

The Private Property and *Awqāf* of the Circassian Mamluk Sultans: The Case of Barqūq

Daisuke IGARASHI*

Qāytbāy (r. 1468-96) and Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī (r. 1501-16), the two most prominent sultans of the late Circassian Mamluk period, donated substantial properties such as agricultural lands, houses, caravansaries, public baths, etc. as religious trusts (*waqf*; pl. *awqāf*). C. F. Petry regards their activities as a “financial policy” intended to secure a private source of revenue independent of the traditional state financial system against the political and economic crisis of the times. However, it must be noted that the preceding sultans had also striven to hold private and *waqf* properties. It is necessary to comprehend the meaning of their “financial policy” from the point of view of the historical development of the sultanic private financial affairs. It seems that the sultans developed their own resources because of practical necessity due to fundamental problems of the state and the political structure in this period.

From this aspect, this paper examines the process by which Barqūq, the first sultan of the Circassian Mamluks (r. 1382-89, 90-99), accumulated property and its background, using narrative and archival sources. Consequently, the following facts have become clear: firstly, Barqūq held various kinds of private and *waqf* properties, and thus the *Dīwān al-Amlāk wa-al-Awqāf wa-al-Dhakhīra*, the special office having charge of them, headed by an *ustādār*, was established; secondly, holding those properties was helpful for him in operating a government in the midst of political instability and the malfunction of the traditional state machinery; thirdly, he accumulated the properties by both fair means and foul, such as the diversion of state property, confiscation, *istibdāl* (exchange of *waqf* properties), etc. Subsequently, the role of the sultan’s property in the political and financial spheres grew in importance throughout the Circassian Mamluk period.

Keywords: Mamluk Sultanate, Waqf, Financial system, Politics, Egypt and Syria.

* Research Fellow, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

Introduction

In recent years, *waqf* (pl. *awqāf*; religious trust) deeds have been attracting scholars' attention as historical sources and several important studies on the Mamluk period that use these deeds as sources have been published. Particularly noteworthy are C. F. Petry's recent papers, which proposed a new interpretation of the sultanic *waqf* endowments by analyzing a huge number of *waqf* deeds of al-Ashraf Qāyrbāy (r. 872–901/1468–96) and al-Ashraf Qānshūh al-Ghawrī (r. 906–22/1501–16), the two prominent sultans in the late Mamluk period. Petry regards these endowments, comprising a huge amount of real estate in urban and rural areas, as a "financial policy" intended to secure their own financial resources against the political and economic crises of the times, independent of the traditional state financial system.¹ It is generally agreed that benevolence was not the military rulers' primary motivation to establish *waqf* endowments, which generally accompanied the construction of religious or public institutions such as mosques, madrasas, and *khānqāhs* (Sufi convents); rather, they bestowed these endowments in an effort to portray themselves as "the guardians of Islam" or to protect their fortunes from being confiscated or finely divided through the process of inheritance.² In comparison with this widely accepted opinion, Petry's new interpretation of the sultan's *awqāf* as a part of their financial policy is very stimulating.

Nevertheless, it must be noted that the sultans preceding Qāyrbāy and al-Ghawrī had also striven to hold private and *waqf* properties (*mawqūfāt*) even though these properties were not as large as those of Qāyrbāy and al-Ghawrī. The fact that the *Dīwān al-Amlāk wa-al-Awqāf wa-al-Dhakhīra*, the special bureau that was in charge of the sultanic private and *waqf* properties, headed by an *ustādār* (director), existed since the early years of the Circassian Mamluks (784–922/1382–1517) proves that endowing *awqāf* was widely employed as a means of creating assets.³ Therefore, it is necessary to comprehend the sultans' financial policy from the viewpoint of the historical development of the sultanic private financial affairs. In particular, it seems reasonable to assume that some practical necessity arising from fundamental problems in the state and the political structure of this period required the sultans—who in their capacity as sovereigns ought to have been holding the state treasury—to create such separate revenue sources.

From this perspective, this article examines the historical background and process by which al-Zāhir Barqūq, the first sultan of the Circassian Mamluks (r. 784–91, 792–801/1382–89, 1390–99), accumulated property, using narrative and

archival sources. I believe that clarifying the actual status of his property will provide a starting point for a discussion of the problem and also for comparative studies of the cases of successive sultans, because a regular management authority that would oversee the sultanic private and *waqf* property was instituted during his reign.⁴

I. The Sultanic Private Property and its Management

1. The Sultans and Atabaks preceding Barqūq

The sultans of the Bahri Mamluks (648–784/1250–1382) preceding Barqūq also devoted efforts to acquire private assets, irrespective of whether they endowed them as *awqāf* or not. One conspicuous example is the establishment of the *Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ* (the bureau of the privy funds) by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn (third reign: 709–41/1310–41). With the abolishment of the vizirate, the chiefship of the financial administration of the state, al-Nāṣir separated the financial affairs of the Royal Court from state finance and incorporated several new income sources into the Royal Court as its own resources. Consequently, a large proportion of the tax revenues, which were hitherto deposited in the state treasury, were transferred to the sultan's private treasury (*Khizānat al-khāṣṣ*). Thus accordingly, al-Nāṣir consolidated the economic foundation of his autocratic power through the secure possession of the property under his direct control, and the *nāzir al-khāṣṣ*, or the chief manager of this bureau, acquired political influence during his reign.⁵

However, as D. P. Little pointed out, what should be noted is the fact that this bureau has its origins in an office that even the preceding sultans had maintained—that of the sultan's private agent (*wakīl*), who engaged in trade transactions and commercial speculations for his master.⁶ In theory, tax revenues collected through the state machinery would first be deposited in the state treasury and then be disbursed for official purposes. However, since the incomes and expenditure of the state were almost fixed, it was convenient for the sultans to maintain their own private sources of revenue in order to manage finances more flexibly or to raise money for their own purposes, such as the purchase of slaves for the organization of their mamluk corps (called *mushtarawāt*) or the expenses of the Royal Court. Therefore, the successive sultans had striven to accumulate assets through the moneymaking activities of their *wakīls*. It can be said that al-Nāṣir, who achieved autocratic power, strengthened the position of the *wakīl* in order to develop his own resources, and that eventually resulted in the establishment of *Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ* and the reorganization of the financial

management structure.⁷

Along with the weakening of sultanic power, the political and economic situation was deteriorating rapidly after the death of al-Nāṣir in 741/1341. Nevertheless, Sultan al-Nāṣir Ḥasan (second reign: 755–62/1354–61) and Sultan al-Ashraf Sha‘bān (r. 764–78/1363–77) managed to attain real political power to some extent. Despite this, the state of their private properties was qualitatively different from that of al-Nāṣir and his predecessors. The difference lay in the fact that the two sultans had large-scale agricultural and urban real estate holdings. Ḥasan purchased for himself large tracts of agricultural land located in various districts of Egypt and Syria, and the madrasa he founded near the Citadel in Cairo had an expansive *waqf* landholding, which originally belonged to the state, as its source of revenue.⁸ According to Ibn al-Jī‘ān’s *Tuhfa*, which recorded the name and the size of the cultivated land, and the tax revenues of each tax district (*nāḥiya*), Sha‘bān also held considerable *milk* property in Egypt, comprising twenty-three tax districts with the annual revenue (*‘ibra*) estimated at approximately 105,250 *dīnārs jayshi*⁹ besides two districts turned into his *waqf* property.¹⁰ In addition to these, he endowed Mecca with nine Syrian villages.¹¹

I believe that the sultans’ inclination to possess such large-scale landholdings stemmed from the prevailing political situation: *majlis al-mashūra* (the supreme council) consisting of prominent amirs assumed the reins of government and performed the role of a “cabinet,” while reducing sultanic political power after 748/1347. This political system of collective leadership of amirs developed into the “Atabak regime.” In this system, an amir who occupied the post of *atābak al-‘asākīr* (the commander-in-chief), the highest military position among the amirs, bearing the title of “the Grand Amir” (*al-amīr al-kabīr*) would administer state affairs as an actual ruler.¹² In these political circumstances, there were ceaseless tensions and contests for power between the Qalāwūnid Sultans, who were the amirs’ puppets at the beginning of their enthronements but aimed to regain real power, and the prominent amirs heading the government—foremost of whom was the *atābak al-‘asākīr*. In view of this political structure, it may be reasonable to suppose that the sultans who were striving to assume the reins of power could not rely on the state treasury, which had fallen under the amirs’ control, for their political funds. Thus, they had to secure their own revenue sources independent of public finances. This compelled them to hold agricultural land that could provide a constant flow of income.

However, it must be noted that the powerful amirs of the time were also

striving to hold their own property and accumulate more, in addition to *iqṭā'*s (their official source of income), in a similar manner. This was true in the case of atabaks who were in power after the establishment of the Atabak regime in 755/1354. For example, Shaykhū al-Nāṣirī, the first atabak who assumed the title of *al-amīr al-kabīr*, held *iqṭā'*s and private and leased lands (*musta'jarāt*) in various regions of Egypt and Syria, which yielded 200,000 dirhams per day, and administered them through his private *dīwāns* and staff.¹³ In addition to this, he built a large madrasa and a *khānqāh* in al-Ṣalība quarter (outside the city wall of Cairo) and endowed them with expansive tracts of agricultural land throughout Egypt and Syria. If we consider that the revenue from the *waqf* property substantially exceeded the expenses necessary for the maintenance of the two institutions and charitable services, and the huge surplus that would come under the sole control of the administrator of the *waqf* (the office was held by the *wāqif*, i.e., Shaykhū himself), we can regard the *waqf* endowments as a part of the financial policy securing Shaykhū's private source of revenue.¹⁴ Amir Ṣarghitmish, who succeeded to the position of atabak after Shaykhū's death in 758/1357, also attempted to purchase lands from the state treasury and endowed the madrasa he built with these lands.¹⁵ These examples indicate that purchasing state lands and converting a part of them into *waqf* properties was the novel method commonly used by the ruling military elite of the late Bahri Mamluk period for securing private revenue sources.¹⁶ The growing ineffectuality of land management under the sole authority of the state allowed them to adopt such a method. As more amirs participated in leasing lands designated as government resources at a nominal rent and purchasing *iqṭā'* lands and converting them into *waqf* properties, they acquired a large proportion of agricultural land. Accordingly, the alienation, privatization, and "waqfization" of the state land reserves accelerated, accompanying the collapse of the state landholding system.¹⁷

Incidentally, there was a key term for referring to such private properties of this period, namely, *dhakhīra* (pl. *dhakhā'ir*), which originally meant "treasure" in Arabic. During the period under consideration, the term *dhakhīra* usually connoted "movable property" of the sultans or amirs, such as cash, gold, silver, jewels, luxurious textiles, and other luxury items, which were often concealed by the sultans and amirs. These hidden treasures only came to light through painstaking searches after the estates were confiscated following the death or downfall of the sultan or amir.¹⁸ The various sources often include descriptions of the *nāẓir al-dhakhīra*, i.e., the controller of the sultan's *dhakhīra*, under Sha'bān's reign, proving that this office attracted the chroniclers' attention

because it was newly established or acquired importance due to the sultan's increasing wealth at the time.¹⁹

On the basis of these political and financial scenarios, we shall now discuss the case of Barqūq, who ascended to power in these circumstances.

2. Barqūq's Private Property

Barqūq appeared on the political scene through a series of power struggles following the assassination of Sha'abān, which resulted in the *coup d'état* in 778/1377. Five years after his actual rule as atabak from 779/1378, Barqūq dethroned the nominal Qalāwūnid Sultan al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī and then officially ascended to the sultanate in 784/1382. He remained in power until his death in 801/1399; his rule stretched over a period of 20 years, although he was temporarily dethroned from 791/1389 to 792/1390. Barqūq also succeeded in acquiring a huge estate during his long reign.²⁰ I believe that the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* (the bureau of private real estate) founded by Barqūq played a crucial role in this acquisition. Al-Qalqashandī describes the bureau as follows:

This (*Dīwān al-Amlāk*) is a bureau that al-Zāhir Barqūq, who was already mentioned above, founded. He assigned lands that he labeled as private (*bilād^{an} sammā-hā amlāk^{an}*) to [the resources of] the bureau and appointed a director (*ustādh-dār*; syn. *ustādār*) and officials (*mubāshirūn*) independent of [the official financial organization of the government]. This bureau was for the sultan's exclusive use (*khāṣṣ bi-al-sulṭān*), and thus any assessments of allowances (*nafaqa*) or [official] expenditures (*kulfa*) were not assigned to it.²¹ (*The underlined part is discussed later)

The post of *nāẓir al-amlāk al-sulṭāniya*, i.e., the vice-director of the bureau, is described as follows:

The duty of [the individual holding] this post is to take charge of the private real estate of the sultan, such as agricultural lands (*diyā'*), houses (*ribā'*), and others.²²

On the basis of these descriptions, the bureau is characterized as follows: First, the object of this bureau's management consisted of real estate such as farmland and houses that could be expected to provide a more assured income; this distinguished the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* from the *Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ*, which existed during al-Nāṣir's reign. Second, the income of the *dīwān* was used freely by the sultan because it was considered as his *milk*. Now, we shall look more carefully into the political background that prompted Barqūq to establish this bureau, and how the *waqf* he established fit into his policy for private finance.

It is clear that Barqūq already held a certain amount of private assets when

he was an amir, because some sources include descriptions of the officers in charge of the lands he privately owned or leased and his *dhakhīra*.²³ Undoubtedly, Barqūq retained these assets even after his enthronement in 784/1382, as is evident from the fact that the eunuch Şandal al-Manjakī, who served as *khāzindār al-dhakhīra* (treasurer of *dhakhīra*), a post he held throughout Barqūq's reign,²⁴ was responsible for the incomings and outgoings of Barqūq's finances; moreover, Barqūq's immense *dhakhīra* money that had been concealed was found when Barqūq temporarily lost his position in 791/1389.²⁵ One of his income sources was an *iqṭā'* of the amir of one hundred, which he held during his amirate and retained after enthronement, refraining from allotting it to another amir (it would be transferred to the resources of *al-Diwān al-Mufrad* as will be explained later). However, the amount of information available about Barqūq's private property during his amirate and first sultanate is less than that available about his property during the later period of his reign.

Let us now attempt to extend this observation to his *waqf* endowments. He constructed *al-Madrasa al-Zāhiriya*, a religious complex comprising a school and a *khānqāh* in 788/1386 during his first sultanate.²⁶ Barqūq endowed this madrasa with large property holdings, the anticipated earnings of which substantially exceeded the necessary expenditures.²⁷ Moreover, a large amount of cash, amounting to 7,500 dinars, was found in the madrasa and was confiscated when Barqūq was dethroned in 791/1389.²⁸ These facts prove that the *waqf* endowments made by him were also a part of the policy for his private finance.

Barqūq then invested more energy into managing his private property during his second sultanate from 792/1390, especially in the later years of his reign. The actual process was as follows: first, the first reference to the *Diwān al-Amlāk* (mentioned above) was made in Rajab 797/April 1395, in which Barqūq appointed Amir Şalāh al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Tankiz as the director of the *dīwān*, and ex-vizier Ibn al-Baqarī as its vice-director. Accordingly, it appears probable that this *dīwān* was instituted at this time.²⁹ In the following year, Muḥarram 798/October 1395, Barqūq made an amendment to the provision regarding *waqf* administratorship, which had hitherto been occupied by a judge (*qāḍī*), and assumed the post himself.³⁰ This indicates that Barqūq intended to play a major—more direct and vital—role in the management of his *waqf* property. We shall later discuss the abovementioned amendment in detail, using the *waqf* deed as a source. In the following year, Sha'bān 799/May 1397, Amir 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī b. al-Ṭablawī, who was the governor of Cairo (*wālī al-Qāhira*) and had taken up the additional charge of

managing the financial duties and interests through the Sultan's favor, was appointed the general-director of the *Dīwān al-Amlāk wa-al-Awqāf wa-al-Dhakhīra*.³¹ This is the first instance wherein Barqūq's movable, immovable, and *waqf* properties were collectively placed under the sole control of an office. This indicates that the authorities managing these properties were thereafter unified under the office of "sultanic financial affairs."

If so, what were the circumstances that compelled Barqūq to adopt such a financial policy for his private property despite an uncontested reign, unlike his predecessors in the late Bahri Mamluk period, who had been engaged in power struggles with the atabak's government? We must attempt to answer this question by taking into account the establishment of *al-Dīwān al-Mufrad* (also founded by Barqūq) because the political and financial situation in which Barqūq ascended to power was intrinsically related to the establishment of the two *dīwāns*. In order to establish his regime, the most urgent and important task for Barqūq was gaining control over the Royal mamluk corps (*al-mamālīk al-sultānīya*). This was because the corps frequently used its armed strength to intervene in politics and had consequently acquired great political clout throughout the period of political confusion prior to Barqūq's accession to power. Moreover, the financial affairs of the state were in dire circumstances, mainly because powerful amirs had acquired state lands (as mentioned above), causing a drop in the land-tax revenues for the government purse. In those circumstances, Barqūq founded *al-Dīwān al-Mufrad* in 788/1386; this bureau had the exclusive charge of providing monthly salaries and other essentials to the Royal mamluk corps, by transferring the *iqṭā'* held by Barqūq during his amirate into the revenue source of the *dīwān*. On the other hand, the total failure of Barqūq's attempt to reconstruct the state's finances during the years of his first sultanate and his temporary dethronement must have increased his desire to establish the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* during his second sultanate. The aim of the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* was to secure the source of Barqūq's private revenue, which he could freely deal with, and ensure the availability of cash necessary for slave purchases in order to reinforce his *mushtarawāt* or other personal expenses such as maintenance costs of the Royal Court and rewards given to his cohorts. In other words, Barqūq established the two *dīwāns* based on the official and private assets he had acquired during the years of his amirate, placing them outside the framework of the traditional financial machinery of the government. He did this for the purpose of overcoming the contemporary political and financial problems he faced. Based on this, we can say that Barqūq's establishment of the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* and subsequent unification of the managements of his *milk*, *waqf* and

dhakhīra were not revolutionary tactics of financial administration, but rather an organized means of securing his private revenue sources that were distinct from the state finances. The use of this method was widespread among the Mamluk military elite of the time, given the contemporary context wherein the traditional financial system of the Mamluk state was dysfunctional.³²

In the following chapter, we attempt to examine the realities of Barqūq's private property more closely, through an analysis of archival sources.

II. The Realities of Barqūq's Private Property: An Analysis of the Deeds

1. The Assets

The archival collection that contains the *waqf* deeds, sales contracts, etc., of the Mamluk era is kept in the National Archive (*Dār al-Wathā'iq al-Qawmīya*) and the Ministry of *Waqf* (*Wizārat al-Awqāf*) in Cairo. The archives contain seven documents concerning Barqūq, including the primary *waqf* deed of the Zāhirīya madrasa.³³ Assets recorded in these deeds are listed in Table 1 according to the date of their acquisition or endowment. There were thirty-three assets, twenty-six of which were turned into *waqf* properties. The assets comprised agricultural lands; urban estates such as public baths, houses, caravansaries, and stables; and various other holdings such as an oil press and a waterwheel and its equipments. However, these might be just a part of Barqūq's assets, and we cannot regard these deeds as listing all his property.

These assets are classified according to their sites in Table 2. This table indicates that the objects located in Egypt occupied about seventy percent of all holdings (twenty-three of thirty-three), and most of them were located in Cairo (fifteen) or its suburbs (three). There were also a certain number of the assets located in the two Syrian provinces of Damascus and Aleppo, both in the provincial capitals as well as in other areas.

In Table 3, these assets are classified into three categories: agricultural land, urban estates, and others. From this table, we can see that the total number of urban estates was twenty, double that of agricultural lands (ten); in particular, all the assets located in Egypt were urban estates, with the exception of three agricultural lands. Nonetheless, we cannot simply state that Barqūq was not interested in the acquisition of agricultural lands, since the conclusions arrived at from the table were based on the data from extant documents only. According to Table 4, which lists the tax districts in Egypt classified as "Barqūq's *waqf*" on the basis of *Tuhfa*, the agricultural land of Barqūq's *waqf* in Egypt comprised sixteen districts with annual revenues estimated at a minimum of 80,800 *dinārs*

jayshī. However, only two districts from among them are found in the descriptions of the deeds (nos. 5, 15). Moreover, although the table shows that nine districts of Barqūq's *waqf* were located in the province of al-Fayyūm, the deeds contain no reference to a landholding possessed by Barqūq in this province, neither as *milk* nor as *waqf*. The *Tuhfa* cannot help us identify the beneficiaries of the *awqāf*. Based on the fact that Barqūq established *awqāf* for various purposes in addition to those whose deeds are still extant,³⁴ we could assume that these *waqf* properties were dedicated to beneficiaries other than those stipulated in the deeds.

2. The Process for Accumulating Property

i) The dates of acquisition/endowment of property

According to the deeds, Barqūq acquired property or endowed *awqāf* fourteen times; I have arranged these instances in chronological order with a brief explanation of the prevailing situation (see Table 5). This table shows that Barqūq acquired or endowed the property as *waqf* once when he was an atabak, five times during his first sultanate, eight times during his second sultanate, and more frequently as he approached the later years of his reign. This trend corresponds with the previously discussed findings obtained from the analysis of the chronicles. As the table indicates, it is natural that most acquisitions or endowments were made during relatively peaceful times. I will cite a characteristic case: Barqūq acquired a village on 7 Jumādā al-Ūlā 792/23 April 1390, only three months after his restoration to the sultanate on 14 Şafar 792/1 February 1390 (no. 7). He went on to endow it as *waqf* when the rebellion of Amir Miñtāsh, the cause of his temporary dethronement, was drawing to a close (no. 8). Acquisitions such as these clearly prove that Barqūq was directing his efforts toward the creation of his private property immediately after his restoration to the sultanate. In addition to these, he endowed many assets as *waqf* properties in the month following his return to Cairo, after Miñtāsh's revolt was successfully suppressed through the military expedition to Syria (no. 9). Let us consider another example: he additionally endowed his madrasa with some assets in Syria and Cairo on 6 Jumādā al-Ūlā 796/9 March 1394. According to the chronicle, on this day, he was near Gaza en route to Syria for the expedition against Timūr (Tamerlane) (no. 11). His actions were similar to those of Qānşūh al-Ghawri, a later sultan, who was devoted to *waqf* endowments just prior to the encounter with the Ottoman army that brought about the fall of the Mamluk sultanate.³⁵ The actions of these sultans show that they hastened to establish their *awqāf* during emergencies in order to secure their private property and also

to perform good deeds in case they died in battle.

ii) The means of acquisition

Islamic law stated that only a *milk* of which the founder's ownership was legally established could be endowed as *waqf*.³⁶ However, of the twenty-six assets of Barqūq's *waqf*, confirmation of the date or details of passing into possession were available only in the case of nine. Thus, in most cases, it is impossible to know how or when Barqūq acquired these properties. In addition to the nine assets, we can learn the details of the means of acquisition of eight other assets that form part of Barqūq's *amlāk* from the deeds of the purchase contracts or other such documents. Based on the findings, I classified the seventeen assets into three groups based on the means of acquisition. I now present a description of each group.

A) Assets purchased or transferred from others

Barqūq purchased the two caravansaries listed under no. 18 (Table 1) from Timurbughā al-Manjakī,³⁷ and the caravansary listed under no. 27 (Table 1) from the sons of Baktamur al-Sāqī al-Nāṣirī (d. 733/1332);³⁸ assets nos. 28–33 passed into Barqūq's possession through Timurbāy.

Now, let us closely examine Timurbāy's case. He purchased assets nos. 28–33 (WA, j67) from four men on 20 Sha'bān 798/29 May 1396, and then sold them to Barqūq for the same price on 5 Rabī' al-Awwal 799/7 December 1396, only seven months after their purchase. Similarly, a portion of the caravansary no. 28 (WA, j736) was first purchased by Jarkas al-Khalīlī, a prominent amir during the first sultanate of Barqūq,³⁹ as a part of his *milk*, and was inherited by his sons after his death in 791/1389. Subsequently, Jarkas's sons transferred (*intaqala*) it to Timurbāy on 7 Sha'bān 798/16 May 1396; Timurbāy then transferred it to Barqūq on 5 Rabī' al-Awwal 799/7 December 1396.

Of course, we can consider these acquisitions as regular transactions between Barqūq and Timurbāy. However, since Timurbāy surrendered these holdings to Barqūq as soon as he acquired them, it is possible he originally accumulated these assets as an unofficial proxy for Barqūq, with the aim of surrendering them to his master.⁴⁰ Another possibility is that these holdings were actually part of property confiscated from Timurbāy by Barqūq, camouflaged as assets acquired through fair transactions in order to prove the legality of the latter's ownership. This was similar to the method adopted by Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī. According to C. F. Petry, almost all the names of people listed in the deeds as those who had surrendered assets to al-Ghawrī were found in the narrative sources as those whose assets had been confiscated.⁴¹ However, a lack

of definite information on Timurbāy prevents us from delving deeper into this issue.

B) The purchase or diversion of the state's property

The sultans in the Circassian Mamluk period often converted state lands into their own *waqf* properties without depositing the payments for these lands into the state treasury. For instance, in the *waqf* deeds of Sultans al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq (r. 842–57/1438–53), al-Ashraf Īnāl (r. 857–65/1453–60), and Qāyṭbāy, we find a confirmation of the legality of the diversion of the lands from the state treasury into the sultans' *waqf* properties.⁴² In some cases, the sultans designated the lands after they purchased them from the state treasury as *waqf* properties.⁴³ Although opinion was divided over the legality of the diversion of state land into the sultans' own *awqāf* or the sultans' purchase of the state property for their own use,⁴⁴ the sultans used this method throughout the Circassian Mamluk period.

In the case of Barqūq's *waqf*, judging from the closing remarks in his *waqf* deed (DW, 9/51), which imply that his *waqf* property contained assets acquired from the state treasury, it is clear that he also diverted a part of the state property into his *waqf*. Furthermore, he acquired the caravansary (no. 19, Table 1) from a *wakīl bayt al-māl* (agent of the state treasury). If we recall the underlined parts of the quotation describing the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* (given earlier in this paper), it seems reasonable to suppose that the claim that Barqūq allocated lands "he labeled as private" to this *dīwān* refers to Barqūq's conversion of the state lands into his *amlāk*. In fact, in one instance, Barqūq converted an *iqṭā'* land, possessed by an amir, into his *milk*.⁴⁵ From these facts, it seems quite probable that the deeds contain little reference to the means of acquisition of *waqf* properties because a large number of them had originally belonged to the state. As supporting evidence, most of the agricultural lands of Barqūq's *waqf* listed in Table 4 (thirteen of sixteen) originally belonged to the financial bureau of the state (six) or to *iqṭā'*s (seven). Although it is not clear as to whether these lands, which belonged to the state treasury, were directly converted into his *waqf* property or were handed over to others before Barqūq acquired them, Barqūq's establishment of *waqf* was, as it turned out, one of the factors that led to the encroachment on and decrease of state land in the period under consideration.

C) The other methods of acquisition

In another case, Barqūq acquired a part of the inheritance of Amir Īnāl, *atābak al-'asākīr* of his second sultanate.⁴⁶ Based on the data available in the deeds, it is not possible to trace the process by which Barqūq acquired it. However, based on the fact that Amir Īnāl was placed under house arrest during the final years of

his life because of the antagonism between him and Barqūq and the rumor that Īnāl was killed by poisoning,⁴⁷ it is quite likely that Barqūq confiscated Īnāl's property after the latter's death.

In the other case, Barqūq acquired the assets that had already been designated as *awqāf* through the means of *istibdāl* (exchange of a *waqf* property for another asset).⁴⁸ Despite the fact that *istibdāl* had hitherto rarely been carried out because of its uncertain legality, it grew widespread until the period around Barqūq's accession to the sultanate, during which *awqāf* were increasing.⁴⁹ Barqūq also adopted this "new stratagem" to acquire private property.

iii) The agent (*wakīl*)

Barqūq did not always engage personally in the acquisition of assets by himself—in some cases, he acquired the property through an agent. Table 6 lists the names of Barqūq's agents found in the deeds, and their careers have been verified on the basis of the narrative sources. First, we shall pay attention to the case of Ibn Tankiz (no. 4). He was the first director of the *Dīwān al-Amlāk* in 797/1395, as stated earlier; later, he was referred to as general-director of the *Dīwān al-Amlāk wa-al-Awqāf wa-al-Dhakhira*, at the time when he was dismissed from the office in Sha'bān 799/May 1397. Thus, the descriptions in the deed provide evidence that the appointee to this post would actually undertake the work of accumulation of assets for Barqūq. In addition, Amir Qurqmās (no.1) and 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī al-Karakī (no. 2) were also close associates of Barqūq. These facts prove that the individuals close to Barqūq participated in the latter's private financial policy.

As has been noted, Barqūq used all possible means—including some questionable means whereby he abused his authority as sultan—to accumulate various kinds of property throughout Egypt and Syria, the legality of which was debatable. However, we should not regard Barqūq's adoption of such a financial policy for his private property as his greed; rather, I would like to emphasize again that the prevailing political circumstances (as explained earlier) required him to hold private revenue sources in order to secure his regime.

In that case, how was the property acquired by the sultan by taking advantage of his authority dealt with after his death? Specifically, was this property inherited by his descendants and termed as "family property," providing a permanent financial basis for their lives? These questions will be considered in the next chapter.

III. Dealing with the Property after the Death of Barqūq

1. *Milk*

Upon the death of Barqūq in 801/1399, his son Faraj succeeded to the sultanate. At this time, a question arose about the vast hoard of money and wealth that Barqūq had left behind in his treasury; like ordinary private property, would it be inherited by the heirs, i.e., Faraj and others, or would it be conveyed to the state treasury because it essentially belonged to the state? Ibn Ḥajar's account reads as follows:

On 17 Dhū al-Qa'da (801/21 July 1399), a conference with *Shaykh al-Islām* and the judges was held in the presence of the *atābak al-'asākir*. They were asked whether the property Barqūq left in the treasury should be inherited by his heirs or whether the property belonged to the state treasury. (*Shaykh al-Islām*) al-Bulqīnī⁵⁰ said, "The incomes from his (Barqūq's) *iqṭā'* or trades are for his heirs. Except for them, [everything] belongs to the state treasury." But [when] he was told [in reply] that these (Barqūq's assets) were [all] mixed together, he answered, "Allot a part of them to his heirs." They voiced different opinions [about the share of the allotment to the heirs], ranging from one-third to one-sixth. [According to another version,] al-Bulqīnī said, "Allot one-fifth [of the property] to them." However, [the veracity of] this [claim] is uncertain.⁵¹

This indicates that the property Barqūq left behind was not regarded as wholly private; furthermore, a major part of it was confiscated for the state treasury. Based on these circumstances, it is highly probable that the real estates owned by Barqūq, especially farmlands, were also expropriated and added to the state land as tax revenue sources for the government or reallocated to amirs as *iqṭā'*s. Such a confiscation of the sultanic property proves that the holdings included not only the estates he acquired in the capacity of an individual but also those originally belonging to the state treasury, which he had diverted into his private holdings by taking advantage of his position as sultan, as we have discussed earlier. Consequently, despite Faraj's accession to the sultanate, he was prevented from inheriting his father's private property, which was a part of his power base. One of the reasons he failed to claim his inheritance might be that he was a very young sultan and therefore did not have any real power when he was first enthroned. However, in view of the fact that the properties of other powerful mamluk amirs were usually confiscated and added to the state treasury after their death,⁵² it is not surprising that the sultan, enthroned as the "principal Mamluk" originally standing on an equal footing with other amirs, was no

exception to this rule. This rule of inheritance and confiscation can be explained by the political structure of the Circassian Mamluks that never fully accepted the principle of inherited position.

2. *Waqf*

It is widely accepted that assets designated as *waqf* properties were not easily confiscated, and therefore, *waqf* endowments were used as a means to safeguard their inheritance against confiscations. For example, based on an analysis of *waqf* deeds, L. Reinfandt suggests that Sultan al-Ashraf Īnāl's *waqf* actually performed such a role.⁵³ Through an investigation of Barqūq's *waqf* regulations with regard to beneficiaries and administratorship as stipulated in the deed, we will now examine the role Barqūq expected his *waqf* to play after his death. Next, using the chronicles, we will examine whether or not his expectations were actually fulfilled.

i) The regulation described in the *waqf* deeds

The *waqf* deed of the Zāhirīya madrasa stipulated that the surplus *waqf* income—after the current expenditure incurred on maintenance and the purchase of equipment for the madrasa, personnel expenses for teachers, students, sufīs, clerical staff, and so on—would be divided among Barqūq's descendants. In addition to this, Barqūq established another single *waqf* for his descendants, although it was on a small scale (WA, j51). Based on these facts, it is clear that Barqūq established his *awqāf*, expecting them to yield a steady profit for his descendants after his death. Adopting such a regulation of expenditure was not limited to the *awqāf* belonging to Barqūq or the other sultans, but was widely practiced during the Mamluk period.⁵⁴

We can obtain information on the administrators of Barqūq's *awqāf*, only from the deed of the Zāhirīya madrasa. The regulation with regard to the assumption of the office of *waqf* administrator (*nāzir, mutawallī*)⁵⁵ enacted in 788/1386, at the time of his first *waqf* establishment, is described below: Barqūq himself occupied the post during his lifetime and he could name another person as deputy. After his death, the post would be filled by one of his male descendants. In the case of the extinction of descendants or the absence of people qualified for the task from among them, one of the amirs of one hundred would assume the post in the following order of priority: *ra's nawbat al-umarā' al-jamdārīya al-kabīr*⁵⁶ > *dawādār kabīr* (executive secretary) > *ḥājib al-ḥujjāb* (grand chamberlain), in cooperation with *kātib al-sirr* (chief secretary), who was the head of the civil officers, and the Ḥanafī shaykh of the madrasa. If, for some

reason, these amirs were unable to take charge of the task, these two civilians undertook the task in cooperation with the man best qualified for the task, chosen from among the amirs who were originally Barqūq's emancipated slaves (i.e., mamluks). If such amirs were also extinct, only the two civilians were to be responsible for the task. At the same time, the amir entrusted with the task of administratorship was obliged to name "the most learned man among the Ḥanafī 'ulamā' (intellectuals) in Egypt" as deputy in order to entrust the administrative work as the *waqf* administrator to the latter. One of the means of *waqf* endowment, widely practiced during the period under consideration, was the formulation of a regulation that ensured that the *wāqif* himself was installed as administrator of his *waqf* during his lifetime, and that his descendants succeeded to the post. This made it possible for *wāqifs* and their descendants to retain possession of the *waqf*-endowed property as virtual "family fortunes."⁵⁷

The revised regulation regarding the *waqf* administrator was written on the reverse of the deed document. Although the date of the revision is not clear, due to the damaged state of the document, it is reasonable to suppose that this is the regulation revised by Barqūq in 798/1395, when he began to actively manage his *waqf*. According to descriptions, the regulation was revised as follows: It was provided that the post of *nāzir* would be occupied by the following five amirs of one hundred in order of: *ra's nawbat al-umarā' al-jamdārīya al-kabīr* > *amīr majlis* (amir of the council) > *dawādār kabīr* > *amīr ākhūr* (amir of the stable) > *ḥājib al-ḥujjāb*. In each case, the *kātib al-sirr* and the Ḥanafī shaykh of the madrasa cooperated with the selected official, as in the former regulation. However, the regulation about Barqūq's descendants' assumption of office as *nāzir* was abolished. In addition to this, all amirs who assumed the post were prohibited from appointing deputies against the former regulation. With regard to the *mutawallī*, it was prescribed that the sultan himself would fill the post.

The revisions can be summarized as follows: first, the former regulation concerning Barqūq's descendants' assumption of office as *waqf* administrator was abolished; second, the *waqf* administratorship was divided into the two posts of *nāzir* and *mutawallī*, and the sultan's powers of supervision over the *waqf* were strengthened through his assumption of the latter post; third, two amirs (*amīr majlis* and *amīr ākhūr*) were added to the list of amirs who would be the administrators and they were required to undertake the task by themselves, resulting in the reduction of the role of the 'ulamā' in *waqf* administration; fourth, the stipulation that amirs from among Barqūq's mamluks would be the administrator was withdrawn. These revisions appear to reduce the influence of Barqūq's descendants over the *waqf*, while, at the same time, strengthening the

control of the Mamluk ruling elite, either the sultans or amirs, over the *waqf*. Such a pattern of regulations regarding *waqf* administratorship was quite unique to Barqūq's *waqf*; to the best of my knowledge, no other *awqāf* had similar regulations in Mamluk Egypt.

Why then did Barqūq to revise the original regulation in a way that seemed to destroy the benefits his descendants' would desire? One possibility is that this amendment was related to Barqūq's policy against the increase of *waqf* land. Throughout his rule, Barqūq intervened actively in the *waqf* administrations, which had heretofore been under the *qādīs*' authority. He did this by conducting detailed checks on the financial management of *waqf*-financed institutions and dispatching special administrators appointed from among his mamluks to the institutions that had fallen into financial difficulties.⁵⁸ Barqūq repeatedly summoned councils in order to discuss the problem of the increase of *waqf* land when this problem, which arose late in the Bahri Mamluk period, was heavily impacting the *iqṭā'* system and the traditional state structure based on it.⁵⁹ These actions by Barqūq prove that he devoted consistent efforts to place *awqāf* under governmental control, which had hitherto been limited because the *awqāf* were "religious trusts." From this point of view, it can be said that Barqūq intended to change the manner of *waqf* administration through the amendment of the regulation regarding *waqf* administratorship: apart from the fact that Barqūq exploited *waqf* incomes during his lifetime, the *waqf* would be maintained under governmental control after his death. Furthermore, if Barqūq, who had by then entered the twilight of his reign, believed that his descendants would succeed to the sultanate as the "Barqūqid Sultanate"—family dynasty—in place of the Qalāwūnid Sultanate to which he himself had put an end, the idea that the new regulation, which appointed the sultan as a *mutawallī* of his *waqf*, to secure his descendants' authority to participate in the *waqf* management, is not too far from the truth.

ii) The actual state of Barqūq's *waqf* after his death

However, was the new regulation strictly observed in actuality? Consequently, was Barqūq's intention realized? The fact that his descendants argued over the right to receive stipends from the *waqf* in 877/1472⁶⁰ proves that the payment of stipends from the *waqf* income to Barqūq's descendants continued, although the reign of Barqūq's family dynasty ended as early as 815/1412, when Faraj was assassinated. Moreover, the Zāhiriya madrasa seemed to be operating smoothly, without any financial difficulties. Viewed in this light, Barqūq's *waqf* was well preserved, and the two purposes of his *waqf* endowment—maintaining the

madrasa and yielding benefits to his descendants—were achieved.

Nevertheless, we should not simply believe that the abovementioned *waqf* regulations were strictly followed or that the *waqf* income was spent only for these two purposes. The scanty activity of Barqūq's descendants after Faraj's death proves that they did not gain profits in proportion to the scale of the *waqf*. Thus, we cannot assume that all surplus of the *waqf* income was distributed among Barqūq's descendants, in keeping with the regulation. Furthermore, according to the chronicles, the actual *waqf* administrators were not appointed in the manner stipulated by the abovementioned regulation. In Şafar 824/February 1421, Amir Taghribirdī, the current *amīr ākhūr* (the fourth candidate in line to head the administration as stipulated by the regulation), was installed as the *nāzīr* of the Zāhirīya madrasa, despite the fact that there were other amirs, such as the *amīr majlis* and *dawādār kabīr*, who had stronger claims to the *waqf* administratorship.⁶¹ Taghribirdī's immediate successor to the post of *amīr ākhūr* was also appointed as the *nāzīr* of the *waqf* on 27 Dhū al-Ḥijja/23 December of the same year.⁶² Moreover, when the new *amīr ākhūr* was appointed in Şafar 853/April 1449, "the *khil'as* for several (*waqf*) *nāzīrs*," including that meant for the *nāzīr* of the Zāhirīya madrasa, were given to him, i.e., he was appointed to these additional posts.⁶³ This instance proves that the custom of the *amīr ākhūr*'s appointment as *nāzīr* of the Zāhirīya madrasa had been established by this time. On the other hand, the stipulation that the sultan would assume the office as *mutawallī* of the *waqf* seems to have been ignored, because there are no signs to indicate that the successive sultans were participating actively in the administration of Barqūq's *waqf* in the position as *mutawallī*.

What do such instances imply? Let us examine in some more detail the first case of the *amīr ākhūr*'s appointment as *nāzīr* of the *waqf* in 824/1421. In Muḥarram of that year, following the death of Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh (r. 815–24/1412–21), who had a stable reign that lasted for about eight and a half years, his son Aḥmad succeeded to the sultanate as Sultan al-Muẓaffar Aḥmad. However, Amir Ṭaṭar, who was to become Sultan al-Zāhir Ṭaṭar (r. 824/1421), held the reins of government under Aḥmad's nominal sultanate. At the time, a military conflict was brewing because Ṭaṭar's regency was barely accepted by prominent amirs who were then on a military expedition to Northern Syria. These circumstances required Ṭaṭar to distribute a great deal of money and other valuables to the amirs and mamluks who supported him and, finally, within less than a year of his leadership, he exhausted Shaykh's reserves from the treasury (*khizāna*).⁶⁴ In such an emergency, when Ṭaṭar appointed the *amīr ākhūr* as *nāzīr* of the Zāhirīya madrasa and also appointed the *dawādār kabīr* as *nāzīr* of al-

Madrasa al-Mu'ayyadīya,⁶⁵ *ra's nawbat al-nuwab* as *nāzīr* of *al-Khānqāh al-Shaykhūniya*,⁶⁶ and the *ḥājib al-ḥujjāb* as *nāzīr* of the mosques of 'Amr and Azhar. Similarly, the appointments of the amirs of one hundred as such *nāzīrs* were made when Ṭaṭar was enthroned to the sultanate in Shawwāl of 824/1421, and also in Dhū al-Ḥijja under the regency of Amir Barsbāy (the future Sultan al-Ashraf Barsbāy) after the sudden death of Ṭaṭar and the subsequent enthronement of his son Muḥammad (al-Ṣāliḥ Muḥammad).⁶⁷ All these were major *waqf*-financed religious institutions in Cairo, holding a huge amount of *waqf* property as their revenue sources. In other words, these posts were expected to yield tremendous financial benefit to the appointees. Viewed in this light, it seems quite probable that both Ṭaṭar and Barsbāy made such appointments for the purpose of providing financial benefits to the amirs who supported them during the period of political crisis. In any case, the appointees to these high-ranking military offices were thereafter installed as the *nāzīrs* of these *awqāf*; Barqūq's *waqf* also came under the jurisdiction of the successive *amīr ākhūrs*, who came to have a vested right to the post.

Conclusion

Under the prevailing conditions wherein amirs alienated, privatized, and then accumulated state lands, Barqūq also strived to secure his own private source of revenue. In this respect, the state of the private finances and the private financial policies of Barqūq and the other amirs were similar. However, by dint of his accession to the sultanate, it was possible for Barqūq to divert state funds into his private purse. Nevertheless, I believe that Barqūq's private property had "one-generation rights" similar to that of the sultanate itself, which did not follow a hereditary system and was succeeded by prominent Mamluk amirs in the Circassian Mamluk era. Incidentally, the sultans after Barqūq followed his policy of private finance. Thus, I would like to emphasize that their private properties had the same characteristics as those of Barqūq, although they employed dubious means of property acquisition—such as the diversion of state property, confiscation, and *istibdāl*—more freely and frequently, allowing them to establish *awqāf* on a much larger scale. The progress of the alienation and waqfization of state lands during that period, which has recently been brought to light by several studies, was caused by the inclination shared by the Mamluk ruling elite, including sultans and amirs, to accumulate private properties.⁶⁸ However, we must not forget that this inclination has to be viewed in the overall context: the sultans were required to adopt such policies in order to maintain

their regimes against the malfunctioning of the *iqṭā'* system and the traditional state structure based on it; which resulted from the state land problem. Such a "vicious spiral" increased the sultans' reliance on their private properties. Consequently, the term "*dhakhīra*" (mentioned earlier in the text) became the general term for various kinds of financial resources placed under the direct control of the sultan, in keeping with the expansion of *dhakhīra*'s role in the state administration such as the fair management of the public finances and the distribution of *iqṭā'*s. Although questions about the historical development of *dhakhīra* and the prevailing political and state structure will be examined further in another article currently in preparation, it must be noted that Qāyṭbāy's and Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī's financial policies (mentioned in the introduction) followed as an extension of that of their predecessors.

Thus, it became essential for the successive sultans to maintain a large-scale private property. However, this raises another question that we must consider next: how and by whom were these properties that were turned into *awqāf* managed after the sultan died? In the case of Barqūq's *waqf*, I have discussed the possibility that it became the financial interest of the *amīr ākhūr*. Similarly, there were many examples of *waqf* administratorships combined with specific official posts.⁶⁹ Amirs who occupied high government posts could simultaneously acquire the additional posts of "the *nāzīrs* [of several *awqāf*] relating to the [government] post."⁷⁰ In the sense that these rights and interests were combined with the government posts, we can regard these *awqāf* in the same light as *iqṭā'*s; however, this leaves unanswered the question of how far they could actually exploit the *awqāf* under their control. Nevertheless, it seems quite probable that under the prevailing conditions, wherein the *iqṭā'* system—the fundamental basis of the Mamluk regime—was becoming increasingly dysfunctional due to the progress of the waqfization of properties in both rural and urban areas, seizing the properties turned into *awqāf* through the acquisition of *waqf* administratorships was vital for the Mamluk military elite to maintain their economic power and social importance. Further research on the sultans after Barqūq as well as on what and how much impact waqfization had on the state and society is essential to confirm this hypothesis. This gives rise to the question about another issue—the radical transformation of the nature of the Mamluk regime.

Notes

¹ He made a rough calculation of the total incomes from their *waqf* properties and the expenditures for designated charities as described in the documents, such as maintenance and operating expenses of their madrasas. Consequently, he found that there were large discrepancies between the two; in each case, only seven percent or at maximum fourteen percent of the entire income was spent on charitable purposes. Based on this finding, Petry suggests that the remainder was used for the sultan's personal expenditure because its management was left to the *waqf* administrator's discretion, and this post was held by the original *wāqif* (founder), namely, the sultan himself (Petry 1994, 199–200, 202–203).

² Cf. Amin 1980, 70–98.

³ Amin 1980, 119–121; Sabra 2000, 72; Ito 2003, 62.

⁴ It is of course impossible to draw a sharp line between public matters and private matters with regard to the properties held by the sultans. However, I will use the term "sultan's private property" to refer to the property acquired by the sultan for his own use through various means and managed by an organization and staff independent of the official financial institutions of the government. These properties, especially the real estates that provided steady and reliable incomes to the holders through rental fees and were easily distinguishable from the state property, will be the main object of this study. In this sense, the "private property" referred to in this article includes not only *amlāk* (sing. *milk*), i.e., property that is privately owned in the legal sense of the term, but also the properties designated as *awqāf* by the sultans. This is because since the *wāqif*s generally took charge of the administration of these properties in the capacity of *waqf* administrators, it is possible to interpret that these properties remained in their "possession."

⁵ Rabie 1972, 143–144.

⁶ Little 1998, 235–253.

⁷ However, the *Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ* lost its position as the bureau in charge of the management of the sultan's "private property" during the period after al-Nāṣir's death, wherein the sultans began losing real power. In particular, with the establishment of the amirs' council system, which began operating the state administration and finances in 748/1347, the sultan's private treasury also became subject to the jurisdiction of the amirs (al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 2, 750–751). Later, the *Dīwān al-Khāṣṣ* became a financial bureau of the government, which obtained its incomes from taxes levied in Alexandria and other coastal ports on the Mediterranean and undertook the responsibility of covering expenses for the two feasts (*'Īdayn*, *khil'as* (robes of honor), etc. For details on the role and resources of this *dīwān*, see al-Zāhiri, *Zubda*, 197–109; Martel-Thoumian 1992, 49–53.

⁸ Land purchases: Ibn Ḥabīb, *Tadhkira*, Vol. 3, 240. *Waqf*: Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *al-Durar al-Kāmina*, Vol. 2, 125. He acquired these farmlands through the purchase or occupancy of state lands (*amlāk bayt al-māl*) (Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, Vol. 14, 291; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh*, Vol. 3, 181; al-Kutubi, *'Uyūn*, fol. 153r). For example, in 760/1359, he was unsuccessful in his endeavor to purchase Syrian farmlands from the state treasury and convert them into *waqf* properties (Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh*, Vol. 3, 146). Al-'Aynī described him as a person who "preferred to collect money (*māl*)" (al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 66v).

⁹ Unit expressing the amount of tax revenues obtained from farmland. The highest *'ibra* of *iqṭā'* belonging to the highest-ranking amir of one hundred (*amir mi'a muqaddam alf*) was 100,000 *dinārs jayshi*. See Sato 1997, 154–156.

¹⁰ In addition to these lands that he owned, there were sixty-one districts assigned to the *iqṭā'*s of his ten infant sons and relatives. Cf. Haarmann 1984, 153–154.

¹¹ *Waqf* Deed, Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'bān, 65–85. Moreover, he stipulated in the *waqf* deed that the surplus of the *waqf* income, after the expenditure on Mecca, would be transferred to himself or his descendants, in the event of his death (ibid. 253–254).

¹² Cf. Levanoni 1994, 383–385. For details on the political system in the late Bahri Mamluk period, see Igarashi 2008.

¹³ al-Şafadi, *A'yān*, Vol. 2, 535; al-Kutubī, *Uyūn*, fol. 162v; al-Maqrizī, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 262; Ibn Taghribirdī, *Manhal*, Vol. 6, 260.

¹⁴ al-Maqrizī, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 764; idem, *Sulūk*, Vol. 2, 898.

¹⁵ al-Kutubī, *Uyūn*, fols. 155v–156r; *Waqf* Deed, Amir Şarghitmish, 12–13, 17–19.

¹⁶ An example is that of Atabak Yalbughā al-Khāṣṣakī, who assassinated Sultan Ḥasan and assumed power in 762/1361 and also accumulated immense wealth (Ibn Ḥabīb, *Tadhkira*, Vol. 3, 301). *Waqf* Deed no. j53 is a deed of his purchase of estates, and nos. j54 and j732 are deeds of his *awqāf*. Uljāy al-Yusufi who assumed office as atabak in 774/1372 also founded a madrasa and endowed it with assets (al-Maqrizī, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 615–616).

¹⁷ Igarashi 2006, 120–123.

¹⁸ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 354, 386; Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm*, Vol. 11, 76, 170; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 1, 26.

¹⁹ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 229, 262; Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm*, Vol. 11, 128, 141; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 3, 493.

²⁰ Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 4, 41–42; al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 938.

²¹ al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, Vol. 3, 453.

²² al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, Vol. 4, 32.

²³ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 402. There is another description indicating that he leased a sugar boiler in Cairo (Ibn Duqmāq, *Intiṣār*, Vol. 4, 45–46).

²⁴ Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 128, 429; al-Şayrafī, *Nuzha*, Vol. 2, 28; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 4, 48.

²⁵ Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 132; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 1, 286; al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 651.

²⁶ For information on this madrasa, see al-Maqrizī, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 679–688; al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn*, Vol. 2, 271; Mostafa 1982. The construction of this madrasa began on 24 Rajab 786/11 September 1384 (al-Şayrafī, *Nuzha*, Vol. 1, 100) and finished on 3 Rajab 788/31 July 1386 (al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 125r; Ibn Duqmāq, *Jawhar*, Vol. 2, 265). According to the *waqf* deed, Barqūq established the *waqf* on 6 Sha'bān/12 September of the same year (see Table 1).

²⁷ al-Maqrizī, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 686.

²⁸ al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 138v.

²⁹ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 834; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 1, 549; Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 406.

³⁰ Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 427.

³¹ Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 464; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, Vol. 1, 616. cf. al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 878; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 1, 528.

³² For details on Barqūq's efforts to rebuild the state finances and the establishment of *al-Diwān al-Mufrad*, see Igarashi 2006, 124–127.

³³ DW, 9/51: the deed of the *waqf* benefiting the Zāhiriya madrasa and Barqūq's descendants. WA, j51: the deed of the *waqf* benefiting his descendants. WA, j67: the purchase deed. WA, j704: the deed of the *waqf* of which beneficiaries are unknown. WA, j736: the deed of transfer. WA, j562: the deed of transfer and *istibdāl* (exchange). WA, j728: the deed of purchase and the *waqf* established by Barqūq's sister. Mostafa 1982 includes the partial edition of DW, 9/51; and Renard 1998 is an abridged translation of the provisions concerning the staff of the Zāhiriya madrasa, such as teachers, students, and clerical workers, specified in the deed of DW, 9/51.

³⁴ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 944.

³⁵ Amin 1980, 98.

³⁶ For details on the legal doctrine of the *waqf*, see Peters 2000.

³⁷ He was an amir of forty (*amir tabikhāna*) at the time. Al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fols. 109r, 162v.

³⁸ This caravansary was constructed by Amir Baktamur and was inherited by his descendants after his death. Barqūq purchased this at the price of 250,000 dirhams (Ibn Duqmāq, *Intiṣār*, Vol. 4, 40).

³⁹ For further information on Jarkas al-Khalili, see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫh*, vol. 1, 308.

⁴⁰ According to Petry, the deeds contain many references to the fact that the *amir khazā'in* (treasurer) Khayrbak al-Sharifi sold assets to al-Ghawri totaling over a hundred, and the total sum of the price amounted to 32,000 dinars during the ten years from 910/1504–5 to 920/1514–5. Petry regards Khayrbak as al-Ghawri's partner in the latter's acquisition of private properties and also regards the price mentioned as Khayrbak's commission for doing the job because the real value of these assets was far greater than the price paid to Khayrbak (Petry 1994, 205).

⁴¹ Petry 1994, 204–205.

⁴² The case of Jaqmaq: DW, 17/109, dated 22 Ramaḍān 853. The case of Īnāl: Reinfandt (ed.), 141, 148, 153, 154; Reinfandt 2002, 55; The case of Qāyṭbāy: WA, q886, 8; Mayer (ed.), 4.

⁴³ The case of al-Nāṣir Faraj (r. 801–08, 808–15/1399–1405, 1405–12): WA, j68. The case of al-Ashraf Barsbāy (r. 825–42/1422–38): Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3, 477–479.

⁴⁴ Cf. Cuno 1999, 136–163; Igarashi 2007, 443–470 (021–048).

⁴⁵ Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 433.

⁴⁶ WA, j562, v., dated 27 Jumādā al-Ūlā 795.

⁴⁷ Ibn Taghribirdī, *Manhal*, Vol. 3, 189–194.

⁴⁸ WA, j562, v., dated 6 Jumādā al-Ākhira 795. Cf. al-Maqrizī, *Khīṭaṭ*, Vol. 3, 225; idem, *Sulūk*, Vol. 2, 362; Abū Ḥamid al-Qudsi, *Fawā'id*, 16; Amin 1980, 344. For details on the *istibdāl* in Mamluk Cairo, see al-Khawri 2000; Fernandes 2000.

⁴⁹ According to al-Maqrizī's *Sulūk*, “the *istibdāl* of *awqāf* had not heretofore been in use in Egypt and Syria and the Ḥanafī judges had rejected it prudently and timidly because there was a difference of opinion [about its legality]” until 778/1376–7, just before Barqūq came into power (al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 269). However, Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Malaṭī (d. 803/1400), who was installed as Ḥanafī judge in the last years of Barqūq's sultanate, was criticized because “he was close to sinners, and frequently performed *istibdāl* of *awqāf*” (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 2, 196). Cf. Fernandes 2000, 206–207.

⁵⁰ Sirāj al-Dīn 'Umar al-Bulqīni (d. 805/1403). See al-Sakhīwī, *Ḍaw'*, Vol. 6, 85–90.

⁵¹ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 2, 53.

⁵² Cf. al-Shirbīni 1997, Vol. 1, 144–149. Such a confiscation of inheritance was called *ḥawṭa* in the Mamluk period.

⁵³ Reinfandt 2002, 61.

⁵⁴ Amin 1980, 72–81.

⁵⁵ In Egypt and Syria under the Mamluk sultanate, in general, there was no distinction between *nāzir* and *mutawallī*—both meant *waqf* administrator and were usually mentioned together in the portion of the regulation dealing with *waqf* administratorship.

⁵⁶ In the chronicles, this office was usually referred to as *ra's nawbat al-umarā'*. It was a military post ranked almost on par with that of the *atābak al-'asākir* at this time (Popper 1955, Vol. 1, 91). Note that this office was different from *ra's nawbat al-nuwab* (chief head of guards) mentioned later.

⁵⁷ Amin 1980, 116, 304.

⁵⁸ al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 337, 469, 503, 766; idem, *Khīṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 730–731; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh*, Vol. 1, 59, 106, 461; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 1, 273, 435; al-Ṣayrafī, *Nuzha*, Vol. 1, 66; al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 118r; Amin 1980, 114, 121–122.

⁵⁹ In 780/1379: al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 345–347; Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm*, Vol. 11, 166; al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 104v; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 1, 178–179; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh*, Vol. 3, 580. In 783/1381: al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 443. In 789/1387: Ibn al-Furāt, *Duwal*, Vol. 9, 10–11; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh*, Vol. 1, 218–219; al-Maqrizī, *Sulūk*, Vol. 3, 563; Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm*, Vol. 11, 247; al-'Aynī, *Badr*, fol. 127r-v. Igarashi 2006, 121–124.

⁶⁰ 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī, *Nayl*, Vol. 7, 46–48.

⁶¹ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, Vol. 3, 240. cf. al-'Aynī, *'Iqd*, 130–131; al-

Şayrafî, *Nuzha*, Vol. 2, 499.

⁶² al-Şayrafî, *Nuzha*, Vol. 2, 510, 519; al-'Aynî, *'Iqd*, 164.

⁶³ al-Sakhâwî, *Tibr*, 256.

⁶⁴ al-'Aynî, *'Iqd*, 157–158.

⁶⁵ This is the madrasa founded by Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh. For more information on the madrasa, see al-Suyûṭî, *Husn*, Vol. 2, 272–273.

⁶⁶ This is the *khânqâh* founded by Atabak Shaykhü al-Nâsirî (mentioned earlier). For further details on the *khânqâh*, see al-Maqrîzî, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 760–764; al-Suyûṭî, *Husn*, Vol. 2, 266–267.

⁶⁷ In al-Zâhir Ṭaṭar's sultanate: al-Şayrafî, *Nuzha*, Vol. 2, 510; al-'Aynî, *'Iqd*, 149–150. In Barsbây's regency: al-Şayrafî, *Nuzha*, Vol. 2, 519–520; al-'Aynî, *'Iqd*, 164–165.

⁶⁸ Abū Ghâzî 2000, 115–116, 125; Sabra 2004, 207–208; Igarashi 2006, 120–123, 137–138.

⁶⁹ The aforementioned case in 824/1421 was henceforth followed as usage. In other instances, the *amîr akhûr* held the additional post of the *nâzir of Khânqâh Qawṣûn* (for more information on the *khânqâh*, see al-Maqrîzî, *Khiṭaṭ*, Vol. 4, 778), the *dawādâr kabîr* held that of *al-Jâmi' al-Ashrafî* (see *ibid.* 348), the *ra's nawbat al-nuwab* held that of *al-Madrasa al-Şarḡhitmishiya* (see *ibid.* 647–658), and so on (anon. *Dîwân al-Inshâ'*, fols. 124v, 126r; Ibn Kinnân, *Ḥadâ'iq*, 116–118).

⁷⁰ Ibn Taghribirdî, *Ḥawādith*, Vol. 1, 346, 363; *idem*, *Nujûm*, Vol. 16, 260; al-Sakhâwî, *Tibr*, 122, 256, 425; al-Biqâ'î, *Izhâr*, Vol. 1, 320, 344.

Bibliography

I. Primary Sources

1. Archival Sources

Waqf Deeds:

Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'bân b. Muḥammad b. Qalâwûn: Râshid Sa'd Râshid al-Qaḥṭânî (ed.), *Awqâf al-Sultân al-Ashraf Sha'bân 'alâ al-Ḥaramayn*, Riyad, 1994.

Sultan al-Zâhir Barqûq: Dâr al-Wathâ'iq al-Qawmiya (DW), 9/51; Wizârat al-Awqâf (WA), j51, j67, j562, j704, j728, j736.

Sultan al-Nâşir Faraj b. Barqûq: DW, 11/66; WA, j68.

Sultan al-Zâhir Jaqmaq: DW, 17/109.

Sultan al-Ashraf Īnâl: Lucian Reinfandt (ed.), in his *Mamlukische Sultansstiftungen des 9./15. Jahrhunderts: Nach den Urkunden der Stifter al-Aşraf Īnâl und al-Mu'ayyad Aḥmad Ibn Īnâl*, Berlin, 2003.

Sultan al-Ashraf Qâytbây: WA, q886; Leo A. Mayer (ed.), *The Building of Qâytbây As Described in His Endowment Deed*. London, 1938.

Amir Şarḡhitmish al-Nâşirî Ra's Nawbat al-Umarâ': WA, q3195.

Amir Yalbughâ al-Khâşşakî Atâbak al-'Asâkir: WA, j53, j54; j732: Muḥammad Muḥammad Amin (ed.), in his *Fihrist Wathâ'iq al-Qâhira ḥattâ Nihâyat 'Aşr Salâṭîn al-Mamâlik (239-922 A.H./853-1516 A.D.)*, Cairo, 1981, 423-439.

2. Narrative Sources

'Abd al-Bâsiṭ al-Ḥanafî, Zayn al-Dîn b. Khalîl b. Shâhîn al-Zâhirî (d. 920/1515): *Nayl al-Amal fî Dhayl al-Duwal*. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salâm al-Tadmurî (ed.), 9 vols., Sidon and Beirut, 2002.

Abū Ḥâmid al-Qudṣî (al-Maqdisî), Muḥibb al-Dîn Muḥammad b. Khalîl (d. 888/1483): *Al-Fawâ'id al-Nafisa al-Bâhira fî Bayân Ḥukm Shawâri' al-Qâhira fî Madhâhib al-A'imma al-Arba'a al-Zâhira*. Āmâl al-'Umarî (ed.), Cairo, 1988.

al-'Aynî, Badr al-Dîn Maḥmûd b. Aḥmad (d. 855/1451): *'Iqd al-Jumân fî Ta'rikk Ahl al-Zamân*.

- 'Abd al-Rāziq al-Ṭanṭāwī al-Qarmūṭ (ed.), Cairo, 1989.
- Idem: *Ta'riḫ al-Badr fī Awṣāf Ahl al-'Aṣr*. London, British Library, MS Add. 22350; Toyo Bunko, AH 1620.
- al-Biqā'ī, Ibrāhīm b. 'Umar b. Ḥasan (d. 885/1480): *Izhār al-'Aṣr li-Asrār Ahl al-'Aṣr*. Muḥammad Sālim b. Shadīd al-'Awfī (ed.), 3 vols., Riyad, 1992-93.
- anon. (9/15c): *Diwān al-Inshā'*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Arabe 4439 (known as al-Khālidi's *al-Maqṣad al-Rafī'*).
- Ibn Duqmāq, Ṣārim al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (d. 809/1406): *Al-Jawhar al-Thamīn fī Siyar al-Mulūk wa-al-Salāṭīn*. Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn 'Izz al-Dīn 'Alī (ed.), 2 vols., Beirut, 1985.
- Idem: *Kitāb al-Intiṣār li-Wāsiyat 'Iqd al-Amṣār*. E. Vollers (ed.), vols. 4-5, Cairo, 1893; repr. Beirut, n.d.
- Ibn al-Furāt, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm (d. 807/1405): *Ta'riḫ al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk*. Quṣṭanṭīn Zurayq (ed.), vols. 7-9, Beirut, 1936-42.
- Ibn Ḥabīb, Badr al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. 'Umar al-Ḥalabī (d. 779/1377): *Tadhkirat al-Nabīh fī Ayyām al-Manṣūr wa Banī-hi*. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amin and Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Āshūr (eds.), 3 vols., Cairo, 1976-86.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Alī (d. 852/1449): *Al-Durar al-Kāmina fī A'yān al-Mi'a al-Thāmina*. Muḥammad Sayyid Jād al-Ḥaqq (ed.), 5 vols., Cairo, 1966-67.
- Idem: *Inbā' al-Ghumr bi-Abnā' al-'Umr*. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (ed.), 4 vols., Cairo, 1969-98.
- Ibn al-Ji'ān, Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Shākir (d. 885/1480): *Kitāb al-Tuhfa al-Saniya bi-Asmā' al-Bilād al-Miṣriya*. Cairo, 1898; repr. 1974.
- Ibn Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā' Ismā'il al-Qurashī (d. 774/1373): *Al-Bidāya wa-al-Nihāya*. 14 vols., Beirut, 1966.
- Ibn Kinnān, Muḥammad b. 'Īsā (d. 1153/1740): *Ḥadā'iq al-Yāsmīn fī Dhīkr Qawānīn al-Khulafā' wa-al-Salāṭīn*. 'Abbās Ṣabbāgh (ed.), Beirut, 1991.
- Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, Taqī al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Aḥmad (d. 851/1448): *Ta'riḫ Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba*. 'Adnān Darwish (ed.), 4 vols., Damascus, 1977-97.
- Ibn Taghribirdī, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf al-Atābakī (d. 874/1470): *Ḥawādith al-Duhūr fī madā al-Ayyām wa-al-Shuhūr*. Fahim Muḥammad Shaltūt (ed.), vol. 1, Cairo, 1990.
- Idem: *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa-al-Mustawfī ba'da al-Wāfi*. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amin (ed.), vols. 1-12, Cairo, 1985-2006.
- Idem: *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhira*. Fahim Muḥammad Shaltūt et al. (eds.), 16 vols., Cairo, 1963-72; English tr. by W. Popper, *History of Egypt 1382-1469 A.D.*, 10 vols., Berkeley, 1954-63.
- al-Kutubī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Shākir (d. 764/1363): *Uyūn al-Tawāriḫ*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 2923 (9).
- al-Maqrīzī, Taqī al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad b. 'Alī (d. 845/1442): *Al-Mawā'iz wa-al-I'tibār fī Dhīkr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*. Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid (ed.), 5 vols., London, 2002-04.
- Idem: *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk*, vols. 1-2, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ziyāda (ed.), Cairo, 1939-58, vols. 3-4, Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Āshūr (ed.), Cairo, 1970-73.
- al-Qalqashandī, Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad b. 'Alī (d. 821/1418): *Ṣubḥ al-A'shā fī Ṣinā'at al-Inshā'*. 14 vols., Cairo, 1913-22; repr. 1985.
- al-Ṣafadi, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl b. Aybak (d. 764/1363): *A'yān al-'Aṣr wa A'wān al-Naṣr*. 'Alī Abū Zayd et al. (eds.), 6 vols., Damascus and Beirut, 1998.
- al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad (d. 902/1497): *Al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi' li-Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi'*. 12 vols., Cairo, 1934-37.

- Idem: *Al-Tibr al-Masbūk fī Dhayl al-Sulūk*. Cairo, n.d.
- al-Şayrafī, al-Khaṭīb al-Jawharī 'Alī b. Dāwūd (d. 900/1495): *Nuzhat al-Nufūs wa-al-Abdān fī Tawārikh al-Zamān*. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (ed.), 4 vols., Cairo, 1970-94.
- al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abū Bakr (d. 911/1505): *Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍara fī Ta'rikh Mişr wa-al-Qāhira*. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (ed.), 2 vols., Cairo, 1967-68.
- al-Zāhiri, Ghars al-Dīn Khalil b. Shāhīn (d. 872/1468): *Kitāb Zubdat Kashf al-Mamālik*. Paul Ravaisse (ed.), Paris, 1894; repr. Cairo, 1988.

II. Secondary Works

- Abū Ghāzī, 'Imād Badr al-Dīn 2000: *Taṭawwur al-Ḥiyāza al-Zirā'iya Zaman al-Mamālik al-Jarākisa: Dirāsa fī Bay' Amlāk Bayt al-Māl*. Cairo.
- Amin, Muḥammad M. 1980: *Al-Awqāf wa-al-Ḥayāt al-Ijtimā'iya fī Mişr 648-923 A.H./1250-1517 A.D.*, Cairo.
- Cuno, Kenneth M. 1999: "Ideology and Juridical Discourse in Ottoman Egypt: The Uses of the Concept of Irşād." *Islamic Law and Society* 6 (2), 136-163.
- Fernandes, Leonor 2000: "*Istibdal*: The Game of Exchange and Its Impact on the Urbanization of Mamluk Cairo." in Doris Behrens-Abouseif (ed.), *The Cairo Heritage: Essays in Honor of Laila Ali Ibrahim*, Cairo and New York, 203-222.
- Haarmann, Ulrich 1984: "The Sons of Mamluks as Fief-holders in Late Medieval Egypt." in Tarif Khalidi (ed.), *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East*, Beirut, 141-168.
- Igarashi Daisuke 2006: "The Establishment and Development of al-Diwan al-Mufrad: Its Background and Implications." *Mamluk Studies Review* 10 (1), 117-140.
- Idem. 2007: "Islamic Legal Disputes Concerning the Waqf-Endowment of State-Owned Land between the Twelfth and Sixteenth Centuries." *The Toyo Gakuho: the Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 88 (4), 443-470 (021-048). (in Japanese)
- Idem. 2008: "The Political System in Post al-Nāşir Muḥammad Era: The Formation Process of the Circassian Mamluk Sultanate." *Chuo Journal of Asian History* 32. (in Japanese; Forthcoming)
- Ito Takao 2003: "Aufsicht und Verwaltung der Stiftungen im mamlukischen Ägypten." *Der Islam* 80, 46-66.
- Al-Khawri, Jamāl 2000: *Al-Istibdāl wa Iḡtişāb al-Awqāf: Dirāsa Wathā'iqiya*. Alexandria.
- Levanoni, Amalia 1994: "The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26, 373-392.
- Little, Donald P. 1998: "Notes on the Early *Nazar al-Khāşş*." in T. Philipp and U. Haarmann (eds.), *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*. Cambridge, 235-253.
- Martel-Thoumian, Bernadette 1992: *Les civils et l'administration dans l'État militaire mamlūk (IXe/XVe siècle)*, Damascus.
- Mostafa, Saleh Lamei 1982: *Madrassa, Ḥānqāh und Mausoleum des Barqūq in Kairo*. Glückstadt.
- Peters, R. 2000: "WAQF, I: In Classical Islamic Law." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., Vol. 11, 59-63.
- Petry, Carl F. 1994: *Protectors or Praetorians?: The Last Mamlūk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power*. Albany.
- Idem. 1998: "Fractionalized Estates in a Centralized Regime: The Holdings of al-Ashraf Qāyrbāy and Qānşūh al-Ghawri According to Their Waqf Deeds." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 41 (1), 96-117.
- Idem. 2000: "Waqf as an Instrument of Investment in the Mamluk Sultanate: Security vs. Profit?" in Miura Toru and John Edward Philips (eds.), *Slave Elites in the Middle East and Africa: A*

- The Private Property and *Awqāf* of the Circassian Mamluk Sultans: The Case of Barqūq
Comparative Study, London and New York, 99-115.
- Popper, William 1955-57: *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans 1382-1468: Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicles of Egypt*. 2 vols., Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Rabie, Hassanein 1972: *The Financial System of Egypt A.H. 564-741/ A.D. 1169-1341*, London.
- Renard, John 1998: "Mamluk Sultan Barquq's Waqf." in J. Renard (ed.), *Windows on the House of Islam: Muslim Sources on Spirituality and Religious Life*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 226-331, 398.
- Reinfandt, Lucian 2002: "Religious Endowments and Succession to Rule: The Career of a Sultan's Son in the Fifteenth Century." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 6, 51-62.
- Sabra, Adam 2000: *Poverty and Charity in Medieval Islam: Mamluk Egypt, 1250-1517*, Cambridge.
- Idem. 2004: "The Rise of a New Class? Land Tenure in Fifteenth-Century Egypt: A Review Article." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 8 (2), 203-210.
- Sato Tsugitaka 1997: *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta's and Fallahun*, Leiden.
- al-Shirbīnī, al-Bayyūmī Ismā'īl 1997: *Muṣādarat al-Amlāk fī al-Dawla al-Islāmiya ('Aṣr Salāṭīn al-Mamālik)*, 2 vols., Cairo.

Table 1: Assets Listed in *Waqf* Deeds Issued by Barqūq

| No. | Type | Asset | Location | Prov. | The Date of Acquisition | The Date of Wapf Endowment | Beneficiary | Number of Deed | Notes |
|-----|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | B | Four Pices of Land (qit'at al-arq) and Eleven Stalls (ḥāntū) | Qārā | Sh | 19/4/784 | 6/5/796 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 2 | B | Two Stables (iṣṭabul) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 3 | B | Public Bath (ḥammām) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 4 | B | House (dār) and Stable (iṣṭabul) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 5 | B | House (dār) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 6 | B | Structure (binā') | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 7 | B | Structure (binā') | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 8 | A | Tax District (nāḥiya) | al-Jiza | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 9 | A | Tax District (nāḥiya) | al-Jiza | M | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 10 | A | Village (qarya) | al-Quds | Sh | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 11 | A | Village (qarya) | Wādī al-Taym | Sh | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 12 | A | Village (qarya) | Ludd | Sh | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 13 | A | Village (qarya) | al-Jawlān | Sh | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 14 | A | Land (ḡay'a kharājīya) | Marj Dimashq | Sh | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 15 | A | A portion of a Village (qarya) | Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān | H | – | 6/8/788 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 16 | B | Building (makān) | al-Qāhira | M | 6/3/789 | 12/12/789 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 17 | B | Structure (binā') | Būlāq | M | 6/3/789 | 12/12/789 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 18 | B | Two Caravansaries (khān) | al-Qāhira | M | 2/7/790 | (26/5/795) | Sister/ Madrasa | WA j728 | One of the caravansaries was endowed as <i>waqf</i> by Barqūq's sister Qānqaz. |
| 19 | B | A Portion of a Caravansary (qaysārīya) | Dimashq | Sh | 29/7/790 | 6/5/796 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 20 | A | Village (qarya) | ? | (Sh?) | 7/5/792 | 12/9/792 | Unknown | WA j704 | |
| 21 | B | Hall (qā'a) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 28/2/794 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 22 | B | Structure (binā') | al-Qāhira | M | – | 28/2/794 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 23 | A | Tax District (nāḥiya) | Asyūṭ | M | – | 28/2/794 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 24 | B | A Portion of a House (dār) | al-Qāhira | M | 6/6/795 | – | – | WA j562 | A portion of this asset was acquired through <i>istibdāl</i> . |
| 25 | B | Public Bath (ḥammām) and Hall (qā'a) | al-Qāhira | M | (6/6/795) | 6/6/797 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 WA j562 | A portion of the public bath was acquired through <i>istibdāl</i> . |
| 26 | B | Building (makān) | al-Qāhira | M | – | 6/5/796 | Madrasa | DW 9/51 | |
| 27 | B | Caravansary (khān) | al-Fuṣṭāṭ? | M | 22/7/796 (18/3/797?) | (7/4/797?) | Descendants | WA j51 | Ibn Duqmāq, <i>Intiṣār</i> , Vol. 4, 40. |
| 28 | B | Caravansary (funduq) | al-Qāhira | M | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 WA j736 | |
| 29 | B | Two Mills (ṭāḥūn) | al-Qāhira | M | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 | |
| 30 | C | Oil Press (mi'ṣara) and House (dār) | Ḍawāḥi al-Qāhira | M | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 | |
| 31 | C | Waterwheel (dūlāb) | al-Fayyūm | M | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 | |
| 32 | C | Waterwheel Fixtures (āḥāt al-dūlāb) | al-Fayyūm | M | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 | |
| 33 | B | Caravansary (khān) | Ḥalab | H | 5/3/799 | – | – | WA j67 | |

Property type: A) Agrarian land. B) Urban real estate. C) The Others.
 Province: M) Egypt (Miṣr). Sh) Damascus (al-Shām). H) Aleppo (Ḥalab).
 Date: Day/Month/Year (in Hijri calendar)
 The dates printed in bold type: In the years of Barqūq's amirate and his first sultanate.
 *The detailed location of the village (no. 20) is not clear although it is sure that it was in Syria.

The Private Property and *Awqāf* of the Circassian Mamluk Sultans: The Case of Barqūq

Table 2: Geographic Distribution of the Assets

| | The Capital City | The Suburbs of the Capital | Local Town | Village | Total |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------|---------|-------|
| Egypt | 15 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 23 |
| The Province of Damascus | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4(+1) | 7(+1) |
| The Province of Aleppo | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 17 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 33 |

The figure in parentheses: The asset listed under no.20 in Table 1.

Table 3: Type of Assets

| | Farm Land | Urban Estates | Others | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Egypt | 3 | 17 | 3 | 23 |
| The Province of Damascus | 5(+1) | 2 | 0 | 7(+1) |
| The Province of Aleppo | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 10 | 20 | 3 | 33 |

The figure in parentheses: The asset listed under no.20 in Table 1.

Table 4: Barqūq's *Waqf* Lands Listed in *Tuḥfa*

| No. | U/L | Province (<i>iqlim/a'māl</i>) | Tax District (<i>nāḥiya</i>) | 'Ibra (<i>dinār jayshī</i>) | Original Form of Landholding | Notes |
|-----|-----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | L | al-Qalyūbiya | al-Qashshish | ? | Private Property of Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'bān | Half |
| 2 | L | al-Gharbiya | Shintin 'Ayyāsh | ? | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 3 | U | al-Jiziya | Badsā | ? | al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni* | |
| 4 | U | al-Jiziya | Buhbayt min Ṣafqa Dahshūr wa Barnasht | ? | al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni | <i>Waqf for ḥajj pilgrims (Ibn Duqmāq, Intiṣār, Vol. 4, 131)</i> |
| 5 | U | al-Jiziya | Ṭahmā | ? | al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni | <i>Waqf for the Zāhiriya madrasa (DW 9/51)</i> |
| 6 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Arḍ al-Sarir | 100 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 7 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | al-Rubayyāt | 19,800 | ? | |
| 8 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Baydif | 900 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 9 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Birkat Baydif | ? | ? | Barqūq's <i>milk</i> |
| 10 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Bayād min Kufūr Sayala | 6,000 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 11 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Dumūh al-Dāthir | 1,200 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 12 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Sayala wa Kufūr-hā | 8,800 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | |
| 13 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Shāba | 21,000 | al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni | |
| 14 | U | al-Fayyūmiya | Maqtūl wa al-Rubayyāt | 9,000 | al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni | |
| 15 | U | al-Asyūṭiyya | al-Qaṭī'a | 6,000 | <i>iqṭā'</i> | <i>Waqf for the Zāhiriya madrasa (DW 9/51)</i> |
| 16 | U | al-Asyūṭiyya | Ṭahanhūr wa Shaqalqil wa Jurūf-hā | 8,000 | Diwān al-Khāṣṣ | |

U/L: Upper Egypt/Lower Egypt *Al-Diwān al-Sulṭāni meant the Financial Ministry of Egyptian central government.

| | Position | Date | Acquisition/ Endowment | No. (Table 1) | Situation |
|----|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Atabak | 19/4/784 | Acquisition | 1 | Peaceful times |
| 2 | Sultan (First) | 6/8/788 | Endowment | 2-15 | Peaceful times |
| 3 | Sultan (First) | 6/3/789 | Acquisition | 16,17 | Peaceful times |
| 4 | Sultan (First) | 12/12/789 | Endowment | 16,17 | Peaceful times |
| 5 | Sultan (First) | 2/7/790 | Acquisition | 18 | Minqāsh rose in revolt in Šafar. The plague prevailed during Rabi' al-Awwal and Jumādā al-Ūlā. |
| 6 | Sultan (First) | 29/7/790 | Acquisition | 19 | ditto |
| 7 | Sultan (Second) | 7/5/792 | Acquisition | 20 | Barqūq was restored to the sultanate on 15 Šafar. |
| 8 | Sultan (Second) | 12/9/792 | Endowment | 20 | Minqāsh's rebellion was drawing to a close. |
| 9 | Sultan (Second) | 28/2/794 | Endowment | 21-23 | Barqūq launched a military expedition to Northern Syria in 793, arrested Minqāsh in Dhū al-Qa'da, returned to Cairo on 14 Muḥarram 794. |
| 10 | Sultan (Second) | 6/6/795 | Acquisition | 24,25 | Peaceful times |
| 11 | Sultan (Second) | 6/5/796 | Endowment | 1,19,26 | Barqūq was on an expedition against Tamerlane; near Gaza en route to Northern Syria at that time. |
| 12 | Sultan (Second) | 22/7/796 (18/3/797) | Acquisition | 27 | Barqūq was staying in Damascus (His return to Cairo was on 12 Šafar 797). |
| 13 | Sultan (Second) | 7/4/797 | Endowment | 27 | Barqūq returned to Cairo from the expedition against Tamerlane on 12 Šafar 797. |
| 14 | Sultan (Second) | 5/3/799 | Acquisition | 28-33 | Vizier Ibn al-Baqarī's arrest and confiscation (on the previous day); Frequent government post sales; Price rise. |

| | Name | Date | Deed | Personal Information | Source |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | al-Sayfi Qurqmās | 2/7/790 | WA, j728 | Probably Qurqmās al-Tashtamurī, an amir of forty and the treasurer (<i>khāzindār</i>) at that time, and later an amir of one hundred and the director of <i>al-Diwān al-Mufrad</i> . | Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, <i>Ta'rikh</i> , Vol. 1, 362. |
| 2 | Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī | 7/5/792 | WA, j704 | 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī b. 'Īsā b. Mūsā al-Karakī (d. 794/1392), a person contributed to Barqūq's restoration, <i>kātib al-sirr</i> and the <i>nāzir</i> of the <i>Zāhiriya</i> madrasa. | Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, <i>Ta'rikh</i> , Vol. 1, 446-7; Ibn al-Furāt, <i>Duwal</i> , Vol. 9, 205; al-'Aynī, <i>Badr</i> , fol. 161v. |
| 3 | al-Ḥājj Zayn al-Dīn Muftih b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Alā'i b. Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī | 22/7/796 | WA, j51 | Unknown. Possibly a member of 'Umarī family, Damascene secretarial family produced several <i>kātib al-sirrs</i> . | |
| 4 | al-Šalāḥī Muḥammad b. al-Nāṣirī Muḥammad b. Tankiz | 5/3/799 | WA, j67 | The first director of <i>Diwān al-Amlāk</i> , appointed in 797/1395. Then the general director of <i>Diwān al-Amlāk wa-al-Awqāf wa-al-Dhakhira</i> . | Ibn al-Furāt, <i>Duwal</i> , Vol. 9, 464. |