



ANNALES ISLAMOLOGIQUES

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

AnIsl 24 (1989), p. 25-79

Doris Behrens-Abouseif

The Citadel of Cairo: Stage for Mamluk Ceremonial.

Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

9782724710885 *Musiciens, fêtes et piété populaire*
9782724710540 *Catalogue général du Musée copte*
9782724711233 *Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études
orientales 40*
9782724711424 *Le temple de Dendara XV*

9782724711417 *Le temple de Dendara XIV*
9782724711073 *Annales islamologiques 59*
9782724711097 *La croisade*
9782724710977 *???? ??? ???????*

Christophe Vendries
Dominique Bénazeth
Emmanuel Pisani (éd.)

Sylvie Cauville, Gaël Pollin, Oussama Bassiouni, Youssef
Hamed
Sylvie Cauville, Gaël Pollin, Oussama Bassiouni

Abbès Zouache
Guillemette Andreu-Lanoë, Dominique Valbelle

THE CITADEL OF CAIRO: STAGE FOR MAMLUK CEREMONIAL

Doris BEHRENS-ABOUSEIF

The Citadel of Cairo has been the residence of Egypt and Syria's rulers from the Ayyubid period until the 19th century. Founded by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī (1171-1193) and his vizir Badr al-Dīn Qarāqūš, it fulfilled the triple function of fortification, administrative center and royal residence. The fortifications, started by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ¹, were completed by al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (1218-1238). The residential structures were begun later by al-Malik al-Kāmil (604 / 1207-1208) who was the first ruler to dwell at the Citadel ². From that time on and until the nineteenth century the Citadel was constantly subject to modifications and reconstructions by almost all sultans who ruled long enough to take initiatives.

Creswell has surveyed the architecture of the Ayyubid part of the Citadel fortifications and Casanova has studied its history and topography throughout the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods ³. Archeological excavations can be expected one day to reveal a great deal about the buildings that once stood there and the hierarchy that connected them, as the recent digs at al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ and a tower of Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars promise.

Casanova's topography of the Citadel has proven to be a basic work, as my own research confirmed in many respects. As more historic material has been meanwhile published, I am adding further details. The aim of this study, however, is not essentially topographical, but rather to point out the various styles of court ceremonial within the Citadel during the Mamluk period. Since almost all of the Citadel's medieval residences

1. K.A.C. Creswell, *The Muslim Architecture of Egypt* II, Oxford 1959, p. 1 ff.; M. van Berchem, « *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum. Égypte*, Mémoires publiés par les Membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, 1900, p. 80 ff.

2. Abū Bakr Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Aybak al-Dawā-

dārī, *Kanz al-durar wa ḡāmiʿ al-ḡurar*, S.A. ʿĀšūr (ed.), Freiburg, Cairo 1971-1972, VII, p. 164.

3. P. Casanova, « Histoire et description de la Citadelle du Caire », in *Mémoires de la Mission archéologiques française au Caire*, VI, Cairo 1894-1897.

have disappeared, it is not always possible to identify the exact location of the buildings mentioned in the chronicles. Neither is it always possible, due to the uninterrupted building and restoration activity, to identify each founder. Mamluk chronicles, however, provide abundant materials on the Citadel as a royal residence which convey the character of the architectural environment ⁴.

After the great building activity of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (1293-1294, 1298-1308, 1309-1341), the basic features of the Citadel's architecture were established. Court life and its rituals, however, changed constantly. Throughout the centuries, the numerous sultans demonstrated individual interpretations of court scenarios, often transferring the focus of their activities from one spot to the other, so that the functions and hierarchy of buildings were regularly subject to modification. Therefore, reconstruction of these activities should contribute to tracing this architectural hierarchy. Thus, the southern enclosure of the Citadel, which contained the residential complex, will be the subject of our concern, while the military structures, concentrated in the northern enclosure and built mainly during the Ayyubid period, will be excluded.

Under Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, who was the main designer as well as builder and rebuilder of the Citadel, this enclosure was composed of two parts, a northern ceremonial complex with the mosque, the Īwān, and Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ as well as the Hippodrome and the Stables, and the southern part which included the Harem and the Park (*Ḥawṣ*).

I. — THE CITADEL, A SYMBOL OF SOVEREIGNTY

The Citadel of Cairo, when mentioned by medieval Arab historians, is always the subject of an individual chapter. With its several thousand inhabitants, its walls, dwellings, markets, *ḥammām(s)* and mosques, it was described as a city in itself, of which all travellers made mention. As in almost all royal courts the palaces of the Mamluks, with their sophisticated ceremonies, rituals and protocol, played an essential role as manifestation of glory and power, whereas religious foundations in the city demonstrated a ruler's piety.

The significance attached to the ruler's seat was a notable feature throughout Cairo's history ever since Ibn Ṭūlūn (868-883), who built new and lavish palaces for himself

4. This approach has already been adopted by the authors Garcin, Maury, Revault, Zakariya when referring to the Citadel in their study of

Mamluk residential architecture in *Palais et Maisons du Caire, époque mamelouke (XII^e-XIII^e et XVI^e siècles)*, Paris 1982, p. 41-95.




Fig. 1. — Plan of the Citadel.

and his court to stress his independence from the Abbasid Caliph. Consequently, demolition of these palaces by Abbasid troops celebrated the return of the Egyptian province to the supremacy of the Caliph. Cairo itself, i.e. al-Qāhira, was founded as the residence of the Fatimid Caliphs to enhance the stage of their religious performances and rituals, symbolizing both the political and religious powers of the Caliphs who, according to Fatimid Šī'a doctrine, were semi-divine. The dismantling of these palaces by Sunni Orthodox Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, and his refusal to dwell there himself, was significant in marking the beginning of a new era. Following a Syrian tradition, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn erected the Citadel as a fortified residence for the sultans, their officers and their soldiers. Unlike the Fatimid residences, the Citadel was not associated with religious rituals; its functions were principally military and administrative, lodging the military aristocracy, with the various residences and offices of sultans and amirs, as well as the barracks.

Our information on court protocol in the Bahri Mamluk period is derived primarily from the report of the historian Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umārī⁵, who lived and worked at the court of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, and that of Qalqašandī who on this matter essentially repeats al-'Umārī's account. Qalqašandī's work, though compiled in the early fifteenth century under Circassian Mamluk rule, is essentially historic; he does not much report much of his own period. Although the chronicles of the Circassian period do inform us about court life at their time, a systematic documentation, like that of al-'Umārī and Qalqašandī, is lacking for this period, a fact which often misleads historians of the Mamluks to identify the whole Mamluk period 1250-1517 with Bahri features. Time, evolution of the political situation, and the cultural origins of the Circassian sultans naturally brought substantial changes in many aspects of court life as well as in various other social levels. Maqrizī, although his descriptions usually focus on the past Bahri period, does register — often regretfully — the changes, drawing comparisons between both rules, as does Ibn Taḡribirdī. Al-Ẓāhiri⁶ gives an eyewitness account of the Mamluk court during the mid-Circassian period under the reign of Sultan Ğaqmaq (1438-1453). His account, though brief, also demonstrates that court life in the fifteenth century was no longer identical to that of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and his sons. This is further confirmed by Ibn Iyās' chronicle. He writes, for example, that the Ḍahabiyya or royal boat from which the sultans used to open the Ḥaliḡ, was reckoned among the emblems of sovereignty. Qalqašandī, however, does not refer to

5. Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umārī, *Masālik al-abṣār fi mamālik al-amṣār*, Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid (ed.), Cairo 1985.

6. Ḥalil Ibn Šāhīn al-Ẓāhiri, *Kitāb zubdat kaṣf al-mamālik wa bayān al-ṭuruq wa'l-masālik*, P. Ravaisse (éd.), Paris 1893.

it, and thus it is not clear since what period it was considered to be so⁷. It should be mentioned in this context that ceremonial rules do not seem to have been codified, but rather, developed gradually. Therefore, when certain customs were abandoned, they were forgotten and it was likely they would not be later reinstated in the same style.

Costumes, which represented an important aspect of court ceremonial, were subject to fashions and innovations⁸. Sultan al-Zāhir Barqūq (1382-1399), who began Circassian rule after a century and a half of Turkish Mamluks, was perhaps, after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, the most innovative sultan in matters of fashions and ceremonial. His policy aimed at lowering the status of the former aristocracy and raising a new one in its stead⁹. New fashions and customs fulfilled the important function of stressing this transfer of power.

Little is known about the origins of Mamluk court ceremonies. The Mamluks inherited heraldry and a few ceremonial customs from the Ayyubids, who themselves had been strongly influenced by the Saljuqs of Iran. Subsequently, they added to and elaborated upon this heritage, and innovated. The Mamluks did not hesitate in using various prototypes with the aim of surpassing them all in sophistication and refinement¹⁰. In addition to the Ayyubid heritage, for example the use of yellow for their banners and emblems, the Mamluks also adopted a great deal of the protocol established by the Abbasids¹¹. Further, the Bahri Mamluks were strongly inspired by the Mongols, to whom they were ethnically and culturally related. In particular, Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars (1260-1277) is reported to have copied Mongol court traditions and ceremonials. Mongol influence continued under the rule of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, especially in the fields of arts and fashions¹². Migration of Mongols to Egypt went on throughout the Bahri Mamluk period and their influence on Mamluk customs should therefore not be underestimated¹³.

7. Ibn Iyās, *Badā'i' al-zuhūr fī waqā'i' al-duhūr*; Muh. Mustafa (ed), Wiesbaden-Cairo 1961-1975, III, p. 330.

8. J.M. Rogers, « Evidence for Mamluk-Mongol Relations 1260-1360 », *Colloque international sur l'Histoire du Caire*, Cairo 1969, p. 385 ff; al-Maqrizī, *Kitāb al-mawā'iz wa'l-i'tibār fī dīkr al-ḥiṭaṭ wa'l-aṭār*, Būlāq 1270 H., II, p. 98 f.

9. 'Alī Ibn Dāwūd al-Ṣayrafī al-Ġawharī, *Nuḥḍat al-nufūs wa'l-abdān fī tawārīḥ al-zamān*, H. Ḥabaṣī (ed.), Cairo 1970-1973, I, p. 213.

10. Al-Qalqaṣandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'sā fī ṣinā'at al-inṣā*, Cairo 1963, IV, p. 7 ff.

11. Qalqaṣandī, IV, p. 44.

12. Rogers, *op. cit.*; U. Haarmann, « Altun Han bei den Ägyptischen Mamluken », *Der Islam* 21 (1974), p. 1 ff.

13. Qalqaṣandī, IV, p. 7 ff; al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥuṣn al-muḥādara fī tāriḥ Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira*, Cairo 1967, II, p. 133; Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 221; Ibn Taḡribirdī, *al-Nuḡūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira*, Cairo 1963-1972, VI, p. 268 f.; VII, p. 182.

The diversity of Mamluk Court traditions to which Qalqaṣandī refers is confirmed by a manual for kings dedicated by Ibn al-ʿAbbās to Sultan Baybars al-Ġaṣankīr (1308) ¹⁴. It is rich in homilies with multiple examples from Indian, Greek, Sassanian, Byzantine and Western cultures and histories. Religious and historic Islamic tradition from various epochs and regions also contributes to the material of this book. Persian influence is particularly pronounced. The frequent use of Persian names for offices and objects of Mamluk court life is a clear indication of the dominant Persian influence, which Qalqaṣandī explains as having reached the Mamluks through the Abbasids of Baghdad ¹⁵, but which could also have reached Cairo through relations with the Il-Khanid Court of Tabriz. Maqrīzī, when speaking of residential architecture in Cairo, refers, for example, to Persian influence in matters of aristocratic architecture and its protocol ¹⁶.

Ceremonial protocol was manifested in specific garments worn by the Sultan and the members of his court at various occasions, emblems displayed, and ritual performances. These performances might be military (tournaments and hunting), religious (the two feasts or *ʿid(s)*, diplomatic (the reception of kings or embassies), or simply customary, like the investiture of dignitaries and the yearly Opening of the Ḥalīġ.

Whereas the Fatimid Caliphs celebrated a number of religious occasions which focused on the person of the Caliph ¹⁷, the Bahri Mamluk sultans, according to ʿUmārī and Qalqaṣandī, celebrated at the Court only two feasts, the two *ʿid(s)*, *ʿid al-fiṭr* and *ʿid al-adḥā*. The Prophet's Birthday is not referred to among the feasts officially celebrated by the Bahri Mamluk sultans. As will be shown below, its celebration at the court started with Barqūq.

The Opening of the Ḥalīġ, however, was celebrated by all of Egypt's rulers, in addition to the hunt, polo, and other military and equestrian tournaments and parades in which the sultans themselves performed the traditional activities and ceremonies of the Mamluk elite, whose backbone was the cavalry.

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's zealous campaigns against Fatimid religious and cultural heritage could not, however, extinguish certain features of Fatimid court life, particularly if these were of a universal character, i.e., common to the entire Muslim world and beyond it. For example, the Fatimids reckoned among their emblems of sovereignty the crown (or rather its equivalent, a special turban), the throne, the scepter, the sword, the spear, the shield, the inkpot, the parasol, flags and banners, various weapons, flywhisks, the

14. Ḥasan Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-ʿAbbās, *Aṭār al-uwwal fī tartīb al-duwal*, Cairo 1295 H.

15. Qalqaṣandī, V, p. 453.

16. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 51.

17. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 490 f.

royal timbalery and the royal tents¹⁸. Similarly, the Mamluk sultans sat on a throne surmounted by a dome, and wore special turbans that fulfilled the function of a crown. Their prayers in the mosque, following both Abbasid and Fatimid customs, took place within an enclosure called *maqṣūra*. They also used for their processions a parasol, banners and flags, a timbalery and special tents for their travels and festivities, in addition to specific Mamluk garments, emblems and customs such as the use of blazons or two young pages (*ḡufta*) riding in front of the sultan in processions.

Like the caliphs, the sultans kept treasure halls of different kinds attached to their palaces, which the historians reckon among the insignia of sovereignty. Under the Mamluks they were designated by composite Arabic-Persian words such as *rikābhāna* and *silāḥhāna*, whereas those of the Fatimids were called by the Arabic word *ḥizāna*. The stables, at the Abbasid Court, occupied a most prominent place among the treasures of a sultan.

Not only emblems and insignia but also the distribution of functions at the Mamluk court bore in some respects common features with the Fatimid traditions, some of which, such as the eunuchs, can be traced back to Byzance¹⁹. The classification of government dignitaries between *arbāb al-sayf* and *arbāb al-qalam* is also common to both governments. In fact, Qalqaṣandī frequently draws parallels between both systems. Canard's comparison of Byzantine and Fatimid court ceremonials could be extended down to the Mamluks.

The Mamluk palaces, like the Fatimid, were used both as administrative and residential quarters. The Citadel, however, did not include an equivalent of the Fatimid *dār al-ʿilm*, an academy for the non-religious studies similar to the *dār al-ḥikma* of the Abbasids. Such academies no longer existed. The numerous religious institutions founded by the Mamluks in the city educated the indigeneous non-military groups of society, whereas the barracks at the Citadel were the site of both the religious and military education of soldiers²⁰. The Citadel also provided study opportunities for the sons of the sultans who resided in the private apartments of the Ḥawṣ. Historians, however, do not mention a library among their list of sultanic treasure halls, nor any equivalent to the Fatimid *ḥizānat al-kutub*. A considerable library had existed in the Citadel under the Ayyubids

18. Qalqaṣandī, III, p. 468.

19. M. Canard, « Le cérémonial fatimide et le cérémonial byzantin, essai de comparaison », *Byzantion* XXI (1951), p. 355 ff (374); Qalqaṣandī, III, p. 477.

20. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 215 f.; D. Ayalon, *L'esclavage du Mamelouk*, Jerusalem 1951; H. Rabie, « The Training of the Mamluk *faris* » in V.J. Parry & M.E. Yapp (ed.), *War and Technology in the Middle East*, London, 1975, p. 153 ff.

— a heritage of Fatimid collections — but was burnt in 691/1292; there is no reference to its being reinstituted. However, the numerous religious foundations of the Mamluk sultans and amirs built within the city were all richly equipped with libraries, as documented in their foundation deeds. There are also references to books written in the Mamluk barracks. Some sultans were cultured and some even wrote poetry²¹. The inkpot, one of the emblems of the Fatimid Caliphs, does not figure among the Mamluk sultans' insignia. It was used, however, to symbolize the function of the *dawādār* or secretary of the sultanate and was represented in his blazon. The sultans were essentially People of the Sword, and although they also acted as Supreme Judges in political and administrative matters, they relied in purely religious matters upon the juridical People of the Pen.

Officially, and on a merely formal basis, the Abbasid Caliph was the supreme religious dignitary. He was expected to have a library and to be a scholar²². The political and religious irrelevance of the Abbasid Caliphs of Cairo needs not be repeated here. The Caliph's principal function was to enhance the Mamluk sultanate as center of the Abbasid Caliphate after the sack of Baghdad. The manifestation of this function was essentially ceremonial : to invest the nominated sultan with the black caliphal gown, to (sometimes) accompany the sultan on military campaigns, to attend ceremonies and to congratulate the sultan at the beginning of every month. Some sultanates, like some in India, relied for the enthronement of their sultans on a document of investiture from the Abbasid Caliph of Cairo²³. Being themselves an emblem of Court ceremonial, the Caliphs generally resided at the Citadel, at the Ḥawš. Sometimes, when their presence was bothersome, they dwelt at Qal'at al-Kabš or near the mausoleum of Sayyida Nafīsa. Even when they dwelt at the Citadel, their presence was hardly noticed.

Finally, unlike the Fatimids, the Mamluks, and before them the Ayyubids, were not buried within their palace complexes. At the end of the Ayyubid period, more exactly with Šağarat al-Durr, widow of the last Ayyubid Sultan al-Šāliḥ Nağm al-Dīn and herself first Mamluk ruler, it became established tradition that Mamluk sultans be buried in the mausoleums attached to their religious foundations or to the foundations of their masters or relatives.

21. B. Flemming, « Literary activities in Mamluk Halls and Barracks », *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet*, M. Rosen-Ayalon ed., Jerusalem 1977, p. 249 ff.

22. Zāhiri, p. 89 ff.

23. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 64; Ibn Tağribirdī, *Ḥawādiṯ al-duḥūr fī madā al-ayyām wa'l-šuhūr*, W. Popper (ed.), Berkeley, 1930-1942, II, p. 287; M. Mitchiner, *Oriental Coins and their values — The World of Islam*, London 1977, p. 343 f.

II. — THE MOSQUE

The mosque at the Citadel had an important ceremonial function associated with the *mawkib* or ceremonial procession of the Sultan's Friday prayer. This meant that the sultan and court dignitaries dressed in full pomp for such an official occasion²⁴. This mosque remained an exclusively royal congregational mosque and unlike the city's religious foundations, it does not seem to have ever fulfilled other functions such as *madrasa* or *ḥanqāh*, or to ever have had a sultan buried in it.

Originally, the prayers of the two great feasts were held at the hippodrome underneath the Citadel. For security reasons, Barqūq transferred the celebration to the Citadel's mosque.

The present mosque at the Citadel, erected by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, was the major royal mosque. It was, however, not the first mosque to be built at the Citadel; the Abbasid Caliph installed by al-Zāhir Baybars is reported to have given a sermon at the mosque of the Citadel²⁵. Most likely there was a mosque there since the foundation of the Citadel, though under the Ayyubids it probably was not a Friday mosque, because the Ayyubids did not build new congregational mosques, following the Ṣāfi'i rite which dictated that only one congregational mosque should exist within an urban agglomeration. Only the mosque of 'Amr at Fuṣṭāṭ and the mosque of al-Ḥākim at al-Qāhira fulfilled this function. Therefore, the mosque of the Citadel must have been a mere *masgid* without *ḥuṭba* until the reign of al-Zāhir Baybars.

Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad rebuilt the Citadel mosque in 718/1318 and modified its architecture again in 1335²⁶.

Beside the principal mosque, Maqrizī mentions two more mosques, one at the Ḥawš built by Sultan Farağ (1405-1412)²⁷ and another at the Stables built by Sultan al-Mu'ayyad (1412-1421)²⁸.

The mosque of Farağ, called al-Ġāmi' al-Abyaḍ, was located on the south side of the Ḥawš, adjoining Qā'at al-Buḥra and a *manẓara* or belvedere erected by the same founder²⁹.

24. 'Umari, p. 41, Qalqaṣandī, IV, p. 46; Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 212.

25. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 315.



26. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 325.

27. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 327; Ṣāliḥ Lam'i

Muṣṭafā, *al-Waṭā'iḳ wa'l-'imāra — dirāsa fī'l-'imāra al-islāmiyya fī'l-'aṣr al-mamlūkī al-ġarkaṣī. Al-ġāmi' al-abyaḍ bi'l-ḥawš al-sultānī*, Beirut 1980.

28. *Ibid.*

29. Ṣāliḥ Lam'i Muṣṭafā, p. 8.



AnIsI 24 (1989), p. 25-79. Doris Behrens-Abouseif.
Fig. 2 and 3. The interior of the Mosque of Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.
 The Citadel of Cairo: Stage for Mamluk Ceremonial.
 © IFAO 2025

III. — DAR AL-'ADL, THE ĪWĀN

1. History.

Little is known about the non-military architecture of the Citadel under the Ayyubids. Al-Malik al-Kāmil began the foundations of residential structures which, as Casanova assumes, must have been substantial³⁰. One might indeed expect that the sultan would not have dwelt in the Citadel before it included structures adequate for his royal functions.

An *īwān* existed at the Citadel since the days of al-Malik al-Kāmil³¹. The Persian term *īwān* in the context of royal architecture designates a type of hall equivalent to the Arabic *qā'a* and is a ceremonial rather than an architectural term³². We also know that al-Malik al-Šāliḥ erected a hall, known as al-Qā'āt al-Šāliḥiyya, to which Zāhiri refers to as having fulfilled the same functions as the later Qaṣr³³. This *qā'a*



Fig. 4. — Sultan Qaytbay sitting on his throne (Arnold von Harff, *The Pilgrimage*, p. 107).

30. Casanova, p. 600 f.

31. Casanova found a reference to this *Īwān* in Coptic unpublished sources, p. 592.

32. O. Grabar, «*Īwān*», *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2nd ed., Leiden 1960.

33. Zāhiri, p. 86.




Fig. 5. — The Great Iwān of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad at the Citadel (Robert Hay).

burnt down in 684 / 1284-1285 together with the royal store rooms³⁴. Al-Ṣāliḥ's main residence, however, was at the fort he erected on the island of Rawḍa opposite Fuṣṭāṭ.

The famous Iwān of the Citadel often associated with the name Yūsuf, implying Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf, was built by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. It was the major Throne Hall and had a triple function : the culmination point of the *mawḳib*, the ceremony of parade reviewing of the mamluks by the Sultan; as the reception hall for ambassadors and guests, and also as the Hall of Justice or sultanic tribunal and therefore also called Dār al-ʿAdl³⁵. Previously, under Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars, the Dār al-ʿAdl had been a separate building underneath the Citadel to the northwest, whereas earlier,

34. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 213; Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-sulūk li-maʿrifat duwal al-mulūk*, M. Ziyāda & S.A. ʿĀṣūr (ed.), Cairo 1934-1976, I, p. 730.

35. ʿUmārī, p. 81 ff.; Qalqaṣandī III, p. 371; Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 210.

al-Mu'izz Aybak (1250-1257) had held his tribunal in town at the *madrassa* of al-Šāliḥ Nağm al-Dīn.

Sultan al-Manšūr Qalāwūn (1279-1290) built a new Dār al-'Adl within the walls of the Citadel, known as al-Īwān al-Kabīr. The Dār al-'Adl of Baybars was turned later into the Royal Timbalery or *Ṭablaḥāna* ³⁶.

Here, it is necessary to make a distinction between the Dār al-'Adl / Īwān built by Sultan Qalāwūn to replace the Dār al-'Adl of Baybars and an earlier Īwān mentioned in the chronicles before the reign of the Qalāwūn dynasty, which Casanova attributes to al-Malik al-Kāmil. This early Īwān was the Throne Hall where the sultans held council and gave audiences ³⁷. Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars and later his son al-Malik al-Sa'id are reported to have held their audiences in a domed structure called Īwān. Baybars also sat there with the Caliph, took the oath of allegiance from his soldiers, and nominated amirs ³⁸.

It was next to this *iwān* that al-Zāhir Baybars erected his palace called al-Dār al-Ġadīda. Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir reports that Baybars built this palace in 664 / 1265 near the Īwān which overlooked the Horse Market. This Dār al-Ġadīda was also called Dār al-Dahab, perhaps reminiscent of the Fatimid Qā'at al-Dahab or Qaṣr al-Dahab which was one of their Throne Halls. Baybars' Dār al-Dahab was painted with portraits of the amirs in military regalia ³⁹. In addition to Dār al-Dahab, Baybars erected a dome on twelve columns, a domed tower, dwellings for his mamluks, and a palace for his son located on an esplanade (*raḥaba*) at the Citadel ⁴⁰.

The Īwān sequence continued with al-Ašraf Ḥalīl (1290-1293) who built his own palace called by this name. There are two versions about al-Ašraf's buildings. According to Dawādārī, he built in 693 / 1293-1294 an *iwān*, adorned with portraits of his amirs depicted with their blazons ⁴¹. This *iwān*, of al-Ašraf was demolished and rebuilt in

36. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 213.

37. Maqrīzī does not refer to this early Īwān in his description of the Citadel in his *Ḥiṭaṭ*, but does refer to it in his early Mamluk history in the *Sulūk*, as do other chroniclers.

38. Dawādārī, VIII, p. 63, 73, 94, 210, 303; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I, p. 438, 573, 744; Muḥyi al-Dīn Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *al-Rawḍ al-zāhir fī al-malik al-zāhir*; A. Ḥuwayṭir (ed.), Riyad 1976, p. 142.

39. Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, p. 246; Casanova, p. 605 f.

40. Šalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalīl Ibn Aybak al-Šafādī, *al-Wāfi bi'l-wafiyāt*, X, A. Amara & J. Sublet (ed.), Wiesbaden 1980, p. 339; Ibn Tagribirdī, *Nuğūm*, VII; p. 190 ff. The term *raḥabat al-ḥabārīğ* is used by both authors. It is not clear what it refers to. A Qā'at al-Dahab is referred to by Ibn Iyās as the residence of the vizirs. It could be the building erected by Barsbāy; I (2), p. 114; III, p. 110.

41. Dawādārī, VIII, p. 345.

711 / 1311-1312 by al-Nāṣir ⁴² who then pulled it down altogether in 734 / 1333-1334 when he cleared the area in front of the mosque ⁴³. Maqrīzī, on the other hand, refers to two buildings erected by al-Aṣraf : his reconstruction of Qalāwūn's Īwān and a *raḡraf* with painted portraits of his amirs, the latter being surmounted by a dome on columns and used as an audience hall until al-Nāṣir destroyed it to erect on its site a tower for the Mamluks ⁴⁴. It thus seems that the *raḡraf* was a structure attached to the Īwān.

As already experienced by Casanova, the chroniclers' reports do not give us a clear picture of the topography of the residential complex at this early period of the Citadel's history. If indeed the early Īwān overlooked the Horse Market, its location was not identical with that of the later Īwān of al-Nāṣir, which did not overlook the Horse Market. It would have instead corresponded to the location of al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ, which did overlook this market. Thus, to Casanova's argument that an earlier *īwān*, probably Ayyubid, preceded that of al-Nāṣir, it can be added that in the period of about a century between the completion of the Citadel and the third reign of al-Nāṣir, several *īwān(s)* were consecutively erected or, in other words, an *īwān* existed which was rebuilt on several occasions.

2. Function.

The Dār al-'Adl was associated with an old royal custom, *al-naẓar fi'l-maẓālim*, established under the Umayyads and rooted in pre-Islamic heritage, according to which the ruler fulfilled the function of Supreme Judge by listening to complaints of the common people. Al-Zāhir Baybars attached great importance to carrying out of his function as Supreme Judge, especially in matters where protection of the common people against economic exploitation was necessary. Egyptian chroniclers use the term Dār al-'Adl to designate not only the place but the audience themselves, wherever they were held by the sultans. On this occasion, the sultans of the Bahri period did not sit on the throne, but on a *kursi* near the throne. During the Dār al-'Adl audiences the sultans were assisted by the supreme *qāḍī(s)* in cases where *ṣarī'a* matters were involved. It was not, however, according to the *ṣarī'a* that the Sultan judged at Dār al-'Adl, but according to *siyāsa*, i.e., administrative and political criteria ⁴⁵. It is known that the Bahri

42. Dawādārī, IX, p. 238; Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 460.

43. Dawādārī, IX, p. 372.

44. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭat*, II, p. 212 f.

45. 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwārdī, *al-Aḥkām al-sultāniyya wa'l-wilāyat al-dīniyya*, 2nd ed., Cairo 1966, p. 77 ff.





Fig. 6 and 7. — The Great Iwān (*Description de l'Égypte*).

Mamluks maintained, alongside *šari'a* law, their own legal system, derived from the Mongol *yāsa* and attributed to Jingiz Khan ⁴⁶. The function of the Mamluk *ḥāḡib* was to apply this law to the Mamluk military class, in consultation with *šari'a* judges in cases of conflicts. With time, however, the *ḥāḡib* trespassed his competence and began to intervene in *šari'a* matters as well, which, according to Maqrizī, led to misrule and legal disorder ⁴⁷.

As in the *Īwān Kabīr* of the Fatimids, the bahri sultans following al-Nāṣir Muḥammad held two weekly audiences ⁴⁸ at the Great *Īwān*, and also like the Fatimids, this was on Mondays and Thursdays. There, they also received ambassadors. The *Īwān* was thus the supreme ceremonial hall of all official buildings of the Citadel. Whereas in the Fatimid *Īwān* the Caliph performed religious rituals as *imām* of his *šari'a* community, the Mamluk sultans sat in their *Īwān* to perform their administrative functions. On Mondays, the sultan sat on a throne or on the floor next to the throne, which was similar to the pulpit of a mosque, but was made of marble and fixed to the wall ⁴⁹. To his right side were the four *qāḍī*(s), the Šāfi'i, Ḥanafī, Mālikī, and Ḥanbalī. To his left were the *kātib al-sirr* and other administrators at the Court. On Thursdays the audience took place without the *qāḍī*(s), after which the sultan inspected the officers and soldiers. Similar to those of the Abbasid and Fatimid Caliphs, the throne of the Sultan stood in a domed area. A door with an iron grill allowed the Sultan to look from his throne at his Mamluks parading on the esplanade in front of the *Īwān*.

The *Īwān*, as was the Qaṣr (see below), also associated with the ceremony of investiture of the sultans. The sons and successors of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad were invested there ⁵⁰.

After the reign of the Qalāwūn dynasty, modifications were gradually introduced into the protocol of the *Īwān*, especially during the reign of Barqūq who reduced its use to a few formal occasions. The Qaṣr substituted for the *Īwān* in many respects.

When Sultan Barqūq received the visit of Ibn Uways, the Ġalā'irī sultan of Baghdad, he invited him after the reception ceremony at the hippodrome or Maṭ'am al-Ṭayr of

46. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 208 ff., 219 f.; Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm* VII, p. 185 f.; D. Ayalon, « The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khan » (Part C1), *Studia Islamica*, XXXVI (1972), p. 113 ff.

47. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 205 f.

48. The duty of the ruler to hold tribunal twice weekly was also stressed by Nizam al-Mulk, vizir

of the Saljuq sultan Malik-Shah, *Siyasatnama. Gedanken und Geschichten*, K.E. Schabinger, Frhr. von Schowingen (transl.), Freiburg-München 1960, p. 106.

49. Qalqašandī, IV, p. 6.

50. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 213.

Raydāniyya to attend the *hidma*, a ceremony during which the Mamluks presented their reverence to the sultan⁵¹, at the Īwān. They entered from Bāb al-Sirr, sat facing the audience and a banquet was served to them. A second *hidma* followed at the Qaṣr⁵².

Sultan Barqūq introduced a new custom to Court ceremonials by holding the Dār al-ʿAdl audiences at the Hippodrome underneath the Citadel which he had restored, or at the loggia of the Stables. He even modified the schedule, making it Sundays and Wednesdays instead of Mondays and Thursdays. Later, he changed it again to Tuesdays and Saturdays⁵³. He preferred to hold sessions in the morning, whereas al-Nāṣir Muḥammad established the custom of night sessions.

After Barqūq's reign the Īwān was neglected, to be restored again under Sultan al-Aṣraf Barsbāy (1422-1438) who tried to revive the ceremonies of the Īwān, « as in the old times » : he restored the building which had fallen into decay, received ambassadors there, and attended parades⁵⁴. This revival, however, did not last long and with the reign of Sultan Ġaḳmaq, the ceremonies of the Īwān were again abandoned and forgotten; later, it was difficult to reinstate them⁵⁵. Zāhirī writes at that time that the *mawḳib* of the Īwān took place only on the occasion of the reception of ambassadors⁵⁶, whereas Ibn Taġribirdī writes that even this was cancelled by Ġaḳmaq, who abolished almost all forms of ceremony and pomp.

Sultan al-Zāhir Ḥuṣḳadam (1461-1467), however, following « the kings of the past », reestablished the *mawḳib* of the Qaṣr and the custom, interrupted by Sultan Īnāl, of slaughtering the animals for the feast at the Īwān⁵⁷. Al-Aṣraf Qāytbāy (1468-1496), though rather austere in his court life, restored the Īwān, but used it little⁵⁸. The only occasion on which he used the throne at the Īwān was the parade of his enemy Šāh Sawār, the Turkoman ruler of Iblistayn after his capture by Amir Yašbak. This was a great triumph, duly celebrated in the city and the Citadel⁵⁹. When, a few years later, 905/1500 Sultan Qānṣūh Abū Saʿīd (1498-1500) took his Ramaḍān breakfast at the Īwān, it was considered a special event⁶⁰.

51. Ibn al-ʿAbbās, p. 98.

52. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 799 f.; Ġawharī, p. 377; Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XII, p. 47 f.

53. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 566, 709, 840; *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 207.

54. Ġawharī, III, p. 238; Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIV, p. 318, 361 f.

55. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIV, p. 318; *Ḥawādīṭ*, p. 117 f.

56. Zāhirī, p. 23.

57. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 386, 456.

58. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 60.

59. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 77.

60. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 432.

3. Later descriptions.

Pococke noticed that the Īwān was open on all sides except the south side, that the columns on which it was built were surmounted by capitals of different styles, and that wooden inscriptions ran above the arches. His plan shows a triple niche on the southern wall which is also just visible in the illustration of the *Description de l'Égypte* ⁶¹.

De Maillet, French consul in Cairo in the late seventeenth century, mentions thirty-four marble columns of extraordinary height and thickness once carrying a dome, whereas his contemporary Evliyā Čelebī (1672-1680) refers to forty-four columns ⁶², confirming Maqrīzī's account of Ancient Egyptian spoils. Some of these have been excavated in recent years and can be seen *in situ*. De Maillet further refers to inscription bands of gilded wood, adding that the Īwān was oriented toward the north. Thévenot, 1656, mentions a smaller structure adjoining the Īwān, similar to it but more dilapidated ⁶³. Was it perhaps Qā'at al-Naḥās? Ibn Iyās refers to a hall called by this name which overlooked the Īwān ⁶⁴.

Jomard, in the *Description de l'Égypte* ⁶⁵, reckons there were thirty-two columns of red granite, of different sizes and capitals, supporting stone pointed arches and wooden stalactite pendentives (as at the mosque of al-Nāṣir at the Citadel). This Īwān had a niche oriented to the east. Jomard describes the architecture as surpassing that of all Cairo's mosques including Sultan Ḥasan, its masonry rather comparable to Bāb al-Naṣr. As for the plan, he finds it rather similar to that of churches and assumes it to be a former church.

In 1422 a Florentine traveller, Brancacci, who accompanied an ambassador, gave a noteworthy description of the Īwān in full function during a reception by Sultan Barsbāy ⁶⁶.

«The sun was already high, and mamluks, who are nobles of high and low rank, kept going into the castle. There was a great crowd of them; they were dressed in their usual style of white linen which hung to the ground and were draped in large pieces of

61. Pococke, *Beschreibungen des Morgenlandes und einiger anderer Länder*, Christian Ernst von Windhelm (transl.), Erlangen 1754, I (Ägypten), p. 52.

62. Evliyā Čelebī, *Seyahatnamesi*, X, (Misir Sudan, Habeš), Istanbul 1938, p. 172; Abbé Le Mascrier, *Description de l'Égypte composée sur les Mémoires de M. de Maillet*, Paris 1735, p. 190 f.

63. J. Thévenot, *Voyage du Levant*, Paris, 1980, II, p. 227.

64. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 49, 408.

65. M. Jomard, «Description de la ville et de la citadelle du Kaire», *Description de l'Égypte*, «État moderne», XVIII (2), Paris 1808-1813, p. 133 ff., 352 ff.

66. Cited by G. Wiet, *Cairo city of art and commerce*, Oklahoma 1964, p. 144 f.

very fine linen with sleeves decorated with blue embroidery forming bands of design peculiar to these people. Almost all of them wore this uniform. Towards the middle of the third hour, we went up to the castle by means of a stairway about eighty yards wide but which was steep and very inconvenient for the horses. We thus arrived at the gate through which we entered a large court where we sat down among a great number of mamluks and waited for half an hour. Then, having gone through another gate, we went along several vaulted passageways, between two rows of mamluks facing each other, with lances in hand, until we came through another door guarded in the same way. Continuing through more vaulted corridors, we came into a court where there were again men armed with lances and lined up in the same fashion. There we were very carefully searched down to our breaches to make sure we were not hiding arms. Finally we came to the sultan's residence after having climbed eight staircases on which were always men armed with lances. The lances of these men had iron tips with several points and are similar to our halberds; they clashed them over our heads as we went by. Everywhere at these guard posts there were about twelve lancers. The room we entered — the one in which the sultan sat — was divided like a church into three naves separated by stone columns; the center nave was much larger than the side ones. These naves were open on the side through which we entered, but a net hung over the openings from top to bottom. They were paved with inlaid marble and almost half their surface was covered with a rug. Facing the entrance, there rose a sort of platform with steps on both sides. Seated right on the floor of the platform was the sultan. The platform had no parapet in front, and the lateral steps had no ramps; he was perfectly visible from everywhere. He was dressed in linen like the others. He was about thirty eight or forty years old and had a brown beard. Directly behind his shoulders stood a great number of mamluks. One of them held a sword and its scabbard in his hand, another carried very high on his right shoulder a solid gold rod about a yard long and an inch thick. Near them, as well as on the side steps and at the foot of the platform, stood a great number of mamluks. This large assembly was arranged in such a way that it brought to mind triumphal scenes that are seen in paintings. Everywhere, especially on the steps at the foot of the columns, there were musicians playing viols, rebecs, lyres, muted instruments, and cymbals all at the same time, accompanying singers with a great deal of noise and occasional unison.»

The descriptions of a similar ceremony under Qāyṭbāy was reported by van Ghistele⁶⁷ who does not, however, identify the location where the reception took place : Eight or

67. J. van Ghistele, *Le voyage en Égypte*, Cairo 1976, p. 42-45.

nine successive gates had to be crossed before an embassy would reach the Sultan. The halls and vestibules between them were crowded with soldiers dressed in white (as was customary for them in the summer). Each gate would be closed after their passage before the next be opened. Against a gigantic wall — as large as the town hall of Brussels — sat the sultan on a bench covered with rich tapestries. The sultan was seated on a « mastabem » or small chair that looked like a prayer chair for women, gilded and silver plated, half a foot high; on his left on a cushion there were a sword and a shield, both gilded. To his right were four or five masts which formed a half tent to give him shade. Under this half tent his counsellors, secretaries, clerks and other scribes were seated in protocolary order. At their arrival the ambassadors knelt and kissed the floor. Then standing at twelve steps distant from the Sultan they were allowed to stand upright quietly and present their message. The interpreter of the Sultan translated the message, which *nāzīr al-ḥaṣṣ* repeated, so that the *amīr kabīr* could communicate it himself to the Sultan. If not the *nāzīr al-ḥāṣṣ* and the *amīr kabīr*, the *dawādār* and *kātib al-sirr* could be the ones to communicate the message to the Sultan. Van Ghistele reports further that the Sultan ordered a mamluk to be beaten in presence of the ambassadors, perhaps as a demonstration of his power.

As for the throne, at the time of Qāyṭbāy, Arnold von Harff describes it as follows : « There sits the Sultan at a man's height from the ground beneath a tent, with exquisite hangings, on fine carpets, with his feet tucked under him as tailors sit in our country working on their tables. There stand by him his two chief men, on the right hand the Armerigo (*silāḥdār*), on the left the Thodar (*dawādār*) and others of his counsellors, stately old and grey men from among the mamluks. In this manner the Sultan sits there three times each week giving audience before his mamluks doing justice to all and injustice to none »⁶⁸.

These descriptions made by foreigners correspond fully to the image of the Sultan's reception of embassies according to the Mamluk manual of princes of Ibn al-'Abbās, who writes that if the ambassador represents a country of military or strategic importance, the Sultan should not delay in meeting him, otherwise serious consequences might result. If this is not the case, the ambassador should wait three days without being received, then be summoned into the Throne Hall which should be accordingly arranged. The sultan should be seated in state, in full pomp on his throne, in the presence of his soldiers and guard who should be standing in order carrying their arms, after which a banquet

68. A. von Harff, *The Pilgrimage of Arnold von Harff, 1496-1499*, M. Letts (transl.), London 1946, p. 107.

should be served. The dignitaries should eat with ceremonial decency, rather than with appetite, and be seated according to the rules of protocol. The ambassador should then be ushered in by a *ḥāḡib* or chamberlain into the center of the hall, at the place designated for him, and near him the *ḥuḡḡāb* and translators »⁶⁹. The sultan should be « inaccessible like a high wild mountain that hides animals of prey »; « the sultan's visitor should feel like visiting a wild lion; but once having been admitted, the encounter with the sultan should bestow glory upon the visitor ». Also, the musicians reported by Brancacci correspond to one of the great necessities to the well-being of a sovereign, like the hunt and sports, to which Ibn al-ʿAbbās dedicates a whole chapter in his book⁷⁰. Metalwork objects of the Ayyubid and Bahri Mamluk periods with representations of musicians as well as hunting and polo scenes present further documentation on this subject.

IV. — THE QAṢR⁷¹

The Qaṣr was another Throne Hall, less ceremonial than the Īwān, dedicated to the daily working sessions of the Sultan. It was also called al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq because its façade was striped with black and yellow stone like al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq of al-Zāhir Baybars in Syria. The Qaṣr was built in 713/1313 by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad who also initiated the whole protocol associated with it. Thus, unlike the Īwān which had its predecessors, the Qaṣr seems to be an innovation. Built on a *qā'a* plan common in secular architecture, its shape and plan however were not exceptional, as was the Īwān (see below). Its northern *iwān* which included the throne overlooked the Hippodrome, the Stables and the Horse Market. The southern *iwān* included the entrance for the Sultan and his private guard, connecting it with the Great Īwān and the Bāb al-Sirr of the Citadel, which was the gate used by the highest dignitaries of state only.

Sultan al-Aṣraf Ša'bān added to the Qaṣr a *ḥirḡāh*, which was a kind of loggia overlooking the Hippodrome and the Horse Market beneath the Citadel. In it, a tent was erected for the sultan on parades days⁷². Sultan al-Ġūrī, who enjoyed luxury and was very much a *bonvivant*, restored several structures at the Citadel including the Qaṣr, the Harem and the kitchen, whose work he appreciated⁷³. The restoration of the

69. Ibn al-ʿAbbās, p. 95 f.

70. Ibn al-ʿAbbās, p. 124 f.

71. Maqrizi, *Ḥiṭaṭ* II, p. 209; ʿUmari, p. 81; Qalqaṣandī, III, p. 368 f.; Zāhiri, p. 36, 86.

72. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 183; Zāhiri, p. 26; Qalqaṣandī calls the structure a *maq'ad*, III, p. 379.

73. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 123.

Qaṣr was celebrated by a banquet, as its inauguration by al-Nāṣir, and its ceremonial functions were revived with the *mawḳib* and the distribution of robes of honor to the amirs ⁷⁴. Al-Ġūrī, however, also maintained the *mawḳib* at the Ḥawṣ on Mondays and Thursdays, and at the Hippodrome on Saturdays and Tuesdays ⁷⁵. On the other hand, he neglected the justice audiences which he escaped «like a child escapes primary school» ⁷⁶.

From the Qaṣr a staircase led down to the Stables, and from there through Bāb al-Silsila there was an access to the Hippodrome through a ramp on which the sultan could ride down from the Stables or up on his way back from processions. The Qaṣr also had a passage to the Inner Palaces (*quṣūr ǧuwwāniyya*). These *quṣūr* were also offices of the Sultan and were connected to the private apartments which included the Saba' Qā'āt.

1. Function.

In the Qaṣr the sultan performed his administrative and political functions, but not the juridical, sitting on a throne or on the floor ⁷⁷. At the Qaṣr the daily *ḥidma* or review of the mamluks took place except on Thursdays and Mondays which were dedicated to Dār al-'Adl. Unlike the Īwān, his attendants at the Qaṣr were restricted to members of the military administrative groups and exclusively to those whose presence was specifically required, without the religious officials. Five daily meals were served to the sultan and the amirs. Under al-Nāṣir Muḥammad the amirs were supposed to spend the night at the Qaṣr when a *mawḳib* was scheduled ⁷⁸.

Zāhiri recalls that the *mawḳib*, which at his time (mid-fifteenth century) was scheduled at the Qaṣr, had taken place in earlier times at the Ṣāliḥiyya. He does not refer to the *mawḳib* at the Īwān. At that time, the *mawḳib* continued to be held twice weekly, apart from special occasions such as the investiture of a new sultan and the two 'id(s) ⁷⁹ which were celebrated with the bestowing of robes of honor upon the dignitaries ⁸⁰. During the month of Ramaḍān sessions of readings of al-Buḥārī took place at the Qaṣr ⁸¹. Zāhiri further refers to a *ṣubbāk* in the «third palace» for the tribunal audiences ⁸². This may have been an innovation of the Circassian Mamluks.

74. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 213, 453

75. Ibn Iyās, V, p. 88.

76. Ibn Iyās, V, p. 91.

77. Qalqaṣandī, IV, p. 45.

78. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 210; Qalqaṣandī, III,

p. 371; 'Umari, p. 36 f.

79. Zāhiri, p. 86.

80. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Ḥawādīt*, III, p. 472.

81. Ġawharī, III, p. 403.

82. Zāhiri, p. 87.




Fig. 8. — The Qaṣr at the Citadel, depicted by Viscount Valentia in 1814 (Creswell). Central area of the *qā'a* without its dome. A triple niche decorates the back wall, columns supported the dome.

An important ceremony associated with the Qaşr was the investiture of a new sultan. The procession of investiture of a sultan followed one of two different itineraries : it began either at the loggia (*maq'ad*) of the Stables, or at Bāb al-Sitāra, the Gate of the Harem. Sultan al-Nāşir Muḥammad in his third reign was invested at the Maq'ad of the Stables. Sultan Barqūq, his son Farağ and grandson al-Manşūr and the majority of the Circassian sultans embarked upon their investiture ceremony at the Stables⁸³. The sons of sultans, because they already dwelt at the Harem, started their procession there. The son of al-Nāşir and the son of Ğaqmaq also started at the Harem⁸⁴.

The nominated sultan wore a religious, not military, black caliphal gown and the turban accompanied by the insignia of royalty, and rode on his horse escorted in full pomp by the religious dignitaries — the Caliph and the four Chief qāḍī(s) — and the amirs until he reached the throne at the Qaşr where he bestowed the robes of investiture on the religious dignitaries and the amirs and then attended a banquet with his amirs⁸⁵. The enthronement seems thus to have taken place in two stages, with the sultan sitting on both thrones, at the Īwān and at the Qaşr⁸⁶. Maqrizī writes explicitly that the procession of the Qalāwūn dynasty moved from the Harem to the Īwān⁸⁷ and he describes the ceremony as taking place at both the Great Īwān and the Qaşr⁸⁸. His investiture accounts are, however, less detailed than those reported by Ibn Iyās. Ibn Tağribirdī usually refers to the throne of the Īwān when speaking of the Bahri Mamluk investiture ceremonies⁸⁹. He also mentions enthronement ceremonies at both the Īwān and the Qaşr⁹⁰, rarely at the Qaşr alone⁹¹. As for the Circassian Mamluks, they seem to have limited the ceremony to the Qaşr only⁹².

The Ayyubid sultans, and later al-Zāhir Baybars, wore their caliphal investiture gown outside Bāb al-Naşr, then crossed the city in a solemn procession up to the Citadel. Al-Nāşir Muḥammad followed this itinerary when, returning from Syria, he acceded to the throne for the second time. His third enthronement procession, however, took place exclusively at the Citadel⁹³.

83. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 431; I (2), p. 319, 434, 536, 735, 741; Ibn Tağribirdī, *Ḥawādīt*, III, p. 602.

84. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 301.

85. Ibn Iyās, I (1) p. 432, 486 f., 491, 487, 499, 507, 513, 520, 538, 553; I (2), p. 3, 188, 319, 404.

86. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 285.

87. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 209.

88. Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 287, 439.

89. Ibn Tağribirdī, *Nuğūm*, X, p. 117, 149; XI, p. 3, 149, 187.

90. Ibn Tağribirdī, *Nuğūm*, XI, p. 149, 207.

91. Ibn Tağribirdī, *Nuğūm*, X, p. 254.

92. Ibn Tağribirdī, *Nuğūm*, XI, p. 222; XV, p. 222, 256, XVI, p. 23, 58, 219 f., 254, 357, 373, 394.

93. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 107 f.

Sultan Barqūq introduced the custom of the Sultan's staying at the Qaṣr in the company of his amirs during the three days following his enthronement ⁹⁴.

Maqrīzī, when speaking of the Qaṣr, writes that already in his time, most of its traditions had been abandoned, as for example the custom of the sultan's taking his meals there together with the amirs of his next entourage and sleeping there, guarded by them.

Zāhirī describes the *mawḳib* of the Qaṣr as follows : the sultan sits flanked to the right and left by his amirs seated on silk covered seats ⁹⁵; the Supervisor of the Armies or *nāẓir al-ġayṣ* informs him about matters of the army and the *iqṭā'* or fief, which require his signature. The Sultan then reviews the soldiers, the highest in rank coming last. Then, he would proceed to the Inner Palace, sitting at a window for the juridical sessions. For the *simāṭ* or official banquet, he would change his place and sit facing the audience framed by the amirs ⁹⁶. On less official occasions, the sultan might sit at the door of the Qaṣr. Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad did so on the wedding day of his son Anūk, greeting the amirs who arrived carrying candles for the occasion. On the second day the candles were all lit — there were 3030 candles — while the sultan was again sitting at the door of the Qaṣr. Then he moved to the Harem to join the celebration of the ladies ⁹⁷.

The Court protocol introduced in the early Bahri period must have become tedious and difficult to maintain, for the historians regularly refer to attempts to revive the old customs. Sultan Barsbāy, in his attempts to revive the old customs, received the ambassador of Šāh Rūḥ at al-Qaṣr al-Awsaṭ, one of the palaces attached to the main Qaṣr ⁹⁸. Sultan Ğaqmaq, who was both very pious and austere and therefore prohibited shadow plays, provoked Ibn Taġribirdī's sadness and criticism because he reduced the *ḥidma* at the Qaṣr to only once weekly on Mondays, and held audience instead at the Ḥawš without formal outfit. The historian notes that such a thing was never seen before. Ğaqmaq also cancelled the *Maḥmal* parade in the month of Raġab and the Ramaḍān procession of Amīr al-Ḥaġġ. He cancelled as well the daily musical performances at the Citadel which had taken place early in the morning and at sunset when the gates of the Citadel were opened or closed, called the Nawbat Ḥātūn and attributed to Šaġarat al-Durr. Ibn Taġribirdī further accuses Ğaqmaq of having cancelled a number of protocolary customs established by the Turkish (Bahri) Mamluks, such as the reception

94. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XI, p. 226; XVI, p. 24.

95. In Maqrīzī's account, the amirs stand and there is no reference to seats.

96. Zāhirī, p. 86 f.

97. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, II, p. 345 f.

98. Ğawhari, III, p. 100.

of ambassadors at the Īwān and the tribunal sessions of the Stables, as well as games and tournaments. In this context, he writes that Barqūq was the first to begin disturbing the traditional protocol when he cancelled the parades that accompanied tournaments. His son Farağ cancelled the excursions to Siryāqūs and Barsbāy abandoned decorating of boats at the Opening of the Ḥaliğ⁹⁹.

Qāyrbāy was similarly criticized by Ibn Iyās, though he did not cancel as much as had Ġaḡmaq. Unlike his predecessor and master, al-Zāhir Ḥuṣqadam, Qāyrbāy was not very fond of parades and neglected the emblems of royalty including the *hidma* at the Qaṣr, as well as many other ceremonial traditions such as Opening of the Ḥaliğ, the use of the *Dahabiyya*, the *Maḥmal* processions etc.¹⁰⁰. However, the military triumph of Amir Yašbak over Šāh Sawār, whom he brought with him as captive to Cairo, was gloriously celebrated with a procession crossing the city towards the Citadel, where it passed both at the Qaṣr and the Īwān, and from there to the Ḥawš where the captive was paraded as had been the king of Cyprus during Barsbāy's reign¹⁰¹.

2. Later descriptions.

While the Īwān with its gigantic granite columns was often described and even illustrated in the D.E., the Qaṣr received less attention, for it was ruined soon after the Ottoman conquest when Sultan Selim dismantled the Citadel's palaces. The Qaṣr was then used as a jail¹⁰², and later as a factory for weaving the Ka'ba cloth.

De Maillet writes that the Qaṣr projected from the rocky hill, carried on gigantic piers of thirty to forty feet of diameter. It was pierced with openings on all sides, especially to the north where the panorama of all Cairo afforded one of the most beautiful views of the world. Its roof was supported by columns¹⁰³. The author also refers to another hall with twelve huge columns carrying a lantern (*dôme ouvert*)¹⁰⁴. The projection with its openings could be the *ḥirğāh*, which Niebuhr describes as a balcony¹⁰⁵, whereas 'Abd al-Ġanī al-Nābulī (1110 / 1698-1699) refers to a structure

99. Ibn Tağribirdi, *Ḥawādīt*, I, p. 117 ff.

100. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 456; III, p. 330.

101. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 77.

102. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ġabartī, *'Ağā'ib al-aṭār fī'l-tarāğim wa'l-aḥbār*, Bulaq 1236 H., I, p. 32, 55.

103. De Maillet, I, p. 193.

104. De Maillet, I, p. 190.

105. M. Niebuhr, *Travels through Arabia and other countries in the East*; Robert Heron (transl.), Edinburgh 1792, I, p. 59; M. Savary, *Letters on Egypt*, transl. 2nd ed., London 1787, p. 107 f.

that resembled a minaret and also had a parapet with a jail near it ¹⁰⁶. Thévenot, Niebuhr and Jomard refer to mosaics of mother of pearl, glass and precious stones ¹⁰⁷. Recent excavations have brought to light part of these mosaics which are very similar to those of Bahri Mamluk *miḥrāb*(s). Thévenot further mentions several terraces which must have been the site of the inner apartments connected to the Qaṣr. Jomard's description indicates that the Qaṣr included a domed structure with twelve granite columns.

V. — THE ḤAWŠ AND THE HAREM

1. History.

On the southern side of the Citadel was the Ḥawš or courtyard with the Buḥra and the Harem. The Ḥawš was originally the non-ceremonial private section of the royal residences, where the Sultan's wives, concubines and children as well as children of previous sultans and the Caliphs dwelt. During the fifteenth century it gradually took over functions of both the Īwān and the Qaṣr.

The structures of the Ḥawš were built around a depression dug to provide building material for the Citadel. During the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad the depression was turned into a park with a pool (*buḥra*) surrounded by several buildings ¹⁰⁸.

The complex of the Ḥawš could be reached either from the *Qusūr Ġuwwāniyya* which adjoined al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq or from Bāb al-Sitāra, a gate opening toward the mosque. When the parade of the king of Cyprus took place in Ramaḍān 829/1426, soldiers were posted from Bāb al-Mudarraġ to the Ḥawš to mark the itinerary of the parade ¹⁰⁹.

The Ḥawš included a series of palaces and residences with several courtyards and a polo ground. At this polo ground, which seems to have been an innovation of the Circassians, the sultan played with his amirs, a special *mawkib* or parade taking place on the occasion ¹¹⁰.

During the reign of Sultan Barsbāy the Ḥawš began to be the place where the Sultan held his audiences, including sometimes also the reception of embassies ¹¹¹. One of the ambassadors of Šāh Rūḥ is reported to have been thrown by Barsbāy together

106. 'Abd al-Ġanī al-Nābulṣī, *al-Ḥaḳīqa wa'l-maġāz fī al-riḥlat ilā bilād al-Šām wa Miṣr wa'l-Ḥiġāz*, Cairo 1986, p. 250.

107. Thévenot, II, p. 227; Niebuhr, I, p. 59; Jomard, p. 351 f.

108. Maqrizi, *Sulūk*, II, p. 433 f.; *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II,

p. 229; 'Umari, p. 82.

109. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIV, p. 300.

110. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIV, p. 307; Zāhiri, p. 87.

111. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XV, p. 234.

with other members of his embassy into the pool filled with water ¹¹². Šāh Rūḥ's ambassador had come demanding that Barsbāy declare his subjugation to the Timurid sultan. The parade of the king of Cyprus, displayed as a captive, also took place at the Ḥawš at the gate called Bāb al-Buḥra, in presence of a number of foreign ambassadors ¹¹³.

Sultan Ğaqmaq started the custom of holding the Dār al-ʿAdl audience at the Ḥawš instead of the Īwān or the Stables, disregarding traditional protocol ¹¹⁴. This was also observed by Sultan Ināl and all the later sultans ¹¹⁵. The Circassian sultans, by transferring their official activities into this part of the Citadel, disregarded the arrangement originally planned by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and Bahri successors, which was to keep the southern section private and the northern part ceremonial with its mosque, the Īwān, the Qaṣr, the Stables and the Hippodrome.

To illustrate this change, al-ʿUmārī, who worked at the Citadel, in his description of the Ḥawš, writes that he never saw it. Later accounts, as noted above, show that the Ḥawš was accessible to all officials.

The Harem was part of the Ḥawš. When the son of Barsbāy was circumcised, the men celebrated at the Ḥawš and the women at the *dūr* or private apartments ¹¹⁶.

A. Qāʿat al-ʿawāmīd.

Qāʿat al-ʿAwāmīd is mentioned in the first years of Mamluk rule in connection with Šaġarat al-Durr, wife of the last Ayyubid sultan al-Šāliḥ Naġm al-Dīn Ayyūb, then married to the first Mamluk sultan al-Muʿizz Aybak, and herself sultan between both reigns for a few months in 1250. She introduced a ceremony at the Citadel, a daily procession with music, which took place at Qāʿat al-ʿAwāmīd ¹¹⁷. According to Zāhirī, this *qāʿa* had been erected by a lady of the court ¹¹⁸. Which lady, between the reigns of al-Malik al-Kāmil and al-Muʿizz Aybak, could have built an important structure at the Citadel if not Šaġarat al-Durr herself? The hall is mentioned in the reign of Aybak as the place where the sultan killed Amir Aqtāy in 625 H. ¹¹⁹.

112. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 167 f.

113. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIV, p. 300 f., 307.

114. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XV, p. 365, 445; XVI, p. 272; Ibn Iyās, II, p. 297.

115. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 665; IV, p. 14, 29, 51, 120.

116. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XV, p. 41 f.

117. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭat*, II, p. 20; Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 286.

118. Zāhirī, p. 121.

119. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 291; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I, p. 390.

The context in which this *qā'a* is mentioned during the early Bahri Mamluk period indicates that it was originally used for official ceremonial functions and not, as referred to later from the reign of al-Nāṣir onward, as a structure of the Harem. It was at Qā'at al-'Awāmīd that Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars invited the first Abbasid Caliph of Egypt to dwell for a few days after his arrival, in order to reinstate the Abbaside Caliphate in Cairo. The Sultan and the Caliph attended there a meeting during which the authenticity of the Caliph was officially confirmed ¹²⁰.

Since Qā'at al-'Awāmīd already stood in the 1250's, and since it was at that time part of the ceremonial complex, not a harem structure, it becomes clear that al-Nāṣir Muḥammad radically disturbed the previous arrangement of the Citadel's residences.

With the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, following his remodelling of the Citadel's buildings, Qā'at al-'Awāmīd became the main palace of the Harem, as the residence of the sultan's favored wife (*ḥawand al-kubrā*) ¹²¹. *Ṣāhibat al-Qā'a*, « the lady of the hall », was the title attributed to the First Lady of the Mamluk court ¹²². If the favorite wife lost her privileged status, she had to abandon Qā'at al-'Awāmīd and leave it to the next favorite wife. If she was not divorced, she would occupy another *qā'a*.

Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad rebuilt Qā'at al-'Awāmīd and redecorated it with marbles when he rebuilt the Harem and the structures of the Ḥawṣ ¹²³.

Qā'at al-'Awāmīd witnessed under the Circassians another bloody scene, when Sultan al-Nāṣir Farağ beheaded his wife : he hit her first with his sword, chopping off some of her fingers, and following her, kept on until he cut off her head while blood splashed on the walls. He then dragged her body from Qā'at al-'Awāmīd to the Duḥayṣa ¹²⁴.

But there were also more cheerful events associated with this palace. Qā'at al-'Awāmīd was the ultimate stage of the great processions that took place each time a sultan married. When the wife of Sultan Ğaqmaq came back from Pilgrimage, she was welcomed by a glorious procession, stepping on silk carpets spread for her from Bāb al-Sitāra, the Harem's gate that faced the mosque, to her throne at Qā'at al-'Awāmīd ¹²⁵. This throne, called *martaba*, was later restored by Sultan al-Ġūrī for his wife, for he was quite fond of pomp ¹²⁶.

120. Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, p. 100; Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 313, 315.

121. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 266, 435; III, p. 472; V, p. 114; Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XII, p. 145; XII, p. 131; Zāhiri, p. 121.

122. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 64; V, p. 430.

123. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 512.

124. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, XIII, p. 131.

125. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 243.

126. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 68, 81.

Apart from Qā'at al-'Awāmīd, dedicated to the favorite wife, each of the sultan's wives had a *qā'a* to herself. There were Qā'at Ramaḍān, Qā'at al-Muẓaffariyya, and al-Qā'a al-Mu'allaqa as well as Qā'at al-Barbariyya for the slave concubines, where the Sultan's children also dwelt ¹²⁷.

B. The Saba' Qā'āt were the dwellings of the royal slaves and concubines, located on the southwestern side of the residential complex overlooking the hippodrome and the cemetery ¹²⁸. Casanova identifies their location with that of the Saba' Ḥaḍarāt of the D.E. map (U/4-72).

C. Qā'at al-Buḥra.

The Buḥra or Qā'at al-Buḥra was one of the structures around the Ḥawš, so called because it overlooked the pool on one side and on the other side, the cemetery; it was thus southward oriented ¹²⁹. Sultan al-Mu'ayyad restored its dome ¹³⁰ and many years later, Sultan al-Ašraf Ġānbalāṭ (1500) erected another domed structure in its neighbourhood near the Duhayša, named al-Ašrafiyya ¹³¹.

The Buḥra was reached from the Qaṣr through the Harem ¹³². Nearby were a *ḥammām* or bath and several treasure halls such as the *taṣtaḥāna* and the store room for the royal tents ¹³³. Under Qāyṭbāy the Caliph dwelt near the Buḥra, until he was dismissed because the Sultan was told that the fire that destroyed his tents had come from the Caliph's kitchen ¹³⁴.

Sultan Qāyṭbāy added a loggia (*maq'ad*) to the Buḥra, private apartments and store rooms ¹³⁵.

D. Al-Duhayša.

The Duhayša was another hall connected to and overlooking the Ḥawš ¹³⁶. According to the map of the D.E., it must have been on the northern side of the complex, whereas

127. Zāhiri, p. 121; Ibn Iyās, II, p. 79, 80, 197, 209.

128. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 212.

129. Ġawhari, II, p. 478.

130. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 63.

131. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 201, 310. This means that two halls existed at the Ḥawš that were

named Ašrafiyya (see below).

132. Ibn Taġribirdi, *Nuġūm*, XVI, p. 370 f.

133. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 352; V, p. 195.

134. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 300.

135. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 329.

136. Ibn Taġribirdi, *Nuġūm*, XVI, p. 101.

the Buḥra was on the southern side. (On the map of the Citadel, the mosque of al-Duhayša which must be the mosque of the Ḥawš is indicated as U/3-4,40.)

The Duhayša was started by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and completed in Ramaḍān 744/1344 by his son al-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl¹³⁷. Originally it seems to have been planned as a private apartment, for on the day of its inauguration Sultan Ismāʿīl sat there celebrating in the company of his slave girls. His successors used it as their living room, and Sultan Ğaqmaq married his daughter to Amir Azbak min Ṭuṭuḥ there¹³⁸. The Duhayša was the starting point of the investiture procession of the newly nominated sultans.

E. Al-Bayṣariyya.

The Bayṣariyya was attached to the Harem. It was erected by Sultan Ḥasan in 661 / 1262-1263. Extremely high, its walls were eighty-eight cubits high and it had a remarkable stalactite portal made « of one piece ». The hall was surmounted by a large dome, gilded as was the rest of the interior, including golden window grills. A gigantic window « similar to Bāb Zuwayla » in the middle of its main *iwān* overlooked a garden. There was also a tower of ebony and ivory serving as bedroom for the Sultan. The extreme height, the remarkable stalactite portal and the extraordinary window suggest that the architect might have been involved in the building of the Sultan's mosque as well, the proportions of which are equally unsurpassed¹³⁹. Sultan al-Ġūrī restored it at the same time he restored Qāʿat al-ʿAwāmīd¹⁴⁰.

In this hall the son of Sultan Qāyṭbāy was circumcised with the Ottoman Prince Ğumġuma as a guest at the celebration. That day, the son of Qāyṭbāy rode from Qāʿat al-Buḥra at the Ḥawš to Bāb al-Sitāra where he dismounted to enter the Bayṣariyya where the circumcision took place¹⁴¹.

F. Al-Ašrafiyya.

The Ašrafiyya was erected by al-Ašraf Šaʿbān within the Harem¹⁴². The sources mention further buildings and *qāʿa*(s), the functions of which cannot be exactly identified, such as Qāʿat al-Ḥaram and a *qāʿa* situated between the Duhayša and the Qāʿat al-Ḥaram used as a bedroom by the Sultan¹⁴³.

137. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 460, 485, 504; Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, II, p. 633, 653; Ibn Taġrībīrdī, *Nuġūm*, X, p. 89 f.

138. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 277.

139. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 212.

140. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 67.

141. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 271 f.

142. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 183.

143. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 175; II, p. 299; III, p. 227; Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, II, p. 890.

2. The functions of the Hawš.

When speaking of the religious feasts officially celebrated by the Mamluk sultans, Qalqašandī, Maqrīzī and 'Umārī refer to the two 'id(s)¹⁴⁴, but do not refer to the *Mawlid* or Birthday of the Prophet or the festivities of the *Maḥmal*, which are both mentioned in later accounts. Celebration of the *Mawlid*, an important feast under the Fatimids, is not referred to in connection with the Citadel before the reign of Sultan Barqūq, who celebrated it once at the Hippodrome, but usually at the Hawš¹⁴⁵. Maqrīzī explicitly states that the celebration of the *Mawlid* was a tradition of the Circassian sultans¹⁴⁶. It took place in low-key form without *mawkib* or «*šāš* and *qumāš*»¹⁴⁷. Usually, a tent was erected for the occasion at the Hawš, sometimes at the Qaṣr¹⁴⁸. Koran recitations were performed in presence of the religious dignitaries, and sometimes chanting accompanied by tambourine (*samā'*), and a banquet followed¹⁴⁹.

Interestingly, Ibn Taḡribirdī intentionally records in detail the *Mawlid* celebration of Barqūq «so that it can be followed by whoever wishes to revive it» (*li-yaqtaḍi bihi man arāda taḡḍidahu*), a sentence implying that the custom was not always faithfully maintained¹⁵⁰. The historian then mentions the *qāḍī*(s), amirs, religious dignitaries and soldiers attending within the tent. After the Koran recitations which were performed by several choirs, sermons were held. Money was offered to the religious dignitaries and a luxurious banquet followed. After the religious and administrative notables left, the Sultan remained with his private Mamluks and the Sufis to attend *samā'*, (probably with music) throughout the night, while sweets and fruits were served continuously. Finally, in the morning the Sufis, for whom Barqūq demonstrated special reverence, received donations of wheat.

Qāyṭbāy, who introduced the celebration of the Birthday of Sayyida Nafīsa, had a round tent (*Mudawwara*) especially made for this occasion which cost as much as 36 000 dinars¹⁵¹. Tents were among the emblems of royalty¹⁵², and the *Mudawwara* was usually the designation of the sultan's tent during his travels¹⁵³.

144. 'Umārī, p. 73 f.; Qalqašandī, IV, p. 53.

145. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 229.

146. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, IV, p. 1090.

147. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 157.

148. Ġawharī, I, p. 168.

149. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 890; IV, p. 1164; Ġawharī, I, p. 168.

150. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XII, p. 73 f.

151. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 200, 216, IV, p. 116 ff.; 447.

152. Qalqašandī, IV, p. 9.

153. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XIV, p. 186, 372; XV, p. 457; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 807; IV, p. 383, 384.

During the rule of the Circassian sultans there was a gradual shift of ceremonial activities from the Īwān, the Qaṣr and the Stables, toward the Ḥawṣ originally planned as private quarters for the sultan and his Harem. The Īwān and Qaṣr were used only on a few occasions of especially formal character, such as the reception of embassies or the investiture of a new sultan. For the daily working sessions the sultans no more bothered to move from the Ḥawṣ ¹⁵⁴.

Even some religious customs, such as the slaughtering of the sacrifices at the Īwān, were transferred to the Ḥawṣ for security reasons by Sultan Īnāl, who was in trouble with his Mamluks ¹⁵⁵. The reading of al-Buḥārī during the month of Ramaḍān and the following distribution of robes of honor to the *qāḍī(s)* and scholars at the Qaṣr was also moved to the Ḥawṣ ¹⁵⁶.

Even the Stables where Sultan Barqūq (see below) initiated the custom of holding his tribunal, were abandoned for a while until Sultan Ḥuṣḡadam revived the tradition established by Barqūq and started to sit there for the Justice audiences.

« . . . for the sultans nowadays have started sitting at the Dikkat in the Ḥawṣ to judge among the people, and gave up going down to the Stables. The old custom was that the Sultan would not be seen by the public, and nobody from the Mamluks was allowed into the Ḥawṣ unless in official outfit (*bi-qumāṣ al-mawḡib*), nobody was allowed to meet him at the Ḥawṣ except the private guard. Whoever wanted to meet the Sultan had to wait for the audience at the Qaṣr. The sultan then would go down to the Stables for Justice audiences Saturdays and Tuesdays, usually in the winter. Now I understand what is meant by , the sultan did not judge since he was invested ', which means he did not go to the Stables » ¹⁵⁷.

This is confirmed by Zāhirī, who writes that the *mawḡib* used to take place at the Qaṣr twice weekly on Thursdays and Mondays, and it was held at the Stables in the late winter and early spring on Saturdays and Mondays ¹⁵⁸.

Ibn Taḡribirdī's words give important informations about the evolution that had taken place in court life at the Citadel. Interestingly, he recalls only that the Justice audiences were once held at the Stables, himself forgetting or ignoring that even these audiences at the Stables had once been an innovation that took place at the expenses of the older customs at the Great Īwān.

154. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XVI, p. 219, 221.

155. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XVI, p. 94.

156. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 88.

157. Ibn Taḡribirdī. *Nuḡūm*, XVI, p. 296 f.

158. Zāhirī, p. 86.

Sultan Ḥuṣqadam, who respected traditions and loved pompous ceremonies, sat on the *dikka* of the Ḥawš only when he was very ill, summoning his amirs there for the *hidma*. When his health became worse, he even received visitors at his bed at the Bayṣariyya and held the *hidma* there, but this *hidma* was a low-key performance without ceremonial outfit or *qumāš* ¹⁵⁹.

Sultan Qāyṭbāy, despite his restoration of the Īwān, continued to sit mainly at the Ḥawš. There, he distributed soldiers' wages, attended parades, gave banquets at the Buḥra, received embassies and invited the Ottoman prince Ğumğuma ¹⁶⁰. In the summer he slept on a bench (*dikka*) in the open air of the Ḥawš, where he built a wall to shelter him against indiscretion after a Mamluk tried to kill him during his sleep ¹⁶¹.

Sultan Qānsû Abū Sa'īd, who was fond of great shows, embellished the *dikka* at the Ḥawš and adorned it with a new baldachin with golden velvet ¹⁶².

With the reign of Sultan al-Ġūrī, glamor returned to Court life despite the catastrophic situation of his empire that led to the Ottoman conquest and to his own death. He ordered a grand scale restoration activity at several parts of the Citadel, in particular the Ḥawš, where he filled in the pool and paved the new floor with colored marbles, and restored the Duhayša. A *maq'ad* was built behind the garden of the Buḥra to overlook the Ḥawš; it was of Coptic style, without columns, and with a high marble dado 30 cubits long and about 20 wide. It had windows both on the Ḥawš and on the garden's side. The sultan inaugurated it on the first of Ramaḍān 911/1506 and took his Ramaḍān breakfast there with his amirs as guests ¹⁶³. He received there the Ottoman prince Qarqad Ibn 'Uṭmān, son of Sultan Bāyazīd, in 915 H. ¹⁶⁴ with more reverence than Qāyṭbāy had done with Ğumğuma, standing up for him and letting him ride into the Ḥawš, an exceptional event because riding within the Citadel was the exclusive right of the sultans. But al-Ġūrī had serious reasons to court the Ottomans. His courtesy, however, did not help.

Al-Ġūrī used to attend the *mawḳib* on Mondays and Thursdays at the Ḥawš and on Saturdays and Tuesdays at the Hippodrome ¹⁶⁵.

Ṭūmānbāy demolished the stone bench (*maṣṭaba*) which al-Ġūrī had erected to sit on at the Ḥawš and restored the old *dikka* of Sultan Qāyṭbāy, which was covered with

159. Ibn Taġribirdi, *Nuğūm*, XVI, p. 272, 302.

160. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 22, 28, 31, 34, 38, 61, 157, 179 f., 185.

161. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 322, 323.

162. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 429.

163. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 80, 165.

164. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 154 f.

165. Ibn Iyās, V, p. 88.

yellow felt. He sat on it, like Qāyrbāy, for the Justice audiences, inspection of the Mam-luks, investiture of the *qāḍī*(s) and all other activities ¹⁶⁶.

3. Later descriptions.

After the Ottoman conquest, the northern part of the residential complex suffered along with other areas when Sultan Selim took away marbles and columns. The ruined Qaṣr and Īwān were abandoned to their fate, and the Ottoman Pashas held Court at the Ḥawš, their main audience or *dīwān* being in a hall known as Dīwān al-Ġūrī. Since al-Ġūrī restored the Duhayša, the Bayṣariyya and Qā'at al-'Awāmīd it could be either one. The hall known under the Ottomans as Dīwān Qāyrbāy was probably Qā'at al-Buḥra, because it is described by Čelebī as having a great dome and overlooking Imām Šāfi'ī, and we know that Qāyrbāy restored this *qā'a*, which indeed overlooked the cemetery. Čelebī also refers to a bath near this hall which also confirms the account of Ibn Iyās mentioned above. Further, Ġabartī writes that it faced the entrance into the Ḥawš ¹⁶⁷.

Evliyā Čelebī describes Dīwān al-Ġūrī, which according to his and to Ġabartī's accounts overlooked the Ḥawš ¹⁶⁸, as one hundred eighty-five feet long and fifty five-feet wide, panelled and paved with handsome marbles. Its painted and gilded ceiling, was not domed but made of wood and was carried by thirty-five wooden columns which he designates as masts of ships. It had on its four sides thirty-three windows with brass grills and twenty six glass windows. This Dīwān was connected by windows to another hall he designates as the « throne room » of the Ottoman pashas. The Duhayša is not mentioned as having had a dome; was it perhaps the later Dīwān al-Ġūrī?

Thévenot, who wrote at about the same time, mentions a long hall with a low floor ¹⁶⁹. The « low floor » might indicate that the level of this hall was lower than the rest of the structures. If so, it would mean that this hall was built earlier than the rest, because new buildings were usually set above the ruins of earlier ones and were therefore higher. In this case, and because of its description as hypostyle, it could be Qā'at al-'Awāmīd, which was one of the oldest structures of the Citadel, according to Zāhiri the largest of the private apartments, and extant until the reign of Muḥammad 'Alī. Ġabartī, however, mentions both a Qā'at al-'Awāmīd and Dīwān al-Ġūrī, thus implying that they were two different halls ¹⁷⁰.

166. Ibn Iyās, V, p. 107 f., 117, 162.

167. Ġabartī, IV, p. 158.

168. Čelebī, p. 176 ff., Ġabartī, IV, p. 158.

169. Thévenot, II, p. 228; Savary I, p. 105.

170. Ġabartī, IV, p. 127, 158.

As for *Dīwān Qāyṭbāy*, Čelebī describes it as smaller than *Dīwān al-Ġūrī*, measuring thirty by twenty steps, with a high dome and three windows overlooking the cemetery of Imām Šāfi'ī. He further attributes to *Qāyṭbāy* a basin, one hundred fifty by eighty feet, covered by a roof on columns. As for the Harem, it was built in several stories and overlooked gardens and courtyards with fountains and basins. The whole complex included three hundred sixty rooms. According to Čelebī's estimations the Ḥawš measured one thousand steps in circumference. On one side was the kitchen connected with waterwheels. The kitchen can be located on the D.E. map (U/3,44) and the ruins of the waterwheels, on the southern side of the mosque, are still recognizable.

De Maillet writes that the Ḥawš was half at large as the Jardin des Tuileries, a hall occupying the whole side of this courtyard, long and wide and large enough to include several thousand persons serving at the *Dīwān* of the Pasha. At this time it was bare of ornaments ¹⁷¹.

From Ġabartī, we understand that *Dīwān Qāyṭbāy* was elevated, with a *maq'ad* built above « the store room with the columns and the great *Dīwān* of al-Ġūrī ». Ġabartī's indications conform to an eighteenth century reference to a staircase connecting *Dīwān al-Ġūrī* with that of *Qāyṭbāy*, the latter being the higher one ¹⁷².

On the map of the D.E. there is a palace attributed to the Pasha (U/3, 41) which could be, according to the descriptions above, *Dīwān al-Ġūrī*. Not far from it (V/3, 36) is a *Sabīl al-Ġūrī*.

Tafur, who was received in 1436 by Sultan Barsbāy at the Ḥawš, refers to a sumptuous tent erected there for the meal of the sultan and next to it a second tent with a platform on which the sultan sat ¹⁷³.

Van Ghistele reports of an embassy to Sultan Qāyṭbāy which obviously was received at the Ḥawš. After having been initiated to the protocol rule of kissing the floor in front of the Sultan, and moving back facing him, they had to cross a series of galleries and halls until reaching a lovely « summer residence » decorated with paintings in gold and other rich colours. The residence looked from two sides through handsome gilded grills upon courtyards, gardens and orchards with all kinds of plants and aromatic fruit trees. There were many artificial fountains to water all the gardens. Finally, in the residence, sumptuously panelled and paved with polychrome marbles, its walls richly

171. De Maillet, I, p. 159.

172. Casanova, p. 706 f.; anonymus, *Al-Durra al-mušāna fī waqā'i' al-kināna min 'uzlān al-sulṭān Muḥammad ḥān wa tawliyyat aḥī-hi al-sulṭān Sulaymān ḥān*; Mns. dated 1169/1755, Codex

Arab. Nr 399, p. 13 f., Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

173. Pero Tafur cit. by P.H. Dopp, « Le Caire vu par les voyageurs occidentaux du Moyen Âge », *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie d'Égypte*, t. XXVI (1953) p. 87 ff. (91).

decorated with arabesques and inlaid stones, they saw in the middle a knee-deep rectangular basin, three or four steps wide, with fresh water and small fishes. The sultan sat in this hall on a cushion, his legs folded like a tailor, playing chess with one of his courtiers, surrounded by cushions of precious materials and leathers spread over carpets ¹⁷⁴.

VI. — THE HIPPODROME AND THE STABLES

1. The Stables.

The Mamluk, a military society characterized by cavalry, gave primary place to its horses and stables. Horses were the most prestigious items of medieval society and only the upper military class and the highest notables could afford them. Less aristocratic and exclusive were the mules, while donkeys were the common animal of transportation. We know that at the Abbasid Court, the Stables were displayed to foreign ambassadors before their admittance into the palace ¹⁷⁵. The Stables of the Citadel in Cairo included the Sultan's menagerie and his hunting falcons ¹⁷⁶. They also included the palace of the *amīr aḥūr*, who was in charge of the royal stables.

From the Qaṣr and the adjoining apartments the Sultan could overlook at all times his Stables and further away, the Hippodrome, in the neighbourhood of which was the Horse Market.

The Stables of the Citadel, from the beginning of the Circassian period, steadily acquired new dimensions, replacing the Īwān and the Qaṣr in many respects. There, Barqūq and his successors held their Justice audiences, sitting in a special loggia called the *maq'ad*. The term *ḥarrāqa* is also used to designate certain loggia at the Stables. The *ḥarrāqa*, as its name indicates, was a « place of firing ». The term also designated a type of ship ¹⁷⁷. The firing implied here could be for military purpose, but may have included fireworks used on festival occasions, also designated by the verb *ḥaraqā* ¹⁷⁸.

By transferring his tribunal to the Stables, Barqūq returned to the custom earlier established by al-Ẓāhir Baybars that the Dār al-'Adl be outside the main part of the Citadel.

174. Van Ghistele, p. 24.

175. D. & J. Sourdel, *La Civilisation de l'Islam classique*, Paris 1983, p. 309.

176. 'Umari, p. 83; Ẓāhiri, p. 125 f.

177. W. Popper, *Egypt and Syria under the*

Circassian sultans 1382-1468 A.D. — Systematic notes to Ibn Taḡribirdī's chronicles of Egypt; California University Press 1955, p. 23.

178. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 61.




Fig. 9. — Plan of the Iwān drawn in 1799 by L. Cassas
(*Voyage pittoresque de la Syrie et Basse Égypte*, Paris).




Fig. 10. — Domed area of the Great Īwān (*Description de l'Égypte*).

If Ibn Iyās' account is correct, there must have been a *maq'ad* at the Stables of the Citadel already in the Bahri Mamluk period, since the historian reports that Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad started the procession of his third investiture at the Maq'ad of the Stables¹⁷⁹. This Maq'ad must have been an important structure since it was one of the main halls used by the Circassian sultans¹⁸⁰.

Sultan al-Mu'ayyad, who maintained the ceremonies of the Stables, erected a mosque there¹⁸¹.

Sultan Barsbāy received the ambassador of Šāh Rūḥ and held tribunal at the loggia of the Stables¹⁸². Like the Qaṣr and the Īwān under the Bahri Mamluks, the Stables under the Circassians witnessed parades, processions and receptions¹⁸³. A period of neglect preceded the reign of al-Zāhir Ḥuṣqadam, who then took care of restoring the Stables' glamor¹⁸⁴. Qāyrbāy also held tribunal at the stables on Tuesdays and Thursdays¹⁸⁵. As mentioned above, unless it began at the Ḥawš, the investiture of a new sultan started at the Stables¹⁸⁶.

The sultan's audiences at the Stables seem to have been only seasonal, taking place there in winter and in early spring¹⁸⁷. This was the time before the horses were taken out for grazing. Ibn Iyās writes in Ramaḍān 876/1472, which corresponded to February-March, that the season for the *mawkib* at the Stables had come to an end¹⁸⁸. This seems to imply that the Ḥawš was the summer alternative. In fact, van Ghistele calls it a summer residence. Located on a higher level and more exposed to the breeze, it was no doubt cooler than the Stables, which were protected to the northeast by the slope of the Muqaṭṭam.

The Stables were outside the main enclosure of the Citadel and at the same time connected to it, hence their strategic importance. During times of peace the connection was open; in times of insecurity, however, the Stables could be disconnected and access to the main part of the Citadel became far more difficult¹⁸⁹.

179. Ibn Iyās, I (1), p. 431. Neither Maqrīzī nor Ibn Taḡribirdī, however, refer to a *maq'ad* in this context.

180. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XII, p. 8.

181. Ġawhari, II, p. 491.

182. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XIV, p. 242, 281, 287; XV, 73; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, IV, p. 613, 615 f.

183. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XI, p. 327; XII, p. 175; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, IV, p. 631, 471.

184. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XIV, p. 173; Ibn

Iyās, II, p. 444.

185. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 66.

186. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XII, p. 169; XIII, p. 41; XIV, p. 253; Ibn Iyās, II, p. 378, 394.

187. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XVI, p. 297; Zāhirī, p. 86.

188. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 68.

189. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, XII, p. 185; XVI, p. 51.

2. The Hippodrome.

From his Stables the sultan could reach the Hippodrome underneath the Citadel, near which was the Horse Market ¹⁹⁰. This Hippodrome existed since the days of Ibn Ṭūlūn, when this area was the royal residential quarter of this capital al-Qaṭā'ī'. Sultan al-Mu'izz Aybak destroyed it, but al-Nāṣir Muḥammad restored and reused it. Barqūq and al-Ġūrī further contributed to its maintenance.

The Hippodrome, in addition to its usual functions, was also the place where, under the Bahri Mamluks, the prayers of the two feasts were celebrated, followed by a banquet at the Īwān with the distribution of robes for the occasion. Security reasons obliged Barqūq, however, to transfer the feast prayer to the mosque, within the Citadel. Polo tournaments under the Circassians took place at the Ḥawš, not the Hippodrome.

Whereas Zāhiri mentions the *Maḥmal* in his enumeration of sultanic *mawḳib(s)*, Maqrīzī, Qalqašandī and al-'Umārī, do not ¹⁹¹. Ibn Taġribirdī attributes to Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn the innovation of the *Maḥmal* parade in 1279. It consisted essentially of lancers' games to celebrate the dispatch of the Ka'ba cloth sent yearly by the Mamluk sultans to Mecca with the pilgrim caravan. Ibn Taġribirdī also notes that the techniques of the lancers evolved greatly with time, « as has happened with all others arts, sports and sciences ». He saw the zenith of this art under Barqūq and its decline in his own time, in the late fifteenth century ¹⁹². The departure of the pilgrim caravan was celebrated at all times. Amīr al-Ḥaġġ, nominated by the sultan, appeared after his investiture accompanied by the religious and juridical dignitaries to join the caravan, after they all had been bestowed upon robes of honor. The games and parades of lancers accompanied the *Maḥmal* until its departure from the northern city gates. This was during the month of Šawwāl. Following Qalqašandī's and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's reports, the Sultan and the Court were not directly involved in all these festivities, which had a strong popular character, except that they might have been spectators from the Citadel windows ¹⁹³. The parades of the *Maḥmal* which crossed the whole city attracted masses of the population. In the Circassian period, however, some sultans, like Ḥuṣqadam and al-Ġūrī, (whose reign Ibn Taġribirdī did not witness), promoted the lancers' games of the *Maḥmal* as a Mamluk art of *furūsiyya* or horsemanship, and attended their performances at the Hippodrome of the Citadel ¹⁹⁴.

190. 'Umārī, p. 83.

191. Zāhiri, p. 87.

192. Ibn Taġribirdī, *Nuġūm*, VII, p. 311.

193. Qalqašandī, IV, p. 54, 57; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa,

Riḥlat Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Cairo 1958, I, p. 26.

194. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 391; Ibn Taġribirdī, *Ḥawādīt*, II, p. 456 f.

Al-Ġūrī restored the Hippodrome, which became a pleasure complex at the same time as his Audience Hall, spending there most of his time. It had a garden with imported aromatic trees on which cages with exotic singing birds were hung. A *buhra* 40 cubits long was surrounded by loggias and belvederes as well as a Justice Hall (*li'l-muḥākamāt*). The pool served both as ornament and for the irrigation of the gardens. On occasions, it was filled with flowers¹⁹⁵. The sultan had a *dikka* or bench inlaid with ebony and ivory with a seat of velvet on which he sat in the shade of jasmin trees, his Mamluks behind him whisking. There, he attended parades, celebrated the *Mawlid*, received embassies and held council. At the gate of the Hippodrome there was an elevated structure (*qaṣr*) overlooking the Ramla square. A passage led from the Citadel down to this *qaṣr*. The Hippodrome, surrounded by a wall, had two gates, a large and a smaller one adorned with chains¹⁹⁶.

Domenico Trevisano, ambassador of the Doge of Venice, estimated the Maydān as twice the size of St Mark's Square in Venice. In the middle of it stood an open kiosk supported by columns and covered with plants. Cloths were hung on the sides to provide shade. On each column was a cage hung with a small singing bird.

VII. — SUMMARY

The reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad established the basic features of the Citadel's residences with the complex of the Īwān and Qaṣr opposite the mosque on the northern part of the southern enclosure and with the Hippodrome at a lower level. At the same time, he developed the private apartments around the Ḥawš with its park and gardens. Al-Nāṣir, at the same time as he erected buildings, established a sophisticated system of ceremonial to be staged in them, which the short ruling periods of his succeeding sons do not seem to have much disturbed.

The Circassian sultans, beginning with Sultan Barqūq, modified the inherited court protocol and thus their use of the Citadel was different. They not only, as Ibn Taġribirdī accuses, cancelled former customs, but added new ones as well. With Barqūq's reign the Stables began to be one of the major ceremonial centers of the Mamluk court. Barqūq also started the tradition of celebrating the *Mawlid* of the Prophet at the Ḥawš. The Ḥawš, originally the private sphere of the Bahri sultans, gradually evolved to be

195. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 151, 449. — 196. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 56, 137, 172.

the ceremonial center of the Circassian sultans. It was also Barqūq who was first mentioned in the chronicles in connection with Maṭ'am al-Ṭayr at Raydāniyya which was a hippodrome and as its name indicates a falconry, used also for ceremonial purposes ¹⁹⁷. The innovation of Barqūq was his transfer of the most official ceremonies into an equestrian environment. The Maṭ'am, where the reception of Sultan Ibn Uways by Barqūq took place, was also the traditional stage for a custom of the Circassian sultans of distributing clothes to the Mamluks, summer white clothes and winter wool clothes. This summer ceremony was held at the same time as the season of Polo tournaments ¹⁹⁸ at the Ḥawš. By the mid-fifteenth century the hippodromes of the Bahri Mamluks were abandoned together with their ceremonials, but the lancers' arts continued to evolve ¹⁹⁹.

The Stables on one side and the Ḥawš on the other, alternating according to the seasons and following the sultans' whims, gradually subsisted for the Īwān-Qaṣr complex of the Bahri Mamluks.

Al-Mu'ayyad, although he maintained the ceremonials of Maṭ'am al-Ṭayr and the Stables, did not spend much time at the Citadel. He planned a residential complex in the northern outskirts of Cairo ²⁰⁰ but died before he could use it. He spent much of his time in the palace of al-Qāḍī Ibn al-Bārīzī at Būlāq along the Nile, where he even made the *ḥidma* ²⁰¹.

Barsbāy seems to be the one who gave the Ḥawš its ceremonial attributes. Ğaqmaq, religious and puritan, cancelled a great deal of the court ceremonials. Ḥuṣqadam, tradition-minded, demonstrated interest for ceremonials whenever he could, reviving the Qaṣr, celebrating at the Maṭ'am, holding court at the Stables and even promoting the lancers' tournaments on the occasion of the *Maḥmal*.

Qāyṭbāy, an old man, pious and rather austere, preferred religious customs and took seriously his function as Supreme Judge, but neglected other ceremonials of purely worldly and pompous character.

Al-Ġūrī did the opposite, preferring the glamorous side of Court life and spending most of his time at the Hippodrome which became a true pleasure complex. He neglected his functions as Supreme Judge, and enjoyed glamorous shows wherever he

197. Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, III, p. 799 f.; Ibn Ḥawādīt, IV, p. 760.

Tagrībīrdī, *Nuḡūm*, XII, p. 45 f.; *Ḥawādīt*, III, p. 446 f.

198. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 404; Ibn Tagrībīrdī,

199. Zāhirī, p. 86.

200. Ibn Tagrībīrdī, *Nuḡūm*, XIV, p. 94, 105.

201. Ibn Iyās, II, p. 61.

could, reintroducing parades, tournaments and insignia which Qāyṭbāy had cancelled ²⁰². His care for ceremonial details is further demonstrated by the fact that he modified a major emblem of sovereignty, the royal parasol, by ordering a crescent to replace the traditional bird on its top ²⁰³. This may have been inspired by the Ottomans, who frequently used the crescent in their emblems and decorative arts. Or, was it perhaps meant to please them? Al-Ġūrī's care for ceremonial shows coincided with a period of great diplomatic activity, partly dictated by trade relations with Europe and partly by the Safawid-Ottoman conflict which put the Mamluk sultanate in an embarrassing diplomatic position. Ibn Iyās reports that on one day fourteen embassies were waiting in Cairo to be received by the Sultan ²⁰⁴.

Surely the personality of the various Mamluk dictated the character of their Court habits. But political and economic factors also contributed to the elaboration of ceremonies. In times of warfare such as most of the Bahri period, which witnessed Crusades and Mongol invasions, military parades acquired great importance. This is seen in the reign of al-Zāhir Baybars, who reviewed his whole army on one day to make sure that every soldier wore his own garments. When he was not involved in warfare, tournaments, parades as well as hunts took up most of his attention. The *mayādīn* or equestrian arts continued to be promoted by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and his successors. Alertness of the armies in times of warfare promoted at the same time the arts and sports of horsemanship which in turn contributed to the glamor of the court and its ceremonies. The Bahri period also instituted the Abbasid Caliphate of Cairo, making the Mamluk capital, with its multinational religious institutions representing the four rites of Islam, a major center of the Muslim world. The Mongol ethnic and cultural connections of the Bahri Mamluks stretched their sphere of interest far beyond the borders of their realm. The Bahri Mamluk period was one of cultural and political diversity, stimulated no doubt by the wars they fought and won and their resulting self-confidence. It is interesting in this context to compare Ibn al-'Abbās' *Aṭār al-uwḡal*, a manual of princes, with Zāhirī's *Zubda* which also includes a substantial section dedicated to the sultan's instruction ²⁰⁵: whereas Ibn al-'Abbās' text is a multicoloured mosaic of information from various periods and cultures, Zāhirī's text is based mainly on religious tradition, a fact which conforms with the personality of the sultan he addressed, who was Ġaḡmaq.

202. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 59.

203. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 412.

204. Ibn Iyās, V, p. 268.

205. Zāhirī, p. 53-87.

Foreign trade was a major source of prosperity for the Mamluk empire and trade relations required diplomacy celebrated with adequate court ceremonials to impress foreign counterparts, as expressed in Ibn al-‘Abbās’ manual. The most gorgeous building of the Citadel, the Īwān, was the reception hall for ambassadors and even when comparatively neglected, was still used on diplomatic occasions.

Coming back to the Citadel as residence of rulers, its buildings, people and ceremonials were supposed to represent the Mamluk state. It is therefore important to evaluate the evolution that occurred between the Bahri and the Circassian periods in dealing with court ceremonials, which seem to have become less formal toward the end of the Mamluk period as the ceremonial shift from the Īwān to the Ḥawṣ seems to indicate. Whereas al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s dynasty held tribunal at the Citadel under a gigantic dome carried by ancient Egyptian columns, the building itself of pharaonic scale, the late sultans had their throne in the courtyard of what used to be al-Nāṣir’s Harem complex. Interestingly, although the Īwān and the Qaṣr were abandoned immediately after the Ottoman conquest, later descriptions continued to refer to the Citadel’s glory by mentioning the Īwān and the Qaṣr. The Ḥawṣ complex, which suffered less under Selim’s conquest and even continued to be used by the Ottoman pashas, being restored and embellished on several occasions, did not much attract the attention of the visitors and is vaguely described, if at all, for its decorations. Obviously, its structures were not as overwhelming as were the grandiose Īwān and Qaṣr.

The question to be raised is how far the change of taste between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, best illustrated by the difference in scale and style between the mosque of Sultan Ḥasan and the mosque of Sultan Qāyṭbāy, or between the Īwān and the Ḥawṣ, reflects a change in the self-image of Mamluk sultans.

Ibn Taḡribirdī noticed such changes with dismay. He might have been exaggerating when he blamed the sultans of his century for having neglected the rules, the protocol and the discipline established by their Bahri predecessors who, moreover, were challenged by wars they won gloriously, while the Circassians had been spared the hardship of serious wars ²⁰⁶. Ibn Taḡribirdī, like Maqrīzī, tends to mourn the past and registers the omissions at the court rather than the additions. Had he lived under al-Ġūrī, he might have been less bitter, but only, however, until the Ottoman conquest. Despite the « fourteen ambassadors » waiting at al-Ġūrī’s doors, Cairo at that time was no more the center of the Muslim world, nor the refuge for eastern and western Muslims. Its

206. Ibn Taḡribirdī, *Nuḡūm*, VII, p. 328; *Ḥawādiṭ*, p. 117 f.

sultans, despite the Caliphate and their monopoly on the dispatch of the Ka'ba cloth, could no longer play the role of guardians of Islam, themselves hopelessly squeezed between the increasing powers of the Ottomans and Safawids, their trade income endangered by European seafaring nations. The centers of power and glamor were gradually shifting to Istanbul, Isfahan, and Delhi. The late Mamluks were even further on the defensive, trying to preserve their heritage. The self-confidence and ambitions of the Bahri sultans, their aim to impress, were not shared by the later sultans. Therefore, the Īwān at the end of the fifteenth century was already a monument of the past. It was sometimes used and sometimes restored, but its use had become archaic and alien to the needs of the late Circassian sultans who preferred the charming parks with pools of the Ḥawš and Hippodrome with their aromatic trees and birds to the overwhelming Pharaonic colonnades of the Īwān.

VIII. — NOTES ON THE ARCHITECTURE

1. General features.

The buildings of the Citadel have often been described by European travellers, whose descriptions leave no doubt that the decorations of the sultanic palaces were done in a style conforming to that of contemporary religious architecture. As for the architecture itself, comparison and parallels with extant buildings is more difficult. Mamluk residences in Cairo are not sufficient, either in number or in quality of preservation, to allow a fair reconstruction of contemporary sultanic palaces. Some features, however, like the *qā'a* plan, still convey an idea of how a reception hall looked. The Qaṣr was built on this plan : two unequal *īwāns* facing each other across a central space, above which they both are slightly raised. An *īwān* is a room made of three walls, open on the forth side. The larger of the two *īwāns* was often north-oriented, and so it was also at the Qaṣr. Unlike the central space or *dūrqā'a* in extant residential (and religious) architecture, which is generally surmounted by a wooden octagonal lantern, the *dūrqā'a* of the Qaṣr was covered by a high dome supported by columns.

The imperial character of the Citadel, together with the security requirements of the sultan and his entourage, dictated additional features that differed from the city's architecture. Historians and eyewitnesses mention a long series of vestibules with individual gates which a visitor had to pass through before being admitted into the ceremonial hall, as was common already in the Fatimid and Abbasid palaces. They accentuated the inaccessibility of the Sultan and protected him at the same time.

Travellers mention vaulted passages, which might be the gigantic structures that survive today underneath the Mosque of Muḥammad 'Alī.

Rather different from earlier palaces of the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphs, the buildings here were not planned symmetrically around the courtyard. Similar to surviving Cairene palaces of the Mamluk and Ottoman periods, each structure was built individually with its center the *qā'a*, flanked by smaller private rooms. The units adjoined each other along the open spaces. Several courtyards and gardens belonged to the complex.

A. The Panorama.

The residences of the Citadel, as most of the travellers say, did not have the character of a fortification, but were rather belvederes, displaying on all sides a panoramic view of the city. The large gilded grills of the Qaṣr, the view over Imām Šāfi'ī cemetery from the Harem and Ḥawš complex, are often referred to. The sultans surveyed the city at all times of the day : the panorama of Cairo was a characteristic feature of the Citadel's extrovert architecture. The so-called Inner Palaces, which adjoined the Qaṣr, were built on three terrace levels with belvederes and loggias commanding the view. A tale of the 1001 Nights called « The two lives of Sultan Maḥmūd » describes a depressed sultan sitting in a room with windows oriented to the four cardinal points and overlooking Cairo and its hinterland. Not only tales, but historic accounts, testify to the role of the Citadel's windows. Sultan Ša'bān for example, was one day sitting at the window of the Qaṣr, when he saw a white tent on the Nile shore at Rawḍa. Investigations revealed that two of his highest officials were enjoying themselves under this tent, drinking wine and listening to musicians²⁰⁷. The window at the Qaṣr allowed the sultan to review military parades at the Stables²⁰⁸ or watch the *Maḥmal* tournaments, as did al-Ġūrī²⁰⁹. Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad watched from there the popular celebrations and shows performed in his honor after his recovery from a serious illness²¹⁰.

The superlative proportions of Sultan Ḥasan's mosque and its projected plan with four minarets can be essentially explained by its location, entirely exposed to royal eyes behind the windows of the Qaṣr. The Qaṣr itself projected from the rocky hill, a feature which accentuated its attributes as a belvedere. The panorama over the capital

207. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 384.

208. Ibn Iyās, II (2), p. 195.

209. Ibn Iyās, IV, p. 411.

210. S. Kortantamer, *Ägypten und Syrien*

zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaḍḍal b. Abi l-Faḍā'il, Freiburg 1973, p. 102 (Arabic text).

contributed to the sultan's sense of power and control over his subjects, as well as providing additional security.

B. The *šubbāk*.

The function of windows at the Citadel was not only connected to panoramic views; they are also referred to in a ceremonial context. The term used in this context, *šubbāk*, which means grilled window, seems to be used also to designate a loggia. The vizirs' palace, called *Qā'at al-Wuzarā'* or *Qā'at al-Šāhib*, had a *šubbāk* for the vizirs of the Bahri period where they sat to attend to their official functions²¹¹. Also, *Dār al-Niyāba* had a similar structure where the *nā'ib al-salṭana* sat for his official functions²¹². This function of the *šubbāk* recalls Fatimid tradition, when the Caliph made his appearance at a window or in a loggia. At Baghdad also, a similar window existed, and it seems that both were inspired by a Byzantine prototype²¹³. The Qaṣr, in addition to the windows overlooking the panorama of Cairo, also had a *šubbāk* where the Sultan sat in his function as judge²¹⁴. Similarly, Sultan Qāyṭbāy, Sultan al-Ġūrī, and Ḥayrbak as governor under the Ottomans, sat at the *šubbāk* of the Duhayša or that of the Ašrafiyya overlooking the Ḥawš to review their Mamluks or hold tribunal²¹⁵.

C. The domes.

The most characteristic architectural feature of the Citadel was its multitude of domes. Almost all *qā'a*(s) were domed, so that Čelebī, when describing *Dīwān al-Ġūrī*, explicitly adds that its roof was not domed. This feature is of particular interest, especially since extant residential architecture within the city presents no parallel. The domes of the city are either religious or funerary but no dome survives in residential architecture²¹⁶. *Waqf* documents, however, often refer to domed areas in palaces used as bedrooms, sometimes inlaid with coloured glass. It is thus likely that residential domes differed in style from mausoleum domes. The Bayṣariyya for example had a golden dome. We already notice a difference of architecture between domes like the *Rifā'ī* dome and the *Fadāwiyya*, which were not funerary, and contemporary mausoleum domes²¹⁷.

211. Ibn Iyās, I (2), p. 114, 147.

212. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 214.

213. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 439; Canard, p. 361.

214. Zāhirī, p. 87.

215. Ibn Iyās, III, p. 229, 440; IV, p. 310, 312, 314, 316; V, p. 429.

216 There is also the dome at the *ḥammām* of Sultan al-Mu'ayyad.

217. Behrens-Abouseif, « Four domes of the late Mamluk period », *Annales islamologiques*, XVII (1981), p. 191 ff.

As mentioned above, al-Zāhir Baybars built several domed structures, Qalāwūn built a dome ²¹⁸, al-Nāṣir's Īwān and Qaṣr were both domed, Qā'at al-Buḥra, the Bayṣariyya as well as the Aṣrafiyya (of al-Aṣraf Ḥalīl), and the hall built by Ġanbalāṭ are all mentioned as domed structures.

It also seems that the hall of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ at Rawḍa was surmounted by a dome carried on columns which stood at the four corners of the central space ²¹⁹.

D. Decoration.

Judging by the descriptions of the Citadel, we may assume that the decorative devices used in its architecture were the same as those used in urban religious or secular architecture : marble floors and dados, wooden inscriptions gilded and painted, carvings and mosaics, stalactites on portals and bases of domes. The recently excavated *qā'a* in the area of the Qaṣr complex shows traces of marble dado as well as remains of mosaics representing buildings and trees. Mosaics of stone and glass were used in Ayyubid and Mamluk prayer niches, with floral patterns. Architectural representations, however, for which the Umayyad mosque of Damascus is famous, has no parallel in Mamluk Cairo.

An important element of palace decoration frequently referred to in historic sources, but for which no example survives, is mural painting. Imperial residential architecture was traditionally adorned with mural paintings representing human figures and even portraits.

The palaces of Ḥumārawayh were decorated with painted wood carvings representing him with his concubines and female singers, with jewelry and clothes faithfully depicted ²²⁰. From the Fatimid period we know that the Caliph al-Āmir (1103-1130) had portraits of poets painted at his belvedere at Qal'at al-Kabš ²²¹. The Fatimid vizir Yāzūrī arranged a competition between two painters who were challenged to show a dancer : one showing her entering into a niche in the wall, the other, her coming out from it. The representations were so realistic that they conveyed the illusion of real women in movement, in other words, the *trompe-l'œil* effect ²²².

Sultan al-Zāhir Baybars had portraits of his amirs in military attire depicted on the walls of one of his palaces ²²³. This was celebrated by the poet Qāḍī Muḥyi al-Dīn,

218. Casanova, p. 613 f.; Maqrizi, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 212.

219. Creswell, *M.A.E.* II, p. 84.

220. Maqrizi, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 316.

221. Maqrizi, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 486.

222. Maqrizi, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 318.

223. Ibn Taḡribirdi, *Nuḡūm*, VII, p. 190.

who praised the sultan because, unlike other kings, he did not have himself depicted in a pleasure scene of wine and music but, instead, in his function as warrior ²²⁴. Qalāwūn had landscapes with cities and fortresses of his empire represented on the walls of a dome ²²⁵. Al-Ašraf Ḥalīl, similarly, had the *raḡraḡ* adorned with the portraits of his amirs ²²⁶.

2. The Buildings.

A. The mosque.

The mosque is built on a hypostyle plan with a large dome covered with green tiles above the prayer niche, crowning the *maqṣūra*, or central area of the sanctuary which was secluded by an iron grill, exclusive to the Sultan and his closest associates ²²⁷.

With three entrances leading to the interior, one of each side except the southeastern, the mosque was free-standing. An entrance faced the Bāb al-Qulla which led to the barracks and various princely administrative palaces, another axial entrance faced the Īwān and Qaṣr and a third entrance (today blocked) located on the southwestern wall, must have been added by the Sultan for access from private apartments.

The two asymmetrically located and faience decorated minarets, one at the northeastern corner facing the barracks, and the other at the axial entrance one facing the Īwān, point to both audiences for whom the call to prayer was broadcasted. Both minarets have no extant parallel in Cairo, either in shape or decoration.

The architecture of this mosque differs from that of contemporary urban mosques in its remarkably plain façades that give it a rather military character, stressed by the crenellation of the outer walls imitating those of fortifications, composed of rectangular panels with semicircular tops. No recesses with stalactites, double windows with engaged columns, bull's eyes nor inscriptions bands can be seen on the façades which look absolutely unconventional compared, for example, to that of Qalāwūn's *madrasa* and mausoleum or other contemporary monuments.

Unlike the religious foundations within the city, no sultan's mausoleum was ever attached to the Citadel mosque.

224. Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, p. 247.

226. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 213.

225. Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, cit. by Casanova,
p. 613 f.

227. 'Umārī, p. 41, 81.

B. The Qaṣr.

The Qaṣr, according to Maqrīzī, had a *qā'a* plan and a large dome. The *qā'a* plan (*qā'a* = reception hall) consisted of two slightly elevated *iwān*(s) facing each other across the *dūr qā'a*, surmounted by the dome. The northern *iwān*, as usual, was the larger one. Both de Maillet and Jomard describe the Qaṣr as having a dome carried by twelve granite columns. The *qā'a*(s) we know from Mamluk and Ottoman palaces and also mosques, did not carry on this combination of two *iwān*(s) and a dome; they are surmounted instead by a wooden lantern. A nineteenth-century illustration reproduced by Creswell shows part of a roofless *qā'a* at the Qaṣr²²⁸. Six columns, which must be Ancient Egyptian, can be seen flanking both sides of the central visible part. The palace of Sultan al-Šāliḥ Nağm al-Dīn Ayyūb on the island of Rawḍa was composed of a cruciform *qā'a* which had three columns at each of the four corners of its central area, making twelve, whose function obviously was to support a dome. The Qaṣr differs in having only two *iwān*(s). De Maillet further describes the Qaṣr as projecting from the rock on gigantic corbels, some of which can still be seen today. Unlike the *Īwān*, it was an extroverted hall with a panoramic view on all Cairo.

C. The Īwān..

The *Īwān* of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was a most extraordinary building for which no parallel is known. As nothing of pre-Mamluk imperial residential architecture survives, the origin of its architecture can only be speculative.

Zāhirī writes that the *Īwān* was free standing, separated from the Qaṣr, and that it was surmounted by a high beautiful green dome resting on marble columns where the throne stood.

The *Īwān* faced an esplanade that reached from Bāb al-Qarāfa to the east and Bāb al-Mudarrağ to the west.

A vestibule for the Mamluks included the main gate into the royal quarter and the mosque. It was a place where the Mamluks waited before entering the *Īwān* for the review. Next to the entrance of the *Īwān* was that of the Qaṣr with its own vestibule. The sultan had direct access to the Qaṣr from the *Īwān*. The royal stores of the Qaṣr were nearby²²⁹.

228. Creswell, *M.A.E.* II, p. 264. — 229. Zāhirī, p. 86.

The unusual architecture of the Īwān almost misled Jomard in the D.E. to identify it as a former church converted into a mosque²³⁰. He, however, refuted this possibility upon finding the Īwān Mecca-oriented and with a niche in its axis. On the Citadel map of the D.E. is it easy to recognize, however, that the Īwān did not have the same orientation as the nearby mosque. The prayer niche wall faces southeast, whereas the domed area of the Īwān faces south, confirming de Maillet's observation that the Īwān faced north. The *Description de l'Égypte* fortunately includes plans, elevations and illustrations of this Īwān conveying a fairly clear view of its architecture.

It had a basilical plan with only one solid wall, the rest being carried by columns supporting pointed arches. Three aisles run perpendicular to the wall, the central aisle being larger than the lateral ones. This central aisle was two-thirds surmounted by a dome covering the space of four-by-four bays. Corresponding to the inner aisle composition, the façade was itself composed of five pointed arches. A central triple arch lead into the central domed aisle, the arch in the middle being almost double the size of the side ones. Two more arches on each side led to the lateral aisles. The result was that the building presented itself on three sides with arcaded façades. The illustration in the D.E. shows that it was open on the main northern façade, and it is possible that the side façades had the same device. In this case, the Īwān would have been open on three sides like a huge kiosk. Brancacci described the Īwān as open on the sides, with nets hung from top to bottom of the arcades²³¹. The symmetry of the plan depicted seems to confirm this. One side, however, the eastern, seems to have been protected by an outer wall, forming a passage between it and the colonnades. The walls carried by the arcades were pierced by two rows of superimposed arched openings for light and release of thrust, as at the Citadel mosque of al-Nāṣir which has one row of windows.

The back wall, the only solid non-arcated wall is shown on the plan as pierced by five openings, two leading into the lateral aisles and three into the domed area. The central opening is set within a recess which probably is the niche mentioned by Jomard and marks the axis of the building. These openings are connected to an oblong hall that flanks the Īwān to the south and which itself included several entrances, among them an entrance leading into a domed area.

The basilical plan had been applied already in Cairene architecture, at the *madrassa* of Sultan Qalāwūn which, however, has no dome.

230. The Venetian Brancacci, *op. cit.*, has also compared the architecture of the Īwān with that of a church.

231. See above.

Looking for a parallel to the *Īwān* architecture, the only halls with tripartite composition having a dome over a central larger aisle that opens into a façade through a triple arch, the middle one being larger than two side ones, are in Fatimid *mašhad* or shrine architecture, at the *mašhad(s)* of al-Ġuyūšī (478/1085) and Sayyida Ruqayya (527/1133)²³². The main difference, apart from the scale, is that these buildings are not carried by columns but by solid walls and piers, and that they are not open on the sides, their only opening being a triple-arched entrance facing a courtyard. The triple arch or triple entrance had a long tradition in ceremonial architecture. The hippodrome of Ibn Ṭūlūn had such a triple gate, the larger and central one for Ibn Ṭūlūn himself²³³.

At the shrine of Yaḥyā al-Šabīh the domed area is open on four sides, thus giving space to an ambulatory around the dome²³⁴. If we include the passage behind the dome of the *Īwān*, the parallel can be extended also to this *mašhad*.

It is not easy to explain the connection between Fatimid shrine architecture and the *Īwān* of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. A multitude of palaces have disappeared which might have offered such explanations. Judging from extant buildings of the Fatimid period, it seems that the shrine plan was not adopted in mosque architecture, and therefore, it could have had secular origins. Also, the Caliphs placed their thrones under domes, which must have then formed the architectural focus of the hall. Between the Fatimid shrine and the *Īwān*, however, there is a parallel in function : in the shrine, the dome included the cenotaph, a symbol of a venerated person. In the *Īwān*, the dome included the throne of the sultan. This focus differs from the mosques' prayer niche, usually also surmounted by a dome. The prayer niche inhaces the Mecca orientation but does not form the functional focus of the building : the worshipper does not have to pass in front of it. At the shrine, however, the worshipper or pilgrim aims at seeing the cenotaph. The sultan on his throne was similarly supposed to be seen by everybody present. Brancacci wrote that he could be seen from everywhere in the *Īwān*, sitting as he was on a stepped elevated platform. Of course at the *Īwān*, unlike the shrine,




Fig. 11. The sanctuary of *mašhad* al-Ġuyūšī (478/1085)

232. Creswell, *M.A.E.* I, p. 155 ff., 247 ff. — 233. Maqrīzī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 315. — 234. Creswell, *M.A.E.* I, p. 264 ff.

the sultan is the active subject, not the passive object, of the ceremony. As at the *maqṣūra* of the mosque, the sultan must have entered from the wall side, which had three entrances. He sat first facing the entrance where the visitors were admitted. *Ḥalaqa dā'ira*, or circle, is the term applied in medieval literature for the arrangement of Mamluks around the sultan²³⁵. The sultan during the *ḥidma* sat surrounded by his counsellors in this *ḥalaqa*. He sat in the *ṣadr*, the front, of the circle and could be seen from all sides. To his right and left the council, consisting of administrative and juridical notables and the elder amirs, and behind them the *ḥuḡḡāb* and *dawādāriyya*, stood to usher in the visitors. There were also amirs standing along the hall. On parade days, thousands of soldiers passed in front of him. The free-standing position of the *Īwān*, facing a large esplanade and being, as it seems, open on three sides, was an adequate adaptation to its function as the culmination of a parade. The *mawḳib* of the Bahri Mamluks, starting below the Citadel before ascending to the sultan for the review, could proceed easily through the colonades. The *Qaṣr*, where the sultan performed fewer public functions, did not necessitate such an arrangement and was accordingly less open, though it had a *ḥirḡāh* for the parades. This was most likely a loggia where the sultan could review the Mamluks parading at the Stables or in the Hippodrome. Such ceremonies occupied a full day and the kitchen of the Citadel was in charge of providing food for all those involved in the ceremony, including the bureaucrat, among whom were at one time al-'Umarī and Maqrizī²³⁶.

C. The Stables.

The Stables occupied a prestigious place in Mamluk residential architecture. The palace of Qūṣūn which was dedicated to the *atābak* in the Bahri Mamluk period was called *Iṣṭabl Qūṣūn*, because of the importance of its stables which faced the royal Stables of the Citadel²³⁷.

Stables usually had a loggia for the master to sit in while watching the horses or showing them to visitors²³⁸. Extant *maq'ad(s)* all date from the Circassian and Ottoman periods. A *Waqf* document of the Bahri Mamluk period, however, mentions loggias even in stables of small houses, but does not call them *maq'ad*. Such loggias could have been the origin of the *maq'ad* that became an integral part of the courtyard in residential architecture, even on the common level. Originally a structure attached to the stables,

235. 'Umarī, p. 36. — 236. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 225. — 237. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 72.

238. Maqrizī, *Ḥiṭaṭ*, II, p. 75.

it later became part of the courtyard connected to the stables, to finally evolve as a characteristic feature of the courtyard in general. Important residences had more than a *maq'ad*.

In the Citadel or aristocratic context, the *maq'ad* is equivalent to a loggia, like the *šubbāk*, the *hirğāh* or the *manžara*, a place for the sultan or amir to sit and watch a performance from an elevated level.

As in urban residential architecture, where the stables were located in a courtyard leading from the street into the residence proper, the Stables, which also happened to be one of the sultan's most precious treasures, formed a vestibule leading into the Citadel and thus, played a ceremonial function as well. Including a menagerie and falconry, the Stables of the sultan, like those of the amirs, were also equivalent to a park ²³⁹.

239. Cf. Félix Fabri, *Le Voyage en Égypte, 1483*; Cairo 1975, p. 408.