulûk*, yay. Sa‘îd ‘Abd el-Fettâh ‘Âşûr, IV/3, Cairo.
- el-Makrîzî, Takîy ed-Dîn Ahmed b. ‘Alî (byy), *Kitâb el-Mevâ ‘iz vel-İ‘tibâr bi-Zikr el- Hitât vel-Âsâr*, I-II, Baghdad.
- Muir, William (1968), *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt AD-1260-1517*, Amsterdam Oriental yay., Amsterdam.
- Perho, Irmeli (2000), “Al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Taghrî Birdî as Historians of Contemporary Events”, *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt*, yay. Hugh Kennedy, Leiden.

- Popper, W. (1957), *Egypt and Syria Under the Circassian Sultans 1382-1468 A.D. Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicle of Egypt*, University of California Publications, 15-16, California.
- Rumlu, Hasan (2006), *Ahsenü't-Tevârih*, çev.: Mürsel Öztürk, T.T.K. yay., Ankara.
- es-Sayrâfî, el-Hatîb el-Cevherî Ali b. Davud (1994), *Nuzhet en-Nufûs ve'l-Ebdân fî Tevârih ez-Zamân*, yay. Hasan Habeşî, IV, Cairo.
- es-Sehâvî, Şemseddin Muhammed b. 'Abdirrahmân (b.y.y.), *Ed-Dâv' el-Lâmi' li-Ehl el-Karn et-Tâsi'*, Dâr Mekteb el-Hayât, Beirut.
- Sobbernheim, M. (1965), "Çakmak", *E.I.*, 2, Leiden.
- Solak, Kürşat (2011), *Memlûk Devleti'nin Anadolu Beylikleri ile Münasebetleri*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, İzmir.
- Sümer, Faruk (1963), "Çukurova Tarihine Dair Araştırmalar", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1, Ankara, s. 1-111.
- Takkûş, Muhammed Suheyl (1997), *Tarih el-Memâlik fî Mısır ve Bilâd eş-Şam*, Beyrut.
- Yinanç, Refet (1989), *Dulkadir Beyliği*, T.T.K. yay., Ankara.