

Mamluk Land Records Being Updated and Distributed

A Study of *Al-Tuḥfa al-Sanīya bi-Asmā' al-Bilād al-Miṣrīya*¹

Wakako Kumakura

Research Associate, Organization for Islamic Area Studies, Waseda University

This study began with a fact I uncovered in my previous study on the Ottoman land register *Daftar Jaysḥī* (Military Register). The register contains Mamluk land records copied from various registers that were handed down from the Jī'ān-Malakī family, the bookkeepers of the Mamluk dynasty.² The study found that a record copied from *Al-Daftar al-Murabba' bil-Jild al-Aṣfar 'ammā Ustuqirra 'alay-hi al-Ḥāl ilā Ākḥir Shahr Shawwāl Sana 777 'an Zaman al-Ashraf Sha'bān b. Husayn* (Murabba' Register on the Records Settled at the End of Shawwāl in A.H 777 during the Reign of Ashraf Sha'bān b. Husayn, Bound with Yellow Leather, hereafter *Daftar Murabba'*) coincided with the record of *Al-Tuḥfa al-Sanīya bi-Asmā' al-Bilād al-Miṣrīya* (The Brilliant Treasure of the Names of Egyptian Villages, hereafter *Tuḥfa*).³ *Tuḥfa*, considered as having been authored by Yaḥyā b. al-Jī'ān (d. 1480), is a list of land records for Egypt as well as *Al-Intiṣār li-Wāsiṭa 'Iqd al-Amṣār* (The Victory at the Center of Metropolises; hereafter *Intiṣār*) by Ibn Duqmāq (d. 1407) and had been referred to as one of the indispensable sources in social and economic studies of the Mamluk period. However, details of the land records, such as its origins, have remained unclear. This article explores why the land record managed by a government office (*dīwān*) was compiled as *Tuḥfa* to approach the issue of record management from a microscopic perspective.

The manuscript this study consults is MS Huntington 2, which is preserved in the Bodleian Library of the Oxford University. It is the only manuscript with the title "*Al-Tuḥfa al-Sanīya bi-Asmā' al-Bilād al-Miṣrīya*." First, this article begins with

a short history of previous studies that focused on *Tuḥfa* to make clear the variant of the manuscript and position of MS Huntington 2 among them.

I. The History of Studies on *Tuḥfa* and Associated Problems

Tuḥfa contains land records for 13 provinces in the Delta and 7 provinces in Upper Egypt. The records are listed alphabetically by village name and are grouped by province. The items are (1) the size of cultivated area (*misāḥa*), (2) the size of land for village community (*rizaq*), (3) the estimated tax revenue (*'ibra*), (4) the category of land right (e.g. *iqṭā'*, private land, *waqf*, or military pension [*rizaq jaysḥīya*]) and the land holder at the time of the reign of Sha'bān II (r. 1363–1377), (5) the current category of land right and land holder.

To the best of my knowledge, the studies that utilized *Tuḥfa* began with European scholars in the 17th century. The first scholar was Louis Piqué (d. 1699), a priest of the French Catholic Church. He made a table of quantitative records of each village on the basis of MS arabe 2262, which is preserved in Bibliothèque nationale de France (Hereafter BnF).⁴ According to the catalogue of BnF, MS arabe 2262, titled "Kitāb Dhikr Mā bi-Aqālīm Miṣr min al-Buldān wa 'Ibra Kull Baladi-hi wa Kam Misāḥati-hā Faddān," was copied in A.H 827 (1423–1424).⁵ Nevertheless, I surmise that the copy date is incorrect as it contains names of *amīr* who lived after 1424. The unknown author's name is indicated on the cover simply as "authored by al-Mas'ūdī, a great *imām*."

The next author is Silvestre de Sacy (d. 1838). In 1810, he made a table of quantitative data based on MS arabe 2262 and other manuscripts. The main concern of de Sacy was to know “what this beautiful country lost under shortsighted reign and what it will gain under better reign,” comparing A.H 777 (1376) with his own time.⁶ Consequently, de Sacy listed the names of villages along with quantitative data on the size of cultivated area, *rizaq* land and estimated tax revenue, omitting the data on land use and land holders.

The other manuscripts de Sacy used were one from Vienna, MS Huntington 2, and MS Vaticani Arabi 267 from the Vatican Library. Among them, de Sacy considered MS Huntington 2 to be *Tuhfa*'s original text noting that the manuscript bears the title and that it was authored by Yahyā b. al-Ji'ān on the order of *amīr* al-Sayfi “Youschbey.”⁷ However, although he never actually touched the manuscript, he did borrow an extract from M. Hammer who was a consul of Moldavia at the time.⁸ The extract listed the names of the villages and the quantitative data de

Sacy listed in his table.⁹ He also borrowed an extract of the Vienna manuscript, which was a Turkish translation of *Tuhfa* for administrative use by the financial bureau in Cairo.¹⁰ The Vatican manuscript was just a list of the Egyptian villages.¹¹ In making the table, de Sacy relied on MS arabe 2262 as much as possible and in footnotes he mentioned the difference between MS arabe 2262 and the other manuscripts.¹² After the work was completed, it was included in *Relation de l'Égypte* as a chapter titled “The Situation of the Provinces and Villages in Egypt under the Reign of Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'bān in 1376.”¹³

In 1898, about a century had passed since the work by de Sacy, Bernhard Moritz (d. 1939), an orientalist who served as the first director of la Bibliothèque Khédiviale (from 1898 to 1911), edited *Tuhfa* (first printed in 1898, reprinted in 1974). While the works of Piqué and de Sacy only extracted the quantitative data, the appearance of the edition by Moritz made it possible for scholars to utilize *Tuhfa* for historical study. Moritz consulted the manuscripts below besides the table of de Sacy (See Table 1).¹⁴

[Table 1] The manuscripts consulted by S. de Sacy and B. Moritz

Bibliographic Information									Reference	
Manuscript	Title	Author	Copyist	Time	Folio	Size (cm)	Line	De Sacy	Moritz	
1 MS. arabe 2262	Kitāb Tārīkh Miṣr wa Aqālīm-hā wa Buldān-hā wa mā yalī-hā min al-'Ajā'ib wal-Gharīb	al-Mas'ūdī, a great imām	unknown	unknown	120	27×18	21	✓		
2 MS. Huntington 2	Kitāb al-Tuḥfa al-Saniya bi-Asmā' al-Bilād al-Miṣriya	Yahyā b. al-Ji'ān	Muḥammad b. al-Maktab	883/1478	264	43×30	15	only extract	photocopy of the first and the last folio	
3 The Vienna Manuscript (it was preserved in the Imperial Library of Vienna)	Unknown (but it is Turkish manuscript)	unknown	unknown	unknown	n/a	n/a	n/a	only extract		
4 MS. Vaticani Arabi 267	Tadhkira Mubāraka bi-'Iddat Aqālīm al-Diyār al-Miṣriya wa Ghayri-hā	unknown	unknown	unknown	38	26×17	15	✓		
5 MS. Geographiya, Arabi 316	It has no title folio, so the title is unknown	unknown	unknown	ca. 18c?	139	21×16	17		✓	
6 The manuscript held by Amīn Sāmī	Al-Tuḥfa al-Saniya fi al-Aqālīm al-Miṣriya	Aḥmad b. al-Ji'ān	unknown	old	81	33×20.5	23		copy	
7 MS. arabe 5965	Daftar al-Jarākisa	unknown	unknown	970/1563	121	25×17	21		✓	

1) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Qawmīya, MS Geographīya, ‘Arabī 316

139 folios, 21×16cm, 17 lines. According to Moritz, the manuscript was copied about 150 years ago from his time. On one hand, he suggested the title was “Ibra Misāhat al-Diyār al-Miṣriya wa Mā Ustuqirra ‘alay-hi al-Ḥāl ilā Ākhir Shahr Shawwāl 777 fil-Ayyām al-Ashrafiya (Estimated Revenue of Egypt and What was Assessed in the End of Shawwāl A.H 777 in the Days of Ashraf [Sha‘bān’s Reign]).” On the other hand, an observation of the microfilm casts doubt on this because there is no cover page where the title is written. I was able to confirm that the title “Al-Tuḥfa al-Saniya by Ibn al-Ji‘ān” on the first page was probably written later by a librarian.

2) The manuscript held by Amīn Sāmī

81 folios, 33×20.5 cm, 23 lines. The manuscript was held by Amīn Sāmī (d. 1941), an Egyptian historian.¹⁵ Moritz did not consult the original but rather a copy. He estimated that the copy originated from a rather old version and suggested the title was “al-Tuḥfa al-Saniya fi al-Aqālīm al-Miṣriya, jama‘a al-faqīr Aḥmad b. al-Ji‘ān kātib al-rawk al-Nāṣiri (The Brilliant Treasure of the Names of Egyptian Villages, edited by the pauper Aḥmad b. al-Ji‘ān, a scribe of the cadastral survey of Nāṣir Muḥammad.”¹⁶ The manuscript is currently missing.

3) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS arabe 5965

121 folios, 25×17 cm, 21 lines. While Moritz suggested that the manuscript was dated on Jumada II 9th, A.H 907 (December 21st, 1501), I confirmed that the date is Jumada II 19th, A.H 970 (February 13th, 1563).¹⁷ As he suggested, the title is “Daftar al-Jarākisa.” Moritz seems to have considered it to be the manuscript de Sacy consulted in his work, i.e. MS arabe 2262. He was seemingly unconscious of the fact the manuscript had never been touched by de Sacy or other previous scholars.¹⁸

*

Moritz had never seen the original text of MS Huntington 2, viewing only photocopies of the first and the last folios. And, he referred to the table by de Sacy when he confirmed the details.¹⁹ Moritz, referring to de Sacy’s table and the above manuscripts, chose the information he judged as correct when he encountered differences in the data, and noted such in the footnotes.²⁰ Considering this fact, we should be careful when referring to Moritz’s edition. First of all, there was no rule to his choice of data from the table and the manuscripts, and he treated equally both seen and unseen manuscripts. Second, he didn’t pay attention to the difference between the manuscripts. In fact, Moritz pointed out that MS Geographīya, ‘Arabī 316, and Amīn Sāmī’s manuscript were similar, while the others, i.e. MS Huntington 2 and MS arabe 5965 had coincidences. He also insisted that the two groups had few similarities in terms of the numbers. Nevertheless, he treated them all as *Tuḥfa* manuscripts. Obviously, it is difficult to conclude they originated from the same text based on such poor evidence as their formats and information being similar. In this regard, this article only recognizes MS Huntington 2 as a text of *Tuḥfa*, and treats others that share similarities with *Tuḥfa* as belonging to the “*Tuḥfa* family of manuscripts.”²¹

II. The Compilation of MS Huntington 2

MS Huntington 2 composes a fonds in which the manuscripts were acquired by R. Huntington (d. 1701), an orientalist who visited the Middle East from 1671 to 1681.²² Upon viewing the manuscript, I found it was in very good condition without any damage. The number of folios is 264 and the size is 43×30cm. It was covered with brown leather.

As mentioned above, de Sacy suggested it was compiled by the order of al-seyfi youchbey, while he did not mention any information on the copyist and the date of the compilation.²³ After de Sacy, Moritz

added footnotes stating that Yashbak min Mahdī ordered a copyist named Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥasanī to copy the text.²⁴ First of all, I'd like to reconfirm the basic information.

In the ornamental circle placed at the center of folio 1r, there are words written in golden ink as below:

For the library of noble, generous, and high-born Yashbak min Mahdī, who is the *dawādār* (executive secretary), the *ustādār* (major-domo), the commander of dynasties of Islam, and the head of the victorious army—May his victory be firm—.

In Arabic manuscripts, it is typical to write “for the library of... (*bi-rasm khizāna...*)” on the cover page when someone, mostly a sultan or *amīr*, had a manuscript made for his own library.²⁵

Yashbak min Mahdī (d. 1480) was a powerful *amīr* who supported the reign of Qāyṭbāy and was second in command along with Uzbek min Ṭuṭukh, who was *atābak al-asākir* (the military commander). In 1468, he was appointed as *wazīr* (vizier), *kāshif al-kusshāf* (viceroy of Upper and Lower Egypt), *ustādār* in addition to *dawādār* and had control over the state's financial affairs. Meanwhile, he commanded a series of military expeditions in which he took control over rebellious *'urbān* in Lower and Upper Egypt. As I mention below, in 1478 when the manuscript was compiled, he was also appointed as *amīr silāḥ* (*amīr of arms*).²⁶

It is obvious that the manuscript was made for Yashbak's own library. This fact is also illustrated by the words written on folio 264r:

Noble, intelligent, and excellent Yashbak min Mahdī, *dawādār*, *ustādār*, commander of the noble dynasty, and the head of the army, ordered the writing [of this work].

And on the same page, the information on the copyist

is given as below:

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥasanī al-Maktab, who is known as Qaṣīr and a student of his uncle *shaykh* Burhān al-Dīn al-Maktab, wrote this in Sha'bān of A.H 883.

The information clearly shows that the manuscript was written by the copyist named Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥasanī al-Maktab in A.H 883 (1478). As is often the case, from the above we obtain scant information on the copyist. However, the National Library and Archives of Egypt preserves a manuscript that was copied by the same copyist by order of Yashbak in 1478,²⁷ which suggests he was one of the copyists who worked for Yashbak's library.

As MS Huntington 2 is the manuscript that was dedicated to the powerful *amīr*, it is beautifully decorated. Blue yarn is sewn in the first page of each province as a bookmark with yellow yarn in the first pages of Lower and Upper Egypt, urging the reader to quickly locate the desired page.

Previous studies are in agreement that the author is Yaḥyā b. al-Jī'ān.²⁸ It is obvious from the passage on folio 1r that “al-shaykh al-imām al-'ālim al-'allāma Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā b. al-maqarr al-marḥūm al-'Alamī b. al-Jī'ān edited [the book].” As the name shows, this person was a member of the Jī'ān family and had been serving as a *mustawfī* (bookkeeper) of the *Dīwān al-Jaysh* (military office) when *Tuhfa* was compiled.²⁹ This is to say, the author had the authority to access the *Daftar Murabba'* that was managed by a government office.

Jean-Claude Garcin and Heinz Halm surmised the time of compilation of *Tuhfa* (although they never saw the manuscript). On one hand, Garcin concluded that the “present time” in the record of *Tuhfa* indicates sometime from September 1475 to December 1480, based on the records of *amīrs* and their positions. On the other hand, Halm suggested it was compiled sometime from 1468 to 1485.³⁰ Subsequently, MS Huntington 2 is rightly the original text of *Tuhfa* as it

[Table 2] The total amount of tax revenue for each province

	Province	Moritz's Edition	MS Huntington 2	MS arabe 5965	MS arabe 2262	MS Geographiya, 'Arabi 316
A	The total amount of Lower Egypt	6,228,455	6,228,455	6,128,450	6,228,455	6,228,055
1	Cairo and its suburb	153,075	153,075	153,075	153,075	153,075
2	Qalyūbiya	419,850	419,850	419,058	419,058	419,850
3	Sharqiya	1,411,875	1,411,875	1,411,875	1,411,875	1,411,875
4	Daqahliya	596,071	596,571	596,071	596,071	596,071
5	Damietta and its suburb	11,100	11,600	11,100	11,100	11,600
6	Gharbiya	1,844,080	2,144,080	1,144,080	1,144,080	1,844,080
7	Minūfiya	574,629(1/3)	574,629(2/3)	574,629(1/3)	574,629(1/3)	574,629(1/3)
8	Ibyār wa Jazīra Banī Naṣr	100,232	114,132	100,132	100,132	100,232
9	Buḥayra	741,294(2/3)	741,294(1/6)	741,294(2/3)	741,294(2/3)	741,294(2/3)
10	Fuwwa and Muzāḥimatayn	56,846(1/2)	56,846(1/2)	56,846(1/2)	56,846(1/2)	56,846(1/2)
11	Nastarāwa	43,500	43,500	43,500	43,500	43,500
12	Alexandria and its suburb	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
13	Jīziya	62,000	— ^(*)	62,000	62,000	62,000
	a. The Total	6,025,553(1/2)	6,278,453(1/3)	5,324,661(1/2)	5,324,661(1/2)	6,026,053(1/2)
	Error (A- a)	202,901(1/2)	(-49,998(1/3)	803,788(1/2)	903,793(1/2)	202,002(1/2)
B	The total amount of Upper Egypt	3,355,808(5/6)	3,355,808(5/6)	3,355,808(5/6)	3,355,808(5/6)	3,355,808(5/6)
1	Iṭfīḥ	143,997(1/2)	143,997(1/2)	143,997	143,997(1/2)	143,997(1/2)
2	Fayyūm	164,050	164,050	— ^(*)	164,050	164,050
3	Bahnasāwiya	1,302,642(1/2)	1,302,642(1/2)	1,302,642(1/2)	1,302,642(1/2)	1,301,642
4	Ushmūnayn	762,040	762,040	762,040	762,040	762,040
5	Aṣyūṭ	323,920	323,920	323,920	323,920	323,920
6	Ikhmīm	243,925(1/3)	243,925(1/3)	243,925(1/3)	243,925(1/3)	243,625(1/3)
7	Qūṣ	414,663(1/2)	414,633(1/2)	n/a	414,633(1/2)	414,663(1/2)
	b. The Total	3,355,238(5/6)	3,355,208(5/6)	n/a	3,355,208(5/6)	3,353,938(1/3)
	Error (B-b)	570	600	n/a	600	1,870(1/2)

* n/a indicates that the number is illegible due to the luck of the folio or it cannot be calculated.

* The bold numbers in the table indicate that the numbers are same with MS Huntington 2.

^(*) The manuscript lacks the number.

^(*) The manuscript lacks the number

was compiled during this time.

Then, what is the difference between the original text and other *Tuhfa*-family manuscripts? Table 2 shows the total amount of tax revenue for each province, which is shown in the preface of each text, i.e. Moritz's edition, MS Huntington 2, MS arabe 2262, MS arabe 5965, and MS Geographiya, 'Arabi 316. The table shows there are only two numeric data out of 22 that differ between MS arabe 2262 and MS arabe 5965. Meanwhile, MS Huntington 2 and MS Geographiya, 'Arabi 316 have little similarity with other manuscripts and

hardly share any numeric data. Though the reason for the difference between the manuscripts cannot be explored here, we should regard MS Huntington 2 as a manuscript of *Tuhfa*.³¹

III. The Dating of *Tuhfa*'s Records

This chapter examines the dating of the records. In the preface to *Tuhfa*, the author indicates the date of the writing of the tax revenue data, "I will mention the tax revenue of each province that

was determined in the reign of Ashraf Sha'bān, and mention the tax revenue of the present time in the case that it has changed." Meanwhile, he does not mention the date for the size of cultivated area.³² Here, a question occurs: does the tax revenue data in the reign of Sha'bān II reflect the result of Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey (*al-rawk al-Nāṣiri*, 1313–1325)? On this issue, previous studies hold the following opinions. On one hand, Garcin tried to solve the issue by comparing *Intiṣār* and *Tuhfa*. He considered *Intiṣār* as being the record of the cadastral survey that was carried out in 1397 and the year for the size of the cultivated area in *Tuhfa* as being 1376. Then, he hypothesized that the record of the size of the cultivated area had been reexamined since 1376 because there was a difference in the numeric data between *Intiṣār* and *Tuhfa*. Moreover, he regarded the year of the tax revenue data as being 1376 and the date of the reexamined data that was followed by the passage "then it was determined..." as being from 1475 to 1480. And, that is the date when he considered *Tuhfa* as being compiled.³³ On the other hand, Halm considered both tax revenue data and the size of cultivated area of *Tuhfa* as being the record of Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey in 1315, and the year of the reexamined data as 1376.³⁴

Nicolas Michel's work on this issue gave us a new analysis axis. He compared numeric data on the size of the cultivated area of Buḥayra province between *Intiṣār*, *Tuhfa*, and Mamluk land records copied in the *Daftar Jaysbi* and analyzed the difference between the three sources. He suggested that the numeric data had been updated since Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey, showing some cases of reexamination of the numeric data in the *Daftar Jaysbi*. He concluded that most of the data had been retained since Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey.³⁵

Here, I'd like to revisit the issue applying Michel's method to other provinces. First of all, I search cases of reexamination of the size of cultivated area. As a result, three cases can be found. The first case is Aqwāz Banī Baḥr village in Iṭfiḥ province. The

size of cultivated area is recorded as follows: "In A.H 746: 924+21/24; in A.H 747: 701+4/24+(1+1/2); in A.H 748: 700 (the unit is *faddān*)."³⁶ It shows that the size of cultivated area had been reexamined every year since 746/1345–1346. The second case is Arḍ al-'Ajamī village in Sharqīya province. The record is: "before the cadastral survey: 75, (after that:) 66+2/3."³⁷ The record interestingly shows the numeric data before and after the cadastral survey that is considered as being that carried out by Nāṣir Muhammad. The third case is Milīj village in Minūfiya province. Firstly, the data in the Mamluk period from the *Daftar al-Jarākisa* (Circassian Register), 1941 *faddān*, is recorded, then Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey data, 2990+23/24 *faddān*, follows.³⁸ These cases clearly show that the record of the size of cultivated area had been reexamined since Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey.

Although these cases give evidence for reexamination of the size of the cultivated area after the cadastral survey, the total number of cases was only the three in Buḥayra, Iṭfiḥ, and Minūfiya province. In addition to this, I compared numerical data of the size of the cultivated area in Qūṣ province between *Tuhfa* and the *Daftar Jaysbi*, which shows that the data are the same except for only 3 cases out of 42.³⁹ Consequently, the result proved Michel's view that the data for the size of the cultivated area in *Tuhfa* mostly followed the results of Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey.

*

Next, I'd like to analyze the tax revenue data, comparing with the *Daftar Jaysbi*. Tax revenue data is reexamined in many cases in *Tuhfa*. For example, in Maḥānis village in Qūṣ province, the tax revenue data "had once been 15,000 *dinār*; [after that,] it was assessed at 2,500 *dinār*". If the tax revenue data changed, the data before and after the change was written down in this way.⁴⁰ It clearly shows that tax revenue data had been reassessed. How, then, was such reassessment treated in the *Daftar Jaysbi*?

Table 3 shows the cases in which the tax

[Table 3] The case in which the tax revenue data had changed

No.	Province	Village	Tax Revenue Record in the <i>Daftar Jaysbi</i>	Tax Revenue Record in <i>Tuhfa</i>	Source
1	Gharbiya	Haddād	The tax revenue had been 4,000, then it was assessed at 2,000 by the land survey (tarbī) in Muharram 7th, 822/ February 3rd, 1419.	4,000	<i>DJ</i> 4626, 97r; MS. Hunt 2, 85r.
2	Gharbiya	Amyūt	The tax revenue had been 17,000, then it was assessed at 8,500 in Shawwal 8th, 780/ January 28th, 1379, and 4,250 by the order (marsmūm) dated Shawwal 5th, 873/ April 18th, 1469.	17,000 → 4,250	<i>DJ</i> 4626, 232r; MS. Hunt 2, 92v.
3	Iṭfīḥ	Iṭfīḥ	The tax revenue had been 25,000, then 24,400, then 25,000, then it was determined 12,500+1/4 by the order dated Safār in 811/1408.	24,400 → 12,500	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 1r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.
4	Iṭfīḥ	Aqwāz Banī Baḥr	The tax revenue had been 12,600, then it was assessed at 3,000.	12,600 → 3,000	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 30v; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.
5	Iṭfīḥ	Burumbul	The tax revenue had been 8,000, then it was assessed at 4,000.	8,000 → 9,000	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 32r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.
6	Iṭfīḥ	Al-Tabbīn	The tax revenue had been 3,000, then it was assessed at 2,000.	3,000 → 2,000	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 35r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.
7	Iṭfīḥ	Al-Ḥayy al-Ṣaghīr	The tax revenue had been 3,500, then it was assessed at 2,916.	3,500 → 2,920	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 38r; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.
8	Iṭfīḥ	Al-Ṣāliḥiya	The tax revenue had been 2,000, then it was assessed at 1,000.	2,000 → 1,000	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 47v; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.
9	Iṭfīḥ	Al-Qalābiya	The tax revenue had been 1,400, then it was assessed at 700.	1,400 → 900	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 51r; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.
10	Iṭfīḥ	Al-Iṣṭabl	The tax revenue had been 4,000, then 5,000, then it was assessed at 1,250.	5,000 → 1,250	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 59r; MS. Hunt 2, 207r.
11	Iṭfīḥ	Ḥilwān	The tax revenue had been 5,000, then it was assessed at 4,166.	5,000 → 4,166	<i>DJ</i> 4639, 93r; MS. Hunt 2, 208v.
12	Fayyūm	Dhāt aṣ-Ṣafā	The tax revenue had been 24,000, then 15,000, then 5,000, then it was assessed at 2,500.	5,000 → 2,500	<i>DJ</i> 4645, 75v; MS. Hunt 2, 214r.
13	Ushmūnayn	Banī Sirāj	The old tax revenue (qadīm) had been 2,000, then it was assessed at 500.	2,000 → 500	<i>DJ</i> 4625, 156r; MS. Hunt 2, 244r.
14	Qūṣ	Maḥānis	The old tax revenue: 8,000, Rabi' II 24th, 732/ January 24th, 1332: 15,000, Muharram 23th, 779/June 1st, 1377: 5,000, Jumada II, 4th, 808/ November 27th, 1405: 2,500.	15,000 → 2,500	<i>DJ</i> 4633, 94r; MS. Hunt 2, 263r.

* The bold numbers in the table indicate that the numbers are different from the *Daftar Jaysbi*.

revenue data had changed. In contrast with *Tuhfa*, in the *Daftar Jaysbi* it is rare for the tax revenue data to be recorded so only 14 cases could be confirmed.⁴¹ In 4 cases (nos. 2, 3, 12, 14), the data had been rewritten more than 2 times, and in 3 cases (nos. 2, 3, 14), the dates of modification were also recorded. No. 14 is the case of Maḥānis village that we saw above. The Mamluk records that were copied from the *Daftar al-*

Jarākisa show the old records (*qadīm*) and those for 732/1332, 779/1377, and 808/1405. Considering that Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey was carried out in Egypt in 1315–1316, records older than 1332 must be the result of the cadastral survey. The data of the village had been rewritten more than 3 times since then. It should be noted that the record in 1332 is consistent with the data of *Inṭiṣār* and the old data of

Tuhfa while the record in 1405 is consistent with the new data of *Tuhfa*.

Such consistency between the updated record in the *Daftar Jaysbi* and that in *Tuhfa* was seen in all except 5 cases (nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9) that show little difference.⁴² It is especially important to note that the data of no. 2 was updated in 1469 which is near the time when *Tuhfa* was compiled. It indicates that the old records in *Tuhfa* date back to A.H 777 while the present records are the latest at the time of compilation.

In conclusion, the analysis reveals the following things. On one hand, the records of the size of the cultivated area in *Tuhfa* are basically reflecting the records of Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey. On the other hand, the tax revenue records in *Tuhfa* are based on the records in 1367. But, if they were reassessed after that, the latest records at the time of compilation were added. In this way, the tax revenue records show both old and new records while the records of the size of the cultivated area do not. Such difference in notation indicates it was the tax revenue records that drew the attention of the government and the military elites.

IV. From *Dīwān* to Others: Distribution of the Mamluk Land Record

According to Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 1333), on one hand, the *mustawfi* of the *Dīwān al-Jaysh* performed a land survey once every three years as his duty. In the survey, he confirmed the names of cultivated villages and uncultivated villages, the size of the cultivated area and the land in fallow, and various taxes, and he determined crop yields for each year and for the overall total. The *mustawfi* recorded the number of villages, an overview of the size of the cultivated area, the revenue in cash and in kind, and details on the tax revenue collected according to the Hijra calendar (*mu'āmalāt*).⁴³ On the other hand, the *kātib* (scribe) of

the *Dīwān al-Jaysh* kept the *Iqtā' Register* in which the tax revenue, the holder, and his rights over each *iqṭā'* were recorded. He had to update immediately after an *iqṭā'* holder moved to another *iqṭā'*. In addition to this, the *kātib* made contract with *mubāshir* (local officials) once every three years to investigate the tax revenue. The result was copied to the register kept by the *kātib* so as to show a clear difference between before and after.⁴⁴ This information indicates that land surveys were regularly carried out, at least, in the beginning of the 14th century, while records concerning such surveys are rarely seen in the narrative sources such as chronicles and biographies.⁴⁵

The *kātib* conducted the survey in cooperation with the *mubāshir* that are believed to have kept land records for their jurisdiction.⁴⁶ The *mubāshir* had the *shaykh* of the village document irrigation systems in order to ascertain their condition in regard to things such as the size of irrigated and unirrigated areas. Moreover, they made farming contracts with peasants and imposed a tax burden on them.⁴⁷ In this way, the person in charge kept detailed information on tax in the agricultural field. Meanwhile, in the central office, the *mustawfi* and the *kātib* asked them to report on tax issues only once every three years to update the records. Assuming such record management system still continued, it was the Jī'ān family who conducted the survey and the update in the late 15th century, which helps us to easily understand why the author of *Tuhfa* was Yaḥyā b. al-Jī'ān.

As the record of the *Daftar Jaysbi* indicates, *Tuhfa* was compiled on the basis of the *Daftar Murabba'*. However, it does not necessarily mean that *Tuhfa* was just a copy of the register. I assume there were differences in notation between the two. It is highly possible that *siyāq* numbers based on the Arabic alphanumerical notation were used for bookkeeping in the governmental offices in the Mamluk period. And, such must have been used in the *Daftar Murabba'*, too. For instance, Nuwayrī mentions as follows in his explanation of the job description of the *kātib* in the military office.

The *kātib* in the *Dīwān al-Jaysh* needs to do following things. First, he has to organize the names of holders of *iqṭāʿ*, cash salary, and payment in kind. They (the holders) are *amīrs* of various ranks, sultan's mamluk corps, *ḥalqa* cavalry, Turkmans and *amīrs* of Bedouin tribes. To confirm their names, the *kātib* compiled a register in alphabetical order. He notes their names and the year in the lunar calendar when their amirate or military career began so they are able to receive the appropriate amount of grain according to the *kharāj* year. Second, the *kātib* lists the holder of the *iqṭāʿ* preceding the current person. Then, he inputs his revenue from the *iqṭāʿ* using symbols (*ramz*), making it difficult to decipher.⁴⁸

Although the author provides no clear information about the symbols, the important thing to note is that the *kātib* of the *Dīwān al-Jaysh* recorded tax revenue data in such a way as to make it illegible. The information written in that way was understood only by a handful of people in the know. Meanwhile, *Tuhfa* and other *Tuhfa*-family manuscripts are written in clear Arabic. This fact indicates that *Tuhfa* was not compiled for financial bureaucracy or for scribes but rather for readers not familiar with such specialized knowledge.

The most outstanding feature of *Tuhfa* and its source, i.e. *Daftar Murabbaʿ*, is that it contains both past records and those then contemporary so readers are able to ascertain how tax revenues and land usage for each village changed over the century. The period of the reign of Shaʿbān II draws a line in Mamluk history as it represents the end of the Qalawunid dynasty.⁴⁹ Consequently, *Tuhfa* is believed to have been a handbook for understanding how land and agricultural production in Egypt had changed since the end of the Qalawunid dynasty, via several financial reforms such as the establishment of *al-Dīwān al-Mufrad* (the Independent Bureau) by Sultan Barqūq—the originator of the Circassian dynasty—and the concentration of resources under *Dhakhira* (sultanic fisc).⁵⁰

The clear style of notation and the attractive contents of *Tuhfa* promoted reproduction of the text. Probably, errors were caused in the process of the reproduction, which generated the differences between the manuscripts we saw in Section 1. Interestingly, one of them was translated into Turkish to be utilized in the office in coming ages. In the 19th century, the manuscripts were used by de Sacy in his colonialist point of view. Finally, they had been inherited via Moritz's edition to the historians in the present time and used as a unique source for picturing the social and economic history of medieval Egypt.

NOTES

- 1 This article is an English translation, with some revisions, of my article “*Mamlūkuchō kōki Ejiputo no Tochichōsakiroku no Keishō to Kōshin, Ibn al-Jīʿān Ejiputo no muramura no namae nitsuiteno kagayakashiki shihō, al-Tuḥfa al-Saniya*” マムルーク朝後期エジプトの土地調査記録の継承と更新—イブン・アルジーアーン『エジプトの村々の名前についての輝かしき至宝 *al-Tuhfa al-Saniya*』(The Administration of Egyptian Land Survey Records in Later Mamluk Period: A Review of *al-Tuhfa al-Saniya*). *Tōyō Gakuhō* (*The Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*) 92, no.2 (2010): 95–120.
- 2 The Jīʿān-Malakī family served as bookkeepers during the Circassian period. For more on the family, see Wakako Kumakura, “Who Handed over Mamluk Land Registers to the Ottomans? A Study on the Administrators of Land Records in the Late Mamluk Period,” *Mamlūk Studies Review* 18 (2016): 279–96. The *Daftar Jayshī* is a land register compiled by the Ottomans in the middle of the 16th century as a list of *waqf* and private lands authorized by the government. It contains two kinds of records, one is a record copied from the *Daftar al-Jarākisa* (Circassian Register) and the other is a record from the Ottoman cadastral survey of 1528. The *Daftar al-Jarākisa*, which no longer remains, is thought to have contained the land records for the Mamluk period. For more on the *Daftar Jayshī* and the *Daftar al-Jarākisa*, see Nicolas Michel, “Les

- rizaq iḥbāsiyya, terres agricoles en mainmorte dans l'Égypte mamelouke et ottoman. Étude sur les Dafātir al-aḥbās ottomans," *Annales Islamologiques* 30 (1996): 105–98; Imād al-Dīn Abū Ghāzī, "Dafātir al-Rizaq al-Iḥbāsiyya wal-Jayshīya wa Aḥammīyat-hā al-Arshīfiyya wal-Tārikhiyya," *al-Ruznāme* 2 (2004): 1–33; Wakako Kumakura, "Mamurū kuchō tochi seidoshi kenkyū ni okeru shin shiryō, Ejiputo kokuritsu monjokan shozō Osumanchō [Gunmu daichō]" マムルーク朝土地制度史研究における新史料—エジプト国立文書館所蔵オスマン朝土地台帳『軍務台帳』 (A New Source for the Study of the Mamluk Land System: The Ottoman Land Register *Daftar Jaysbī* in the Egyptian National Archives), *Nihon Chūtō Gakkai nenpō (Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies)* 25, no. 2 (2009): 59–81.
- 3 The register is quoted in the column for the Mamluk land records in the *Daftar Jaysbī* to provide information on the land holders of Zarnikh and Kūm al-Shiqaf village in the Qūṣ province. The information quoted is as follows: "It was once Khalīl b. Tankizbughā, and now it is Muḥammad b. Jarbāsh al-Muḥammadi." This is coincident with the information in *Tuhfa*. See *DJ* 4633, 57v; Ibn al-Jī'ān, "Kitāb al-Tuhfa al-Saniyya," 261v; idem, *Tuhfa*, 193.
 - 4 Silvestre de Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte par Abd-Allatif, médecin arabe de Baghdad*, Fuat Sezgin ed. repr. (Frankfurt am Main, 1992), 587. Piqué's book is preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS arabe 2263 and has now been released online: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11002645r/f3.image> (accessed 18 November 2017). See also William Mac Guckin de Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes* (Paris, 1883–1895), 397.
 - 5 De Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes*, 396.
 - 6 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 591.
 - 7 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 587.
 - 8 The lender must have been Joseph Hammer-Purgstall (d. 1856), an Austrian orientalist. For further information on him, see *The Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Science, Literature and General Information, 11th Edition* (Cambridge, 1910), 898.
 - 9 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 587–88.
 - 10 Concerning the manuscript, de Sacy never mentioned the archival data. De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 588.
 - 11 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 588. The manuscript is identified as MS. Vaticanī Arabī 267 in Giorgio Levi Della Vida, *Elenco dei Manoscritti Arabi Islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana, Vaticanī Berberiniani Borgiani Rossiani* (Vatican, 1935), 15. I'm deeply grateful to Dr. Frédéric Bauden who gave me the information on this manuscript.
 - 12 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 589.
 - 13 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 581–704.
 - 14 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, II–III.
 - 15 As for this figure, see Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *al-A'lām Qāmūs Tarājīm li-Ashḥā al-Rijāl wal-Nisā' min al-'Arab wal-Musta'ribīn wal-Mustashriqīn* (Beirut, 2005), 2: 17.
 - 16 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, II–III. I was not able to identify the manuscript. Although a manuscript with the same title is preserved in the Vatican Library (MS Vaticanī Arabī 283), it seems to be different from the manuscript as far as I can tell from the catalogue. Della Vida, *Elenco*, 18.
 - 17 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, III; MS arabe 5965, 122v. The information on the catalogue of BnF shows that the date is 1562–1563, which is correct. Edgar Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes des nouvelles acquisitions (1884–1924)* (Paris, 1925), 150.
 - 18 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, II–III.
 - 19 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, II–III.
 - 20 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, IV.
 - 21 There are other *Tuhfa*-family manuscripts. See for example Jo Van Steenbergen, "Tawqīm al-Buldān al-Miṣriyya (C.U.L. MS. Qq. 65). Identifying a Late Medieval Cadastral Survey of Egypt", *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras IV*, eds. U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen (Leuven, 2005), 475–89.
 - 22 Alastair Hamilton, "Huntington, Robert (bap. 1637, d. 1701)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004; online edn., Jan 2008 (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14242>, accessed 15 June 2017)).
 - 23 De Sacy, *Relation de l'Égypte*, 587–88.
 - 24 Ibn al-Jī'ān, *Tuhfa*, III, n. 2.
 - 25 Ayman Fu'ād Saīd, *al-Kitāb al-'Arabī al-Makhṭūṭ wa 'Ilm al-Makhṭūṭāt*, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1997), 2: 453–72. Interestingly, another example of a manuscript compiled by the order of Yashbak can be found in this book (Saīd, *al-Kitāb al-'Arabī al-*

- Makbūṭ*, 2: 470).
- 26 Shams al-Dīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad Al-Sakhāwī, *al-Ḍaw al-Lāmi' li-Abl al-Qarn al-Tāsi'*, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1934–1937), 10: 272–74; Carl F. Petry, *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamlūk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power* (New York, 1994), 15–18; Jean-Claude Garcin, “The Regime of the Circassian Mamlūks,” in *The Cambridge History of Egypt. Vol. 1: Islamic Egypt, 640–1517*, ed. Carl F. Petry (Cambridge, 1998), 290–317; Daisuke Igarashi, *Land Tenure, Fiscal Policy, and Imperial Power in Medieval Syro-Egypt* (Chicago, 2015), 153–60. Yashbak also made an expedition to Syria that was recorded by Ibn Ajā (d. 1476) and later edited by Muḥammad A. Dahmān as *al-'Irāk bayna al-Mamālik wal-'Uthmāniyyin al-Atrāk: ma'a Riḥlat al-Amīr Yashbak min Mahdī al-Dawādār* (Damascus, 1986), 63–177.
- 27 Unidentified author, “Kitāb Turk Dilingja,” Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Qawmīya, MS mawā'iz, Turkī 16. The microfilm of the manuscript was missing. I'm deeply grateful to Yuta Arai who gave me the information on this manuscript.
- 28 On Yahyā b. al-Jī'ān, see al-Sakhāwī, *Ḍaw'*, 10: 229; Ibn Iyās, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Jarkasī, *Badā'i' al-Zubūr fī Waqā'i' al-Dubūr*. M. Muṣṭafā (ed.), 5 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1960–1975); al-Fahāris. M. Muṣṭafā (ed.), 3 vols. (Cairo, 1984), 3: 168.
- 29 The period of his service as *mustawfi* seems to have been from 1460 to his death. Ibn Iyās, *Badā'i'*, 2: 357.
- 30 Jean-Claude Garcin, *Un centre musulman de la Haute-Égypte médiévale: Qūṣ* (Cairo, 1976), 456; Heinz Halm, *Ägypten nach den Mamlukischen Lebensregistern*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1979–1982), 1: 32.
- 31 Anyhow, it is obvious that each text has errors in numeric data because the total amount of tax revenue in each text (A and B in the table) does not equal to the total of tax revenue of each province.
- 32 MS Huntington 2, 1v; MS arabe 5965, 1v; MS arabe 2262, 1v.
- 33 Garcin, *Un centre musulman*, 454, 456.
- 34 Halm, *Ägypten*, 1: 30–31.
- 35 Nicolas Michel, “Villages désertés, terres en friche et reconstruction rurale en Égypte au début de l'époque ottoman,” *Annales Islamologiques* 36 (2002): 235–40.
- 36 DJ 4639 (Reg. 3001–000105), 30v. The numbers in parentheses shows 1/24 of *qirāt* (1/24).
- 37 DJ 4641 (Reg. 3001–000112), 33v.
- 38 DJ 4634 (Reg. 3001–000109), 146v.
- 39 The exceptions were Jabalayn village (MS Huntington 2: 1450; *Daftar Jaysbi* (DJ 4633, 32r): 1452), Ṭukh Damanū village (MS Huntington 2: 5021; *Daftar Jaysbi* (DJ 4633, 65r): 5011), Farjūt village (MS Huntington 2: 23000; *Daftar Jaysbi* (DJ 4633, 72v): 22999).
- 40 MS Huntington 2, 263r.
- 41 The number of cases in which tax revenue data was recorded in the *Daftar Jaysbi* is 51. Probably, the reason why tax revenue data was not default data in the *Daftar Jaysbi* is that it was not compiled for tax but for confirmation of land right.
- 42 As for the case no. 1, though the record was updated in 822/1419 in the *Daftar Jaysbi*, *Tuhfa* recorded only the old record (MS arabe 5965, 42r; MS arabe 2262, 43v; MS Geographīya, 'Arabī 316, 50r). As for the other cases, it is little difference in the number after the decimal point (no. 3), in the one's place (no. 7), and mistakes in reading the special number for bookkeeping (nos. 5, 9). The notations of 4000 and 9000, 700 and 900 are almost indistinguishable. Michel, “Les rizaq iḥbāsiyya,” 130.
- 43 Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab*, 31 vols. ([vol. 1–18] Cairo, 1923–55; [vol. 19–31] Cairo, 1975–1992), 8: 297.
- 44 Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, 8: 202–203.
- 45 As an exception, there is an account of the land survey (*misāḥa*) in 1397 (Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥīm Ibn al-Furāt, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wal-Mulūk*, ed. Q. Zariq, vol. 7–9 [Beirut, 1936–1942], 9: 461; Taqī al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk*, eds. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ziyāda et al., 4 vols. [Cairo, 1939–1973], 3: 876). Tsugitaka Sato points out that cadastral surveys had been carried out at least two times (in 1389 and 1396) since Nāṣir Muhammad's cadastral survey near the end of the Mamluk period. See Tsugitaka Sato, *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta's and Fallahun* (Leiden, 1997), 145.
- 46 Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 193.
- 47 Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, 8: 247–50; Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 192–93.
- 48 Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāya*, 8: 200–201.

- 49 Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418) remarked that Nāṣir Muhammad’s cadastral survey established the dynasty’s basis that had lasted until the reign of Sha‘bān II. Shihāb al-Dīn Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-‘Ashā fi Ṣinā‘at al-Inshā’*, 14 vols. (Cairo, 1913–1922; repr. 1985), 4: 14; Igarashi, *Land Tenure*, 25–30.
- 50 Barqūq established a new office named al-*Dīwān al-Mufrad* and added *iqṭā’*s to it to secure the financial resources for monthly payment to the sultan’s mamluk corps. Igarashi, *Land Tenure*, 47–81.

Bibliography

Unpublished Sources

- DJ 4633: *Daftar Wilāyat al-Qūṣiyya Jaysbi*. 5056, 4633, 19 (Reg. 3001–000111), Rūznāma, Cairo, Dār al-Wathā’iq al-Qawmiyya.
- DJ 4634: *Daftar Thānī Wilāyat al-Manūfiyya Jaysbi*. 5057, 4634, 20 (Reg. 3001–000109), Rūznāma, Cairo, Dār al-Wathā’iq al-Qawmiyya.
- DJ 4639: *Daftar Wilāyat al-Itfiḥ Jaysbi*. 83/3, 4639, 25 (Reg. 3001–000105), Rūznāma, Cairo, Dār al-Wathā’iq al-Qawmiyya.
- DJ 4641: *Daftar Awwal al-Sharqiyya Jaysbi*. 5040, 4641, 27 (Reg. 3001–000112), Rūznāma, Cairo, Dār al-Wathā’iq al-Qawmiyya.
- MS Huntington 2: Ibn al-Jī‘ān, Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Shākir (d. 885/1480). “Kitāb al-Tuḥfa al-Saniyya bi-Asmā’ al-Bilād al-Miṣriyya.” Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Huntington 2.
- MS arabe 2262: Al-Mas‘ūdī, “Kitāb Tārīkh Miṣr wa Aqālīm-hā wa Buldān-hā wa Mā Yalī-hā min al-‘Ajā’ib wal-Gharīb.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS arabe 2262.
- MS arabe 2263: Louis Piqué, Untitled. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS arabe 2263 (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11002645r/f3.image>, accessed 18 November 2017).
- MS arabe 5965: Anonymous, “Daftar al-Jarākisa.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS arabe 5965.
- MS Vat Arabi 267: Anonymous, “Tadhkira Mubāraka bi-‘Iddat Aqālīm al-Diyār al-Miṣriyya wa Ghayri-hā.” Vatican, the Vatican Apostolic Library, MS Vaticani Arabi 267.
- MS Geographiyya, ‘Arabi 316: Anonymous, Untitled. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Qawmiyya, MS Geographiyya, ‘Arabi 316.

Published Sources

- Ibn al-Furāt, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm (d. 807/1405), *Tārīkh al-Duwal wal-Mulūk*. Quṣṣantn Zurayq (ed.), vols. 7–9, Beirut, 1936–1942.
- Ibn al-Jī‘ān, Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Shākir (d. 885/1480). *Kitāb al-Tuḥfa al-Saniyya bi-Asmā’ al-Bilād al-Miṣriyya*. B. Moritz (ed.), Cairo, 1898; repr. 1974.
- Al-Nuwayrī, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 733/1333), *Nihāyat al-Arab fi Funūn al-Adab*. 31 vols., (vols. 1–18) Cairo, 1923–1955; (vols. 19–31) Cairo, 1975–1992.
- Al-Qalqashandī, Shihāb al-Dīn Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī (d. 821/1418), *Ṣubḥ al-‘Ashā fi Ṣinā‘at al-Inshā’*. 14 vols., Cairo, 1913–1922; repr. 1985.
- Al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad (d. 902/1497). *Al-Daw al-Lāmi‘ li-Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi’*. 12 vols., Cairo, 1934–1937.
- Ibn Iyās, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Jarkasī (d. ca. 930/1524). *Badā’i‘ al-Zubūr fi Waqā’i‘ al-Dubūr*. M. Muṣṭafā (ed.), 5 vols., Wiesbaden, 1960–1975; *al-Fahāris*. M. Muṣṭafā (ed.), 3 vols., Cairo, 1984.

Studies

- Abū Ghāzī, Imād al-Dīn, “Dafātir al-Rizaq al-Iḥbāsiyya wal-Jayshīya wa Ahammiyyat-hā al-Arshīfiyya wal-Tārīkhīya,” *al-Ruznāme* 2 (2004): 1–33.
- Bloch, Edgar. *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes des nouvelles acquisitions (1884–1924)*. Paris, 1925.
- De Sacy, Silvestre. *Relation de l’Égypte par Abd-Allatif, médecin arabe de Baghdad*, Fuat Sezgin ed. repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1992.
- De Slane, William Mac Guckin. *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes*. Paris, 1883–1895.
- Della Vida, Giorgio Levi. *Elenco dei Manoscritti Arabi Islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana, Vaticani Berberimiani Borgiani Rossiani*. Vatican, 1935.
- Fu‘ād Saīd, Ayman. *Al-Kitāb al-‘Arabi al-Makhtū‘ wa ‘Ilm al-Makhtū‘āt*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1997.
- Dahmān, Muḥammad A. *Al-‘Irāk bayna al-Mamālik wal-‘Uthmāniyyin al-Atrāk: ma’a Riḥlat al-Amīr Yashbak min Maḥdī al-*

- Dawādār*. Damascus, 1986.
- Garcin, Jean-Claude. *Un centre musulman de la Haute-Égypte médiévale: Qūs*. Cairo, 1976.
- Halm, Heinz. *Ägypten nach den Mamlukischen Lebensregistern*. 2 vols., Wiesbaden, 1979–1982.
- Hamilton, Alastair. “Huntington, Robert (bap. 1637, d. 1701),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14242>, accessed 15 June 2017).
- Igarashi, Daisuke. *Land Tenure, Fiscal Policy, and Imperial Power in Medieval Syro-Egypt*. Chicago, 2015.
- Kumakura, Wakako. “*Mamurūkuchō tochi seidoshi kenkyū ni okeru shin shiryō, Ejiputo kokuritsu monjokan shozō Osumanchō Gunmu daichō*” マムルーク朝土地制度史研究における新史料—エジプト国立文書館所蔵オスマン朝土地台帳『軍務台帳』 (A New Source for the Study of the Mamluk Land System: The Ottoman Land Register *Daftar Jaysbī* in the Egyptian National Archives). *Nihon Chūtō Gakkai nenpō (Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies)* 25, no. 2 (2009): 59–81.
- . “*Kōki Mamurūkuchō ni okeru Ejiputo tochi monjo gyōsei no shosō: Osumanchōki Gunmu daichō ni miru Mamurūkuchō tochidaichō to sono riyō*” 後期マムルーク朝におけるエジプト土地文書行政の諸相：オスマン朝期『軍務台帳』に見るマムルーク朝土地台帳とその利用 (Record Management in Land Administration: The Mamluk Land Registers and Their Use as Seen in the *Daftar Jaysbī*). *Ochanomizu Shigaku* 53 (2010): 41–83.
- . “Who Handed over Mamluk Land Registers to the Ottomans? A Study on the Administrators of Land Records in the Late Mamluk Period.” *Mamlūk Studies Review* 18 (2016): 279–96.
- Michel, Nicolas. “Les rizaq iḥbāsiyya, terres agricoles en mainmorte dans l’Égypte mamelouke et ottoman. Étude sur les Dafātir al-aḥbās ottomans.” *Annales Islamologiques* 30 (1996): 105–98.
- . “Villages désertés, terres en friche et reconstruction rurale en Égypte au début de l’époque ottoman.” *Annales Islamologiques* 36 (2002): 197–251.
- Petry, Carl F. *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamlūk Sultans and Egypt’s Waning as a Great Power*. New York, 1994.
- Sato, Tsugitaka. *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta’s and Fallahun*. Leiden, 1997.
- The Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Science, Literature and General Information, 11th edition*. Cambridge, 1910.
- Van Steenbergen, Jo. “Tawqīm al-Buldān al-Miṣriya (C.U.L. MS. Qq. 65). Identifying a Late Medieval Cadastral Survey of Egypt.” *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras IV*, U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen ed., 475–89. Leuven, 2005.
- Al-Zirikli, Khayr al-Dīn. *Al-ʿlām Qāmūs Tarājim li-Ashbar al-Rijāl wal-Nisā’ min al-ʿArab wal-Mustaʿribīn wal-Mustashriqīn*. Beirut, 2005.