

A CRITICAL STUDY ON THE MAMLUK LITERARY LEGACY, WAS IT REALLY AN ERA OF LITERARY DECADENCE?

A. Lamei-Giv

Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Department of Persian language and Literature,
University of Birjand, Birjand, Iran.

ABSTRACT

In the literary history of the Arabs, the seven centuries before the contemporary world (Hadith Age) are the birthplace for the emergence of two great administrations, i.e. Mamluk and Ottoman Sultanates. These two states were completely different in terms of political, social and scientific domains. Mamluks ruled over Arab territories whereas Ottoman sultans founded their government in a Non-Arab land. Arabic language like other areas has gone through undeniable ups and downs under these governments. The research studies show that while some contemporaries regard this period “the age of decadence”, there are many other historians, researchers and critics who insist on calling this period “the age of salvation” and they preserve “decadence” for Ottoman period. This mislabeling goes back to biased orientalists who initially suggested this term which was later adapted by some writers. This paper attempts to compare these two governments by means of a historical analytic method and after outlining the views of advocates and opponents about the prevalent conditions of that period, examines how that labeling is questionable. The paper also examines the role and contribution of each of these governments in the emergence of this condition and brings it to an end by tracing the coinage of “decadence” and its use in history.

Keywords: Criticism, Mamluk and Ottoman Periods, Decadence, Historians, Islamic Civilization

Introduction

The emergence of Mamluks in Islamic societies dates back to Abbasid Dynasty when al-Ma'mun (825 AD) started employing Turk slaves (Mamluk) in his army. Ayyubids also relied on the assistance of Mamluks before the establishment of their government in Egypt. (Ibn Taghrī Birdī, 1939:256/4). Gradually, these former Mamluks took over and formed their own administration called Bahri (1250-1382 AD) and Burji (1382-1517 AD) in Egypt, Syria and Hejaz, which lasted about three hundred years.

Ottoman Empire was founded about 1200 AD on the ruins of Seljuk Sultanate and after nearly thirty years it managed to survive as a borderless, unstable and on the verge of collapse “Emirate”. In 1366 AD, this newly founded Emirate gained more stability because it managed to conquer parts of the Europe and gradually became a country with Edirne as its capital city. The conquest of

Constantinople by Mehmed II, the 7th Ottoman Sultan in 1453 AD started a new era, the formation of Ottoman Empire, and the decline of Byzantine and Mamluks reigns.

In 1517 AD, Qansuh al-Ghawri, the second-to-last of the Mamluk Sultans in an attempt to act as a mediator between Selim I, the 9th Ottoman Sultan and Shāh Ismā'īl, the founder of the Safavid dynasty travelled from Cairo to Aleppo. It seems that his real intention has been to support his Iranian ally with whom he had secretly signed a treaty against Turks (Sheikh Amin, 2005, PP. 41-2). When Sultan Selim learned about this conspiracy against him, a bloody war broke out between the two, as a result of which Syria and Egypt were conquered and Turks gradually overtook other Arab territories, and started a three-century Caliphate in the Arab world which lasted up to 1798 AD i.e. before the invasion of Egypt by Napoleon.

The significance of this study originates from the fact that Mamluk and Ottoman eras

were intertwined with painful social and political tensions, conditions which loomed over the history, culture and particularly literary heritage of that period, giving it a unique and complicated essence.

One of the motives which caused the author of this paper to study the present subject concerns the fact that Mamluks and Ottoman literary achievements have not been properly examined by researchers, a careful examination of which could unravel and demystify many of the enigmas and perplexities wrapped around these two eras. Most of the literary legacy of these two eras relate to manuscripts found in the libraries of diverse Arab, Islamic or European countries. It seems that what has been studied from this huge and rich legacy does not exceed the few works of several poets and writers, and most of them have been overlooked. That is why the author of this paper made up his mind to unveil some of the literary achievements of those eras and expose the hidden aspects of political and cultural dimensions, hoping to shed light on the dark aspects and reveal the realities to many interested researchers and academicians, an insight which would help them avoid many biased and wrong judgments they have formed about these periods.

It needs to be noted that the scarcity of literary researches on the Mamluk and Ottoman Eras compared with the deluge of views expressed by prejudiced historians is one of the obstacles on the way of researchers. It will not be unfair if we claim that no other literary period has been so unfairly wronged and overlooked by literary critics and researchers as have the works of these two periods.

The literary conditions of these two eras, whatever they may be, cannot be disregarded or sank into oblivion, because they are a part of our history and a part of our intellectual, and even social evolution. For sure, our present life is deeply rooted in life in these two periods. It can be said with a high degree of certainty that a 6-century

long period which has been wrongly described as “literary decadence”, has had a more lasting and deeper effect than the Islamic or Arabic periods on the different intellectual or cultural areas of literary movement. Anyway, this research aims to firstly study and elaborate on the writers and critics’ views about the scientific, political and literary conditions of these two periods and secondly answer this basic question whether Mamluk Era really deserves the title of “literary decadence”? If we accept the assumption of “literary decadence”, what are the shares and roles of each the two dynasties in it? And finally, who has coined the term “decadence” and how it has entered the Arab literature?

Review of Related literature

The present research was impossible to realize were it not for the extensive research conducted by the author. As a tribute to the works done by our predecessors, it is necessary to briefly describe few of the prominent works done on the subject of this study:

- 1- Kīlānī, Muḥammad Sayyid, in his book entitled “al-Adab al-Miṣrī fi zillal-ḥukmal-Uthmānī or The Arabic Literature Under the Rule of Ottoman Empire” is one of the pioneer writers who has compiled a booklet on the defense of Ottoman literary in which he examines the poetry and prose of that era, though an auspicious start in its own, it is far from a satisfactory source to quench the thirst of eager researchers.
- 2- Basha, Omar Musa, in his book called “al-Adab al-Arabi fi Asr al-Uthmani or Arabic Literature in Ottoman Period” gives a detailed account of Syrian poets at that period though briefly mentions few of Egyptian poets as well.
- 3- Basha, Omar Musa has another book entitled “Tarikh al-Adab al-Arabi (al-Asr al-Mamluki) or the literary History of Arabic Language during Mamluk

Dynasty” in which he not only introduces the celebrated authors of this period, but also describes the intellectual and socio-political conditions of this time. He maintains that Mamluki Era is one of the most significant ages in literary history, yet most researchers and orientalist have overlooked it and have wrongly labelled it “Mongol Era” and “Decadence Era”.

- 4- Burus al-Bustānī in his book called “al-Odabo al-Arab fi al-AndalusvaAsr al-Anba’ath” talks about the famous literary men since Jaheliat Era “Ignorance Age” up to Hadith Age. He does not differentiate between Mamluk and Ottoman Periods and holds that both are “decadent”, though he implicitly points to the superiority of Mamluk achievements in this regard. A criticism that can be levelled at the author is that though he embarks on the description of the literary circumstances of that period, he fails to cite any poem or prose samples. However, his views about the cultural conditions of the time have been extensively used in this study.

The Comparison of Mamluk and Ottoman Periods

The contemporary Arab intellectuals maintain that the seven century long period before the contemporary movement (Hadith Era) in all its aspects and activities was nothing more than “decadence” and the Arab and Islamic Societies of that long period were deprived of any significant achievement or innovation they have had before or after that period. These modern scholars do not differentiate between the various centuries or the conditions of the people living under different non-Arab rulers.

These centuries consist of two different administrations which were completely different, one Mamluk Dynasty (1249-1517 AD) and the other Ottoman Sultanate (1517-1918), the only commonality between the

two concerned their rulers, but their differences are as follows:

- 1- Mamluk rulers established their government in an Arab territory whereas Ottoman Sultans founded their reign in a non-Arab land and it was after 1517 AD that major and significant parts of Arab lands and parts of Europe were annexed to it.
- 2- Mamluk rulers put an emphasis on the Arab nationalism in the management of their affairs. If we exclude the military and political spheres of this period, we notice that in all other areas such as education, judiciary, administration, tax collection, finance and accounting system and in many other issues even the court ceremonies, there was a strong sense of Arabism. However, the Ottoman rulers relied heavily on Turkish cultural values and they gradually tried to replace Arabic values and customs in the Arab territories under their governance.
- 3- The official language of Mamluk rulers was Arabic and they used it as a means of communication for all affairs including administration, judiciary etc... These rulers founded numerous schools and generously supported them. They also protected scholars and greatly contributed to the promotion of Arabic language and literature in that period, but the Ottoman sultans established the Turkish language as the official language of their administration and they planned to replace Arabic with Turkish, they made the teaching of Turkish language mandatory in all the schools of Arab territories.

“One of the major impacts of this anti-Arabic policy on the literature, literary activists and pen men was that they lost their connection link, their minds became quiescent and inactive and the ink dried in their ink bottles, they lost the ability to self express and they declined and consequently plagiarism became the common practice of

the day. The literary men of this period felt handicapped in literary arts such as rhetoric and figures of speech, an art which requires mastery of diction and the possession of a rich vocabulary, both of which was missing in them” Rekabi, 2006 P. 145

As was pointed above, these two governments were quite different in terms of their time, characteristics and features. Though some scholars have had no malevolence or pre-determined purpose in resembling these two governances, what has been overlooked here concerns the fact that the scientific movement that developed during Ottoman reign, was in need of scientific tools and bases, and that is why it did not continue. They wanted to reinvent the wheel by establishing a new kind of movement based on their own culture and civilization, an attempt which history is an eyewitness for its total failure.

“Selim I stayed for eight months in Egypt, his soldierstreated the conquered Egyptians with the utmost cruelty, they confiscated people’s goods and grabbed whatever ancient riches and antiques they could lay their hands on, they destroyed mosques and monuments in order to plunder their artistic treasures to be sent to Constantinople. The invaders took captive the Egyptians’ chiefs, artists and craftsmen and with tied hands and shackled feet in a disgracing manner boarded them on ships to be taken to Constantinople” (Anan, 1969, PP 219-220).IbnAyyas who himself had been an eye-witness to these events dedicates a special chapter in his history book to the names of persons exiled to Constantinople.he ends his book by an elegy for the Mamluk Rulers which reads:

Sing mournful songs for the people of Egypt and the suffering they have gone through

(IbnAyyas 1961. PP 232/5-229)

He immortalizes the above in the following poem:

My heart bleeds over the broken doors and destroyed houses (by Ottoman army)

My heart weeps blood for the Mosque of Sheikho and the worshipers massacred therein

The Turks demolished all the Egypt’s symbols of beauty which they prided themselves on

My heart is full of sorrow for that caliphate who was unjustly banished from his homeland

My heart is also painful for the nightly deportation of the caliphate’s nephews and relatives

My tears are for the children of the Emirs and chieftains who were treated with disgrace

The Ottoman ruler mistreated the heads of state and other dignitaries, my heart is sorrowful for them

(IbnAyyas, 1961. PP 198-201/5)

In order to describe the features of any administration and discuss its similarities and differences with its counterparts, we need an exact and unbiased research. If this question is answered, it will become clear which dynasty should be blamed for the scientific and literary decline of Arab countries at its time.

At first, we do not intend to study the condition of non-Arab lands under the rule of Ottoman Sultans, because it is not of our concern here and it requires its own methodology. What is of interest for us here relates to those Arab territories which were under the Mamluk control, so we can compare them under both reigns. This is done in order to challenge the views of many Turkish researchers who consider the start of the Ottoman Empire as the beginning of Turkish Movement and the emergence of art and literature.

Views of historians and literary men about the Mamluk's scientific and literary conditions

There is a consensus among all historians doing research about Mamluk period that "in that period, the Islamic Arab civilization neither weakened nor declined, but rather it became more brilliant, pragmatic and full of different branches of science and art" (Sabbagh, 1983. P. 7). Concerning the prevalence of Arabic language at this period, Burus al-Bustānī says: "During the rule of Mamluks, Arabic language did not decline as it did during Ottoman Empire, because though Mamluk rulers were uneducated military men, yet they needed Arabic to manage their government, therefore, they had many schools founded in Syria and Egypt and they took the scholars under their wings to manage their bureaucratic affairs and write books for them" (1979. PP. 210-211/3).

Bustani further adds "the scientific movement during Mamluk reign was remarkable, a movement which was triggered by an increase in the number of schools, the arrival of scholars to Egypt and the kings' encouraging the authors to compile and collect books" (1979, PP. 219-3). He then gives a long list of books and authors active in the fields such as lexicography, history, geography, sociology and encyclopedia (1979: PP. 220-223).

But Mohammad Maher Hamadeh, who has extensively investigated the administrative and political documents of Mamluk period, maintains that this period "was a period of salvation in its real sense" (1980: 15). He believes that it was Mamluks who saved Islamic civilization from complete destruction by Mongols and saved Syria and Egypt from complete annihilation by Mongol Army. Mamluks managed to stand against this invasion and confined it in few islands. They also put an end to "Crusaders' rules in Syria, revived Islamic State and made Cairo their capital" (Hamadeh, 1980: P. 15). Jundi regards the culture and

ideology of Mamluks as their strong point and holds that "the significance of this period materializes in the efforts made for the collection of compilations and sciences of that period. It was during this period that encyclopedias emerged, and collections of books on literature, theology, and sociology became available. This movement was in fact a reaction against the invasion of Crusaders and Tatars who wished to erase Islamic traces. Islamic scholars tried to save the legacy of their predecessors by recording and collecting their works, and this can be attributed to the strength not the weakness of the ruling regime, even though masterpiece artistic or remarkable researches are few among these collected works.

Some authors are of the opinion that there was no innovative poet at Mamluk Era (Zeydan: 1957: P. 22-3). Mohammad Feghi maintains that the poetry of this period revolved mostly around issues such as love and youth, humor, riddles, and letter writing, subjects which the poets of these two territories were fond of. He regards these genres as a valuable legacy of that period" (1976: PP. 129-131).

Another researcher holds that "Mamluki era was the end to an already majestic and magnificent era which had been established by different Islamic states in Egypt in the past" (Ananni, 1969: P. 191). And Rekabi says: "there is no doubt that the role of Mamluks was outstanding and significant in few cases, cases which have no counterparts in Ottoman periods" (2006: P. 125). Perhaps the last argument in the contemporary world is the finding of this research which presents a lengthy account of the scientific and literary endeavors at this period.

The output of this movement may surpass many of its predecessors, a movement which was unique in terms of the efforts made for the collection, description, and annotation of the books of the great men of letters, although one may turn a blind eye to the insignificant level of innovation or invention in these works.

The scholars of that time were of the opinion that sciences and knowledge have become perfect and terms are disambiguated and purified, arts and crafts are organized and infinitely advanced. Every art or craft had celebrated individuals who were regarded as the sole authority of that field. (IbnKhaldun, 2003: P. 373). This exaggerated view about the predecessors' knowledge can be attributed to the deeply-rooted confidence of the contemporaries who feel indebted to the achievements of their ancestors. They regarded them as the pinnacles that no one else has managed to conquer. This attitude may be the origin of immunity against criticism for many of these scholars.

What was offered above was an image of Mamluk Era found in the fair contemporary researchers works, now let us see what they think about Ottoman Period.

Ottoman Period

Before dealing with the views of contemporary authors, let us see what earlier historians have told about them. IbnAyyas refers to the crimes committed by Ottoman army during the occupation of Egypt and Syria and how they plundered and removed the Islamic civilization items in order to achieve these two objectives:

- 1- To deprive Egypt of her political, intellectual and artistic dignitaries in order to smash Egyptian's chauvinism and destroy their spiritual and mental strength.
- 2- To establish an exclusive civilization, a civilization whose pillars are put on material and human forces exported from Syria and Egypt. This meant to extinguish the flame of life, a flame which was fully luminous during Mamluk Era. It was quite clear that they intended to abandon cultural and scientific centers which were abundant and flourishing during that era, and these centers and schools gradually declined and many were closed down. (Halabi, P. 193).

Some researchers regard the end of Mamluk era, the starting point for decadence and declining, a period when Turks ruled over Syria and Egypt (Annan, 1969: P. 191). As was noted earlier, Bustani maintains that "Ottoman rulers were similar to Mamluks in terms of ignorance and brutality. however, after they conquered Constantinople, they became civilized and selected this city as their capital....they turned away from Arabic and apart from few occasions, they made it the official language of the entire Ottoman controlled territories (Bustani, 1979: PP. 211-3).

One of the immediate consequences of this policy was that "Arabic greatly declined, the superiority of rhetoric terminated, the minds of men of letters were shut down and a rusty cover of inactivity and morbidity stretched over them, and these dormant minds were only awakened by the loud noises of Napoleon artillery and the belfries of Lebanon churches (Bustani, 1979: PP. 211-3). Referring to the sufferings the Ottoman rulers posed on the Egyptians, Bustani writes: "Ottoman rulers sowed the seeds of discord among races, because they were afraid of their uprising. They committed numerous crimes and they legalized terror, intimidation and massacre. Many a plots and hatred occurred, the wisdom was imprisoned, pens broken, and individual and social freedom were subdued and repressed, Arabs were humiliated and disputes and differences were common among them. This period was the worst time for them" (1979: PP.212-3). Concerning the scientific movement of Ottoman Empire, he says: "writing and writers were not greatly appreciated, and few passing shining stars who scintillated occasionally here and there and lit the dark nights of this period, were soon hidden by the interconnected curtains of darkness (Bustani, 1979: PP212-213).

Rekabi mentions that "during Ottoman rule, many of the schools were ruined and closed down, Al-Azhar University faced problems, and its students no longer led an easy life as

they did during Mamluk period, so they dropped out and dispersed, superstition became widespread and the moral values collapsed, people found refuge in witchcraft and many books and manuscripts were written on it, corruption and sin and materialism and lust gained popularity” (2006, P. 136).

Now that some points were described, we can say for sure that this period cannot be called decadence in all its aspects. The author is dead sure had it not been for the fragile image of the poetry at this time, the fair and unbiased contemporaries would have had quite a different view for this period. Life was going on in full swing there. When the Ottoman storm started blowing in Arab territories, the people tried to overcome this destructive storm and managed to partially do so.

Poetry criticism as the full mirror reflecting the science and culture

The author does not intend to defend the poetry of this period. This research aims to provide more than an answer to the questions posed about the poetry conditions at that time, but it should be reminded that “a poet is not an emotional hyper-sensitive individual who composes poems in a very nice manner. A poet visualizes the emotions of his audience, and tries to satisfy and excite them. A poem line pleases a listener when it is identical with one’s inner wishes and is in agreement with one’s emotions and beautifully meets one’s needs. Therefore, the poets faced the inner requirements of the people of that time and their emotions and aesthetic views which were quite different from the previous periods, because a poem will not survive if it does not agree with the inner needs of the people, their emotions and their aesthetic views (Heib, P. 11-12).

Today we certainly do not like these poems in terms of their literary features. We said that poetry should be in harmony with our inner needs. We assess it with criteria before and after it, and it will not be fair if we

regard the poets of this period perfect, because their art was overwhelmed by unnecessary circumlocutions and phraseology. However, their contemporaries in other territories insisted on simplicity. This exaggeration made poetry decline more than other branches of thought, though this cannot be applied to all genres. However, the few poems deteriorated were large enough to overshadow few limited poems and make decadence the prevailing characteristic of this period’s poetry.

Can we claim here that poetry reflects all aspects of a given period’s thinking? Many contemporaries are of the opinion that many other aspects of intellectual life have contributed to the removal of decadence from the face of this period.

But many of our great researchers and some of those whose views were cited above have not expressed this characteristic for the Mamluk era and Ottoman era, which was the starting point for the decadence and decline for this civilization. This convergence of opinion popularized this naming among the contemporary erudite, to arrive at a unanimous decision to call it “decadent”.

Bustani was one of the first researchers who differentiated between the thought and culture of Mamluk and Ottoman Eras, but he reserved the term “decadence” for both (1979, PP. 208-213). But Jorge Zeydan coined the new term “Mongol Age” and applied it for Mamluk era, because he believed that the Mongols ruled over many Islamic territories. However, he agrees that the rule over Islamic world was divided between Turks and Mongols. He holds that the rule of Mamluks was confined to Syria and Egypt (Zeydan, 1957: PP 116/3).

Shawqi Daif uses the naming of Zeydan, but maintains that the Mongol rule was during 1258 to 1517 AD and believes that the first and second rule of Mamluks was formed at this time (1977: P132). Perhaps Fathi Jalal can be regarded as more justified when he calls this period “Turkish Period” (84),

because Mamluks were originally Turks. Rekabi can be regarded as more comprehensive in this regard when he calls both eras the age of “decadence”, because in his literary research he frequently applied this term to describe these two periods (2006: PP. 7, 120, 125, 129, 136, 141). It is while he explicitly confesses that Mamluk era was superior to Ottoman period and literary decline was much obvious in Ottoman period (Rekabi, 2006: PP. 7, 8).

Some other researchers reject the relationship of literature with political tensions. One of these researchers writes: “the fact is that cultural movement does not always run parallel with political trajectory. In many occasions politics moves in a declining line whereas literature and culture has an upward movement. The best example for this claim is the 4th period of Abbasids and Mamluks Age. As we study the final days of Abbasids Dynasty, we see just uprising against the central government, and numerous plots, disturbances, tensions and assassins whereas the cultural domain witnesses marvelous and matchless literary achievements (Amin, 2005: P. 57).

But where did this naming come from? Was it the result of deep investigations made by researchers about the traditions and cultural characteristics of that age? Or was it the outcome of prejudice? Or was it due to the time difference and the researchers’ ideological differences?

Why “decadence” was applied to Mamluki era?

It needs to be noted here that the term “decadence” is a newly coined term applied for the first time by some contemporary historians and critics. This term was a French term used to describe the undeveloped conditions of Europe in the final centuries before Roman Age (Basha, 2004: P. 12).

Western researchers have conducted many researches on the literary, scientific, historical and religious achievements of

Mamluk rulers. They are the pioneers in this domain, however, there are some resentful orientalist among them who most probably initiated the use of this term for this period, a naming which was adapted and popularized by Arab researchers. Joston Fitt, a French orientalist writes: “it is not appropriate to be misled by the abundance of religious schools and mosques during Mamluk rule, because it does not have any relationship with innovation and genius, and no great writer or a talented person graduated from them. They were schools where teachers taught lessons there, and apart from Ibn Khaldun’s “Introduction” (1406 AD) which was an exception, the other writers were not that much influential. Even the same Ibn Khaldun who had studied in the west, as he settled in Cairo, did not achieve anything of significance. This period was famous for writers engaged in biography and encyclopedias, but we have to keep in mind that these books do not require a deep and comprehensive thought. There was no work of distinction or originality at that period. These men may have received laudation during their life for their exaggerated life stories, but their names were soon forgotten” (Izz ad-Din, 1987: P.7, 8).

The modern Arab researchers found out about the origin of this mislabeling and pointed the finger at biased researchers in the west who had started investigation on eastern customs and sciences, a misconception which was followed by Jorge Zeydan in his books on Arabic Literature and History of Islam (Jundi, 1085: P.41).

Wiping out this imposed mislabel is possible by hard work and through two methods as below:

The first mechanism should focus on revealing the literary, religious, philosophical, scientific and cultural achievements of that period by means of scientific researches. Moreover, the works of that period should be published in a manner appropriate for Islamic Arab civilization.

The author has embarked on a small section of this project by working on historical aspects of that time, but this should expand to cover all the remaining areas.

The second mechanism concerns the purging of the researchers from any previous bias or prejudice, so that the legacy of that period can be disclosed to the public without any pre-judgment and in a just manner (Sabbagh, 1983: P. 10-11).

It is of utmost importance to remember that calling a particular period in history as “decadent” whatever the cultural circumstance may be, is neither fair nor acceptable. How can a period be called “decadent” while numerous men of letters and scholars have been raised in it? Calling a given period a given name can be justified only if it is based on comprehensive and thorough researches not by taking into account just one of its dimension, namely its poetry.

Conclusion

Mamluk era, as one of the ages of Islamic history was an attempt to revive caliphate by moving it from Baghdad to Cairo. Mamluk rulers drove away Mongols from Syria and put an end to 200-years presence and invasion of crusaders in the east. In the domain of cultural achievement, we have an unprecedented great cultural revolution during this period which had no matches in

the previous centuries. The plethora of intellectuals, great enthusiasm for writing, abundance of scientific centers and revival of intellectual assets, compilation of dictionaries and encyclopedias, are few of the evidences which can defy the wrong labelling of this period. Cultural transformation is not necessarily related to political change and it does not always move parallel with it. therefore, Mamluk era can be called in a true sense of the word the “salvation age” while the Ottoman age was the starting point for the decline and collapse of Islamic civilization. Though some researchers have made a distinction between these two eras, there are others who maintain both eras are “decadent”. It was also mentioned that this mislabeling goes back to few biased orientalist who initially applied this term for this period, a term which found its way into Islamic culture and civilization. Finally, it is crucial to point here that poetry cannot be a sole indicator for Mamluk era’s intellectual works and achievements, but it is a small fragment of the entire situation and it is not fair to consider it as a proof for a particular era’s decadence. Now is the time for contemporary researchers to undertake fair researches in order to unravel the cultural, artistic and scientific works of that period and sanctify it from the biased labeling it does not deserve at all.

References

- IbnAyyas, Ahmad, M.I. (1961).** Bad’eZohor fi Vaghaye al-Dohur, a research by Mohammad Mostafa, Cairo, al-Hei’at al-Amelelketab, Chapter five, 2nd edition.
- al-Hamavi, I.H., al-Din, T., Ali, A. and Abdollah, I.M., (1304 AH).** KhazanolAdabVaGhayatolarab, Beirut, DarolGhamus Al-Hadith
- Ibn, Khaldun, Abdolrahmanibn Mohammad (2003).** Almoghadame, Beirut, DarolKotobolElmiye, 8th Edition
- Bustani, Betrus (1979).** Odaba al-Arab fi AndalusvaAsr al-Enbe’ath, Beirut, Dar MarunAbud, Chapter three, 6th Edition
- Pasha, Omar Musa, (2004).** Tarikh Al-Adab Al-Arabi (al-AsrMamluki), Damscus: Darolfekr.
- Jundi, Anvar (1085).** Somomol-Esteshraghva al-Mostashreghin, Beirut: Daroljabal

Hamadeh, Mohammad Maher (1980). al-VosagholSiyasiyava Al-Edariya fi al-asr al-Mamluki, Beirut: Alresala Institute.

Rekabi, Judat (2006). Al-AdabOlArabi men al-endeharela al-Azdehar, Damscus, Darolfekr: 2nd Edition

Zeyadn, Jorge (1957). TarikhAdab al-Loghatal_arabiya, Cairo, Darolhelal, Chapter three.

Sheikh Amin, Bakri (2005). Motale'at fi She'r al-Mamlukiva al-Othmani, Beirut: Darolelmlelmalaeen: 12th Edition.

Sabagh, Leili (1983). Men KetabKholasatolAsar. Damscus: Publication of Ministry of Culture and Guidance.

Zeif, SHoghi (1977). al-She'rvavavab'e al-Sha'biyealaMor al-Osur, Cairo: Darolma'aref

Othman, Fathi Jalal (1973). SharhBardat al-Bosuri, Cairo: Darolma'refa.

Izz ad-Din, Mohammad Kamalodin (1987). IbnHajar al-asghalaniMorekhan. Beirut: Alem al-Kotob. SelselatolMovarekhin. No 2.

Anan Mohammad Abdollah (1969). Mesro-EslamiyevaTarikhal_khetat al-Mesrya. Cairo: Matb' Lejenata al-talifvaTarjomevaNashr

Feghi, Mohammad (1976). Al-Adab fi al-Asr al-Mamluki, Cairo: al-Hei'at al-Ame al-ketab.