This study began with a fact I uncovered in my previous study on the Ottoman land register Daftar Jayshî (Military Register). The register contains Mamluk land records copied from various registers that were handed down from the Ji‘ān-Malakī family, the bookkeepers of the Mamluk dynasty. The study found that a record copied from Al-Daftar al-Murabba‘ bil-Jild al-Asfar ‘ammā Ustuqirra ‘alay-hi al-Hāl ilā Akhir Shahr Shawwāl Sana 777 ’an Zaman al-Ashraf Sha’hān 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-Tuhfâ al-Sanîya bi-Asmā’ al-Bilâd al-Miṣrîya (The Brilliant Treasure of the Names of Egyptian Villages, hereafter Tuhfâ). Tuhfâ, considered as having been authored by Yahyâ b. al-Jî‘ân (d. 1480), is a list of land records for Egypt as well as Al-Intiṣâr li-Wâsi‘ta ‘Iqd al-Amṣâr (The Victory at the Center of Metropolises; hereafter Intiṣâr) by Ibn Duqmâq (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 Tuhfâ 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-Tuhfâ al-Saniya bi-Asmā’ al-Bilâd al-Miṣrîya.” First, this article begins with a short history of previous studies that focused on Tuhfâ to make clear the variant of the manuscript and position of MS Huntington 2 among them.

I. The History of Studies on Tuhfâ and Associated Problems

Tuhfâ 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 (misâh), (2) the size of land for village community (rizâq), (3) the estimated tax revenue (‘ibra), (4) the category of land right (e.g. iqtâ‘, private land, waqf, or military pension [rizâq jayshîya]) 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 Tuhfâ 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 national de France (Hereafter BnF). According to the catalogue of BnF, MS arabe 2262, titled “Kitâb Dhikr Mâ bi-Aqâlim Miṣr min al-Buldân wa ’Ibra Kull Baladī-hi wa Kam Misâḥatî-hâ Faddân,” was copied in A.H 827 (1423–1424). Nevertheless, I surmise that the copy date is incorrect as it contains names of amîr who lived after 1424. The unknown author’s name is indicated on the cover simply as “authored by al-Mas‘ûdi, a great imâm.”
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. 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-Jī‘ān on the order of amīr al-Sayfī “Youschbey.” 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. 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. The Vatican manuscript was just a list of the Egyptian villages. 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. 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.”

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Copyist</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Size (cm)</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>De Sacy</th>
<th>Moritz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MS. arabe 2262</td>
<td>Kitāb Ṭārīkh Miṣr wa Aṣqālīm-hā wa Baldān-hā wa mā yaḥlī-hā min al-Ajniḥ wa-Ghārib</td>
<td>al-Mas’udi, a great imām</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27×18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MS. Huntington 2</td>
<td>Kitāb al-Tuhfa al-Saniya bi-Asmā’ al-Bilād al-Miṣrīya</td>
<td>Yahyā b. al-Jī‘ān</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Maktab</td>
<td>883/1478</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>43×30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>only extract</td>
<td>photocopy of the first and the last folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Vienna Manuscript</td>
<td>Unknown (but it is Turkish manuscript)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>only extract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 MS. Vaticani Arabi 267</td>
<td>Tadhkira Mubāraka bi-Iddat Aṣqālīm al-Diyār al-Miṣrīya wa Ghayrī-hā</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26×17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MS. Geographiya, Arabi 316</td>
<td>It has no title folio, so the title is unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>ca. 18c?</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21×16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The manuscript held by Amin Şâmi</td>
<td>Al-Tuhfa al-Saniya fi al-Aṣqalīm al-Miṣrīya</td>
<td>Ahmad b. al-Jī‘ān</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33×20.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MS. arabe 5965</td>
<td>Daftar al-Jarākisa</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>970/1563</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25×17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Qawmīya, MS Geographīya, ‘Arabī 316

139 folios, 21×16 cm, 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 Misāḥat al-Diyār al-Miṣrīya wa Mā Ustuqirra ‘alay-hi al-Hāl 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-Tuhfa al-Sanīya by Ibn al-Jī‘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. 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-Tuhfa al-Sanīya fī al-Aqālīm al-Miṣrīya, jama‘a al-faqīr Aḥmad b. al-Jī‘ān kātib al-rawk al-Nāṣirī (The Brilliant Treasure of the Names of Egyptian Villages, edited by the pauper Aḥmad b. al-Jī‘ān, a scribe of the cadastral survey of Nāṣir Muhammad.” The manuscript is currently missing.

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

121 folios, 25×17 cm, 21 lines. While Moritz suggested 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). 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 5965 had coincidences. He also insisted that the two groups had few similarities in terms of the numbers. Nevertheless, he treated them all as Tuhfa 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 Tuhfa, and treats others that share similarities with Tuhfa as belonging to the “Tuhfa family of manuscripts.”

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. 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 43×30 cm. 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. After de Sacy, Moritz

* 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. 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. 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 Geographiya, ‘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 Tuhfa 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 Tuhfa, and treats others that share similarities with Tuhfa as belonging to the “Tuhfa family of manuscripts.”
added footnotes stating that Yashbak min Mahdī ordered a copyist named Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Hasanī to copy the text. 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… (ki-rasm khizāna…)” on the cover page when someone, mostly a sultan or amīr, had a manuscript made for his own library. Yashbak min Mahdī (d. 1480) was a powerful amīr who supported the reign of Qāytbāy and was second in command along with Uzbak min Tūshuk, 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 ‘urbnān in Lower and Upper Egypt. As I mention below, in 1478 when the manuscript was compiled, he was also appointed as amir silāḥ (amir of arms).

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. Ahmad al-Hasanī al-Maktab, who is known as Qasīr 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-Hasanī 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, 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 Yahyā b. al-Jī‘ān. It is obvious from the passage on folio 1r that “al-shaykh al-imām al-‘ālim al-‘allāma Sharaf al-Dīn Yahyā 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 Ji‘ān family and had been serving as a mustawfī (bookkeeper) of the Divān al-Jaysh (military office) when Tuhfa was compiled. 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 amirs and their positions. On the other hand, Halm suggested it was compiled sometime from 1468 to 1485. Subsequently, MS Huntington 2 is rightly the original text of Tuhfa as it
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

### III. The Dating of Tuhfa’s Records

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.*

### Table 2 The total amount of tax revenue for each province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Moritz’s Edition</th>
<th>MS Huntington 2</th>
<th>MS arabe 5965</th>
<th>MS arabe 2262</th>
<th>MS Geographiya, <em>’Arabi</em> 316</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cairo and its suburb</td>
<td>153,075</td>
<td>153,075</td>
<td>153,075</td>
<td>153,075</td>
<td>153,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Qalyūbiya</td>
<td>419,850</td>
<td>419,850</td>
<td>419,058</td>
<td>419,058</td>
<td>419,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sharqiya</td>
<td>1,411,875</td>
<td>1,411,875</td>
<td>1,411,875</td>
<td>1,411,875</td>
<td>1,411,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Daqahliya</td>
<td>596,071</td>
<td>596,571</td>
<td>596,071</td>
<td>596,071</td>
<td>596,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Damietta and its suburb</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gharbiya</td>
<td>1,844,080</td>
<td>2,144,080</td>
<td>1,144,080</td>
<td>1,144,080</td>
<td>1,844,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Misrīya</td>
<td>574,629 (1/3)</td>
<td>574,629 (2/3)</td>
<td>574,629 (1/3)</td>
<td>574,629 (1/3)</td>
<td>574,629 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Biyār wa Jazira Bani Naṣr</td>
<td>100,232</td>
<td>114,132</td>
<td>100,132</td>
<td>100,232</td>
<td>100,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Buḥayra</td>
<td>741,294 (2/3)</td>
<td>741,294 (1/6)</td>
<td>741,294 (2/3)</td>
<td>741,294 (2/3)</td>
<td>741,294 (2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fawwa wa Muzāhimatayn</td>
<td>56,846 (1/2)</td>
<td>56,846 (1/2)</td>
<td>56,846 (1/2)</td>
<td>56,846 (1/2)</td>
<td>56,846 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nastārāwa</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Alexandria and its suburb</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jizīya</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>— (n/a)</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The Total</td>
<td>6,025,553 (1/2)</td>
<td>6,278,453 (1/3)</td>
<td>5,324,661 (1/2)</td>
<td>5,324,661 (1/2)</td>
<td>6,026,053 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (A-a)</td>
<td>202,904 (1/2)</td>
<td>(-49,998 (1/3)</td>
<td>803,788 (1/2)</td>
<td>903,793 (1/2)</td>
<td>202,002 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B The total amount of Upper Egypt</td>
<td>3,355,808 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,355,808 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,355,808 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,355,808 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,355,808 (5/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Isfih</td>
<td>143,997 (1/2)</td>
<td>143,997 (1/2)</td>
<td>143,997</td>
<td>143,997</td>
<td>143,997 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fayyūm</td>
<td>164,050</td>
<td>164,050</td>
<td>— (n/a)</td>
<td>164,050</td>
<td>164,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bahnasāwīya</td>
<td>1,302,642 (1/2)</td>
<td>1,302,642 (1/2)</td>
<td>1,302,642 (1/2)</td>
<td>1,302,642 (1/2)</td>
<td>1,301,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Usḥunūnayn</td>
<td>762,040</td>
<td>762,040</td>
<td>762,040</td>
<td>762,040</td>
<td>762,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Asyūṭ</td>
<td>323,920</td>
<td>323,920</td>
<td>323,920</td>
<td>323,920</td>
<td>323,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ikhmīm</td>
<td>243,925 (1/3)</td>
<td>243,925 (1/3)</td>
<td>243,925 (1/3)</td>
<td>243,925 (1/3)</td>
<td>243,625 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Qūṣ</td>
<td>414,663 (1/2)</td>
<td>414,663 (1/2)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>414,663 (1/2)</td>
<td>414,663 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The Total</td>
<td>3,355,235 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,355,208 (5/6)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,355,208 (5/6)</td>
<td>3,353,938 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (B-b)</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,870 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 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 Nāsir Muhammad’s cadastral survey (al-rawk al-Nāṣiri, 1313–1325)? On this issue, previous studies hold the following opinions. On one hand, García 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 Nāsir 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 Jayibi and analyzed the difference between the three sources. He suggested that the numeric data had been updated since Nāsir Muhammad’s cadastral survey, showing some cases of reexamination of the numeric data in the Daftar Jayibi. He concluded that most of the data had been retained since Nāsir 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 Bani Baḥr village in Iṭfīḥ 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 Ard al-‘Ajami village in Sharqiya 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 Milij 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, Iṭfīḥ, and Minūfiya province. In addition to this, I compared numerical data of the size of the cultivated area in Qūs province between Tuhfa and the Daftar Jayibi, 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 Jayibi. Tax revenue data is reexamined in many cases in Tuhfa. For example, in Mahanis village in Qūs 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 Jayibi?

Table 3 shows the cases in which the tax
revenue data had changed. In contrast with Tāhfa, in the Daftar Jayshi it is rare for the tax revenue data to be recorded so only 14 cases could be confirmed. 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 Mahānis village that we saw above. The Mamluk records that were copied from the Daftar al-

Jarākisa show the old records (qadim) and those for 732/1332, 779/1377, and 808/1405. Considering that Nāsimuhammad’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 Inṣiṣār and the old data of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Tax Revenue Record in the Daftar Jayshi</th>
<th>Tax Revenue Record in Tāhfa</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gharbiya</td>
<td>Ḥaddad</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 4,000, then it was assessed at 2,000 by the land survey (tarbi’) in Muḥarram 7th, 822/ February 3rd, 1419.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>DJ 4626, 97r; MS. Hunt 2, 85r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gharbiya</td>
<td>Amyūṭ</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 17,000, then it was assessed at 8,500 in Shawwal 8th, 780/ January 128th, 1379, and 4,250 by the order (marṣūm) dated Shawwal 5th, 873/ April 18th, 1469.</td>
<td>17,000 → 4,250</td>
<td>DJ 4626, 223r; MS. Hunt 2, 92v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>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 Safar in 811/1408.</td>
<td>24,400 → 12,500</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 1r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Aqwāz Bani Bahr</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 12,600, then it was assessed at 3,000.</td>
<td>12,600 → 3,000</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 30v; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Burumbul</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 8,000, then it was assessed at 4,000.</td>
<td>8,000 → 9,000</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 32r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Al-Tabbin</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 3,000, then it was assessed at 2,000.</td>
<td>3,000 → 2,000</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 35r; MS. Hunt 2, 206r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Al-Ḥayy al-Ṣaghīr</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 3,500, then it was assessed at 2,916.</td>
<td>3,500 → 2,920</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 38r; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Al-Ṣalihiya</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 2,000, then it was assessed at 1,000.</td>
<td>2,000 → 1,000</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 47v; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Al-Qalabiyah</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 1,400, then it was assessed at 700.</td>
<td>1,400 → 900</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 51r; MS. Hunt 2, 206v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Al-Īṣṭabl</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 4,000, then 5,000, then it was assessed at 1,250.</td>
<td>5,000 → 1,250</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 59r; MS. Hunt 2, 207v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>İṭṭīḥ</td>
<td>Ḥilwān</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 5,000, then it was assessed at 4,166.</td>
<td>5,000 → 4,166</td>
<td>DJ 4639, 93r; MS. Hunt 2, 208v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fayyūm</td>
<td>Dḥāt as-Safā</td>
<td>The tax revenue had been 24,000, then 15,000, then 5,000, then it was assessed at 2,500.</td>
<td>5,000 → 2,500</td>
<td>DJ 4645, 75v; MS. Hunt 2, 214r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ushmūnayn</td>
<td>Bānī Sirāj</td>
<td>The old tax revenue (qadim) had been 2,000, then it was assessed at 500.</td>
<td>2,000 → 500</td>
<td>DJ 4625, 156r; MS. Hunt 2, 244r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Qays</td>
<td>Mahānis</td>
<td>The old tax revenue: 8,000, Rabi’ II 24th, 732/ January 24th, 1332: 15,000, Muḥarram 23th, 779/June 1st, 1377: 5,000, Jumada II, 4th, 808/ November 27th, 1405: 2,500.</td>
<td>15,000 → 2,500</td>
<td>DJ 4633, 94r; MS. Hunt 2, 263r.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The bold numbers in the table indicate that the numbers are different from the Daftar Jayshi.
Tuḥfa while the record in 1405 is consistent with the new data of Tuḥfa.

Such consistency between the updated record in the Daftar Jayshī and that in Tuḥfa was seen in all except 5 cases (nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9) that show little difference.\textsuperscript{42} It is especially important to note that the data of no. 2 was updated in 1469 which is near the time when Tuḥfa was compiled. It indicates that the old records in Tuḥfa 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 Tuḥfa are basically reflecting the records of Nāṣir Muhammad’s cadastral survey. On the other hand, the tax revenue records in Tuḥfa 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.

\textbf{IV. From Diwān to Others: Distribution of the Mamluk Land Record}

According to Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 1333), on one hand, the mustawfī of the Diwān 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 mustawfī 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).\textsuperscript{43} On the other hand, the kātib (scribe) of the Diwān al-Jaysh kept the Iqtā’ Register in which the tax revenue, the holder, and his rights over each iqtā’ were recorded. He had to update immediately after an iqtā’ holder moved to another iqtā’. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{45}

The kātib conducted the survey in cooperation with the mubāshir that are believed to have kept land records for their jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{47} In this way, the person in charge kept detailed information on tax in the agricultural field. Meanwhile, in the central office, the mustawfī 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 Ji‘ān family who conducted the survey and the update in the late 15th century, which helps us to easily understand why the author of Tuḥfa was Yahyā b. al-Ji‘ān.

As the record of the Daftar Jayshī indicates, Tuḥfa was compiled on the basis of the Daftar Murabba’. However, it does not necessarily mean that Tuḥfa 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 Diwān al-Jaysh needs to do following things. First, he has to organize the names of holders of iqtā’, cash salary, and payment in kind. They (the holders) are amīrs of various ranks, sultan’s mamluk corps, halqa 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 iqtā’ preceding the current person. Then, he inputs his revenue from the iqtā’ using symbols (ramz), making it difficult to decipher. Although the author provides no clear information about the symbols, the important thing to note is that the kātib of the Diwān 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 Murabba’, 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 Sha’bān II draws a line in Mamluk history as it represents the end of the Qalawunid dynasty. 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).

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.
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