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Abstract

Saladin, who set up the Ayyubid dynasty in Egypt in 1169, proceeded to Syria when his master, Nūr al-Dīn, died in 1174 and established a military regime based on the iqṭāʾ system. The iqṭāʾ holders (muqtaʾ), as in the Seljuqid period, were obligated to participate in the campaign with their followers whom they supplied with their armor and provisions from their iqṭāʾ revenues. Though the Ayyubid government was worried about a shortage of gold coins, the cities under the iqṭāʾ system could still enjoy full prosperity owing to active commercial transactions.

By studying the Ayyubid iqṭāʾ system from the contemporary sources, we find the characteristics peculiar not only to the Ayyubid period but also to the Mamluk period. For example, military service (khidma) rendered to the sultan and the burden of constructing citadels were levied according to iqṭāʾ revenue in both the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods. Moreover, both the Ayyubid and Mamluk muqtaʾs were in full charge of managing the irrigation system to promote the economic development (ʾimāra) of their iqṭāʾs. On the other hand, we see half-independent sāhibs in Syria sometimes struggling with the Ayyubid sultan over their iqṭāʾ holdings. The Egyptian amirs maintained close relations with their peasants by visiting the villages at harvest time every year.

We may also observe in the documentary evidence the actual conditions of iqṭāʾ management, by taking the case of amir Fakhr al-Dīn (d. 1232). When he was granted Fayyūm province as “complete iqṭāʾ” in 1222, he endeavored to promote the prosperity of al-Fayyūm by dredging out the Canal Yusuf and opening a new canal. He built a tower outside Cairo and managed his iqṭāʾ using carrier pigeons connecting Cairo and al-Fayyūm. He was praised as “a noble and great amir” for taking the helm of state as ustādār and constructing many public facilities such as mosques, schools and the Ṣūfī convent.
The military iqtāʿ system, which was first established in Buwayhid Iraq, was introduced into Egypt by Saladin through the Seljuqid and Zangid dynasties. In Egypt the amirs and high officials had held the iqtāʿs since the Fatimid period. But the areas assigned as iqtāʿ were comparatively small and their character was, in various respects, different from the Buwayhid and Seljuqid iqtāʿ systems. Saladin’s new regime based on the iqtāʿ system, therefore, also took on different features from the ancient Fatimid regime.

According to A.N. Poliak, who regards the iqtāʿ system as “Islamic feudalism”, the military fiefs held by the cavalrymen who rendered their services to the sultan prevailed in Egypt during the Ayyubid period. Cl.Cahen, who considers the iqtāʿ system as a form of “feudalism”, points out as the characteristics of the Ayyubid iqtāʿ system (Poliak, 1939: 428-432) the rigid control of iqtāʿ holdings by the government, (Cahen, 1953: 25-52) non-inheritance of iqtāʿ holdings, and (Gibb, 1953: 74-90) non-existence of independent power by iqtāʿ holders (muqtaʿs) in the local provinces (Cahen, 1952: 25-52). H.A.R. Gibb, on the other hand, describes how the Ayyubid amirs used to visit their iqtāʿs at harvest time as well as their granting money and crops from iqtāʿ revenues to their mamluks (Gibb, 1953: 74-90).

Following these generalistic studies, H.M. Rabie published an important work, based on numerous historical sources, in which he wrote explicitly about the reality of military services, the characteristics of iqtāʿ holdings, and the way the iqtāʿs were managed (Rabie, 1964, 1972). I.A. Turkhân gave a general description of the Ayyubid iqtāʿ system, but unfortunately without fully utilizing the available historical sources (Turkhan, 1968: 32-47). R.S. Humphreys’s work, though it does not aim at studying the iqtāʿ system specifically, is noteworthy for relating vividly the political history related to the iqtāʿ holdings of the amirs (Humphreys, 1977). R.Sesen, in his recent work, gives another general description of the political and socio-economic conditions of the Ayyubid dynasty. But he does not draw any conclusions about the iqtāʿ system different from the conventional views mentioned above (Seson, 1983).

Generally speaking, these studies all discuss the Ayyubid iqtāʿ system of Egypt in particular. But it is also certainly necessary to study the Syrian iqtāʿs, too, in order to make clear the iqtāʿ system which existed in this period. There remains also the problem of searching the causes of the disputes among the muqtaʿs, one feature peculiar to the Ayyubid iqtāʿ system only. Furthermore we need to reveal more concretely the way the revenues were collected from the peasants and the management of irrigation by the muqtaʿs. In this article I propose to study the character of the Ayyubid state and the realities of muqtaʿs’ rule over both Egyptian and Syrian society through an investigation of the iqtāʿ system.
I. Formation of the *Iqtā‘* System

1. Enforcement of the *Iqtā‘* System.

On 25 Jumādā II 564/26 March 1169 Saladin was installed as the Fatimid *wazir* after his uncle, Shīrkuh, died in Cairo. Though he was still deputy (*nā‘ib*) of Nūr al-Dīn, Saladin took control over military and financial affairs, and granted confiscated lands to his followers in the form of *iqtā‘*s. About this Abū Shāma relates as follows:

Saladin began to confiscate the *iqtā‘*s held by the Fatimid soldiers to root out them for his followers. But Mu‘tamin al-Khilāfa, who still held power at court, intended to arrest al-Asadiya and al-Šalāḥiya groups in conspiracy with the Crusaders (Rawdatayn, 11, 450).

Al-Asadiya and al-Šalāḥiya refer to the military forces formed by Shīrkuh and Saladin. According to al-Kāmil, the *iqtā‘* assignment to the Syrian soldiers immediately followed the confiscation of land from the Egyptian amirs (Kāmil, XI, 344, 166). And it was on 28 Dhū al-Qa‘da 564/13 August 1169 that Saladin defeated the black slave soldiers of Mu‘tamin in the battle of Bayna al-Qaṣrāyin. Abū Shāma’s description quoted above indicates that the *iqtā‘* assignment was carried out before the battle of Bayna al-Qaṣrāyin. Therefore we may be fairly certain that the *iqtā‘* system was instituted by Saladin between March and August 1169.

Saladin’s predecessor, Shīrkuh, however, had already granted *iqtā‘*s to the Syrian soldiers. This indicates that the *iqtā‘* apportionment by Saladin was not the first case in Egypt. But since al-Maqrizī relates that, from the reign of Sultan Saladin, all the Egyptian lands have been distributed to the sultan, amirs, and soldiers as *iqtā‘*s, Saladin’s *iqtā‘* distribution was therefore clearly more important than that of Shīrkuh (Abū al-Fida, 111, 50). Thus Saladin was able to bring the provinces under his control through his *iqtā‘* system, and the dignity of the Fatimid caliph, ‘Aqid, decreased in proportion (Kāmil, XI, 415-417: 126-128).

Saladin, by defeating the black slave soldiers and forming the *iqtā‘* system in Egypt, succeeded in establishing a new regime based on the Syrian troops. He was also prudent in Syrian affairs. It was after the death of Nūr al-Dīn in Shawwāl 569/May 1174 that Saladin proceeded to Syria with his troops. When he entered Damascus in Rabi‘ I 570/October 1174, he entrusted its rule to his brother, Tughdīkīn, and then set out to conquer Ḥims and Hamā. Concerning Saladin’s conduct after he seized both cities, Zubda of Ibn al-‘Adīn has the following to say:

Al-Malik al-Nāṣir advanced his troops from Ḥamā to Bārin over which the deputy of ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Za‘frānī had been appointed as its ruler. Saladin continued to besiege the town until the deputy surrendered it out of fear
for his life. When Saladin returned to Ḥamā, he granted it to his maternal uncle, Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad, as iqtā’. Then he granted Ḥimṣ to his nephew, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad, before he returned to Damascus (Zubda al-Halab, 11620, Kamil, XI, 422).

As mentioned above, Saladin first granted Ḥamā and Ḥimṣ to his relatives as iqtā’ in Syria. Both Ḥamā and Ḥimṣ before Saladin’s conquest were the iqtā’s held by the Zangid amir, Fakhr al-Dīn Mas’ūd. That is, Saladin redistributed the confiscated lands to his followers in order to establish his authority. He did the same when he conquered the provinces of Baʿlabakk, Bayrūt and the other Syrian cities(7).

The iqtā’ apportionment thus became the most crucial factor for maintaining the Ayyubid state order. For example, when al-Malik al-ʿAdil inherited the sultanate in Shawwāl 596/July-August 1200, he ascertained at first the amir’s iqtā’s and inquired them one after another about the number of soldiers they should maintain (Kamil, XII, 156). And in Aleppo, after al-Malik al-Ẓāhir died, the right to grant iqtā’s was given to al-Malik al-Mansūr, while the power to appoint and dismiss the religious officials (al-manāṣib al-diniya) was held by Shihāb al-Dīn Ṭughril. But soon Ṭughril assumed all the powers to administrate the town and the citadel and to grant wages and iqtā’s (Zubda al-Halab, 111, 175-178). Both of these examples point out clearly that the right to grant iqtā’s was very important to the Ayyubid dynasty rule. In 591/1195 al-ʿAziz in Egypt formed an alliance with the Asadiya amirs by means of granting iqtā’, or khubz, to them (al-Taʾrīkh al-Sālihi, fol. 214 r-v). Khubz, which basically means “bread”, was used also to mean iqtā’ during this period(6). This indicates that the sultan or the provincial princes had to grant suitable iqtā’s to their followers in order to maintain stable regimes.

2. Iqtā’ Holders

We can classify the iqtā’ holders (muqta’s) of this period as follows:

(a) Ayyubid Kinsfolk

In 565/1170, following the institution of the iqtā’ system in Egypt, Saladin granted Alexandria, Damietta and Buḥayra to his father, Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, and Qūs, Aswān and ‘Aydhab to his brother, al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Tūrānshāh, all in the form of iqtā’ (Rawdatayn, 11, 466). Alexandria and Damietta were the most important commercial harbors in Lower Egypt; and given the attack on Damietta by the Crusaders stationed at Sicily earlier in the year (Kamil, XI, 351-352, Lyons & Jackson, Saladin, 76-77) the iqtā’ assignment to his father was probably made to fortify the coastal region against the enemy. The iqtā’ grant to his brother, on the other hand, probably demonstrates the sultan’s intent to control the Red Sea route, as well
as to consolidate political affairs in Upper Egypt\(^9\). In 569/1174 Tūrānshāh invaded Yaman to conquer Aden. Through this move the Ayyubid government aimed at monopolizing the commercial profits from the Red Sea route\(^10\).

Saladin distributed the main districts in Syria also among his kinsfolk. As mentioned above, after the conquest of Bārīn he granted Ḥammā to his uncle, Shihāb al-Dīn, and Hims to his nephew, Nāṣir al-Dīn. In 583/1187, following the victory at Ḥittin, Saladin granted ‘Akkā to his son, al-Malik al-Afḍal, (Sulūk, 1, 94) and distributed the province of Jerusalem among his sons immediately upon obtaining it (A’lāq-lubnān, 221). Concerning al-Jazīra in 587/1191, he initially gave Harrān, Ruḥā, and Mayyāfāriqin to al-Afḍal, but then granted them to al-Malik al-‘Adil the next year (Mufarrīj, 111, 271, Kamil, XII, 82-83). Saladin thus made efforts to consolidate his authority in Syria and al-Jazīra through iqtā’ assignments to his kinsfolk. But, after he died in 589/1193 there occurred internal conflicts among these kinsfolk and were finally resolved in 591/1195 with the peace treaty between al-Afḍal and al-‘Adil. Al-Kāmil describes the terms of the treaty like this. “Quds, Palestine, Ṭabarīya, Urdund and all he (al-Afḍal) possessed belonged to al-Afḍal, while al-‘Adil, who was to remain in Egypt, kept the same iqtā’s as in former times” (Kamil, XII, 120). The iqtā’s kept by al-‘Adil were Ḥarrān, Ruḥā and Mayyāfāriqin. Notwithstanding such a treaty, however, conflicts continued to occur repeatedly in later years. In 599/1202-3 a new treaty was concluded between al-‘Adil in Egypt and al-Ẓāhir in Aleppo. It resulted in the following partitioning of political rule (al-Ta’rikh al-Saḥi, fol. 220).


Because they were not iqtā holders, but rather provincial lords, al-Malik al-Ẓāhir and other princes were able to wield their power partly independent from the Egyptian sultan. The Ayyubid princes thus came to rule the important Syrian towns quasi-independently, a political situation which continued until the time of Sultan Baybars\(^11\).

(b) The Amirs

Cases in which the amirs were allocated iqtā’s in Egypt were relatively few in number. The first allocation was made in 572/1176-7 when amīr Makka was granted the iqtā in Upper Egypt valued at 8,000 irdābbīs per year on condition that he gave up the right to levy tax from the pilgrims\(^12\). Fayyum province, however, was from earlier times granted as iqtā’ khāṣṣ. For example, in
577/1181-2 amir Ṣārim al-Dīn Khūṭulubā was entrusted with the governorship of al-Fayyūm, which was then considered to be his special domain (al-khāṣṣa) (Sulūk, 1, 72, Khitat, 11, 120). Two years later, the total revenues of al-Fayyūm were granted to Saladīn’s nephew, Taqī al-Dīn ʿUmar b. Shāhanshāh (Barq, v, fol. 120v, Sanaā al-Barq Q, 234, Sulūk, 1, 82). In 619/1224 Fayyūm province was given to amir Fakhīr al-Dīn as “complete iqṭā’”(13). Accordingly we can conclude that Fayyūm province was used to be granted as iqṭā’ to the influential amirs and the Ayyubid kinsfolk, with the exception that it was registered in the sultan’s domain(14).

As for the iqṭā’ apportionment in Syria, the conquered lands were distributed among the amirs as well as to the Ayyubid kinsfolk. For example, Saladīn gave Baʾibakk to amir Ibn al-Muqaddam as iqṭā’ after he conquered it in 573/1177-8, (Barq, 111, fol. 62’, Sanaā al-Barq, 1, 292-293, Aʿlāq-lubnan, 48) and granted also Ǧāf al-Dīn Masʿūd in 584/1188 (Aʿlāq-lubnan, 147). Furthermore, he gave Rāwandān and Kafar Ṭāb in Aleppo to Qarāqūsh, Ibn al-Muqaddam’s deputy in Afărmiya, provided that he surrendered to the sultan (Mufarrīj, 111, 131). Also, in contrast to the iqṭā’ holdings in Egypt, the amirs’ iqṭā’ in Syria were frequently inherited by his sons(15).

Three cases which indicate the size of iqṭā’ holdings by the amirs are known to us:

(1) In 599/1202-3 al-Malik al-Aṣḥraf Mūsā, lord of Diyār Mudar, granted Mārdīn to ʿImād al-Dīn b. Masḥūb, who was an amir commanding 400 cavalry (al-Taʾrikh al-Sālihi, fol. 220 r-v).  

(2) Shams al-Dīn Ǧawāb al-ʿAdilī, who was an amir of al-Tawāshī, held an iqṭā’ of 250 cavalry in Ikhmīm, Qāy, al-Qāyāt and Dujuw. In 627/1229-30 he was also given an iqṭā’ of 100 cavalry(16).

(3) In 644/1246-7 amir Bahāʾ al-Dīn Rashīd al-Ṭawāshī was granted an iqṭā’ of 200 cavalry, and amir al-Kāfīrī an iqṭā’ of 100 cavalry, both in Syria (Dawla al-Akrād, fol. 159 r).

In each case the size of the iqṭā’ was designated not by its annual revenue (ʿibra), but by the number of cavalry the iqṭā’ holder should support with that income. The number varied, revealing that the amirs were not yet ordered into ranks as in the Mamluk period(17).

(c) Mamluks and the Kurds

Saladin, after he disbanded the Fatimid army, formed the new army called “al-Ṣalāḥīya” which he recruited from the Turks and the Kurds(18). Among them were included the sultan’s royal army (ajnād al-ḥalqa al-sultāniyā) and slave soldiers (mamlūks)(19). While ajnād al-ḥalqa in the Ayyubid period were not granted iqṭā’(20), the mamluks had held iqṭā’ since the reign of Saladīn(21). It was sultan al-Ṣāliḥ who promoted positively a policy to give the mamluks
important positions. He bought 1,000 Turkish mamluks already during the reign of his father, al-Kâmil. He had paid for them with estates confiscated from merchants\(^{(22)}\) Kanz al-Durar describes al-Ṣâliḥ’s policy after he ascended the throne:

Al-Ṣâliḥ purchased more Turkish mamluks than all the previous sultans combined. Consequently, the mamluks came to form the majority of his army. The reason why he bought so many mamluks was that the Kurds and the Khwârizmiyya turned out to be disloyal to him. When a mamluk died, the sultan gave his \(\text{iqtân}\) to his son and, if he did not have son, the sultan granted it to one of his comrades (\(\text{khushdâsh}\)) (Kanz, VII, 370-371).

The Ṣâliḥiya or Baḥrîiya army was able to gradually increase its influence with the acquisition of \(\text{iqtâ}s\) and amir ranks\(^{(23)}\).

Kanz al-Durar relates that the Kurds and the Khwârizmiyya formed the Ṣâliḥ’s army before the recruitment of the mamluks. During Saladin’s time the four Kurdish tribes of al-Hakkâriyya, al-Ḥumaydîya, al-Zarzâriyya and al-Mihrânîyya played an important role,\(^{(24)}\) but, during the reign of al-Ṣâliḥ, al-Qaymariyya became the most influential. They came to Ḥamâ in 641/1243-4 to serve al-Ṣâliḥ, then proceeded to Damascus with the Khwârizmiyya\(^{(25)}\). About them we find the following in Dawla al-Akrâd:

In 642/1244-5 al-Malik al-Ṣâliḥ Najm al-Dîn Ayyûb sent amir Jamâl al-Dîn Aqush and amir Jamâl al-Dîn Yaḥyâ to give gowns, cash and clothing to the amirs and khâns of both al-Qaymariyya and al-Khwârizmiyya. Further, he granted al-Khalîl and its surroundings to amir Najm al-Dîn and al-Ghazza to amir Nâṣîr al-Dîn. The other amirs and the cavalry of al-ḥalqa were granted villages as \(\text{iqtân}\), and the Khwârizmiyya were given the whole province of Damascus with the exception of Nâbulus (Dawla al-Akrad, fol. 153 r-v).

Though al-Ṣâliḥ intended to use the military strength of these tribes through \(\text{iqtân}\) grants, he had to be worried about controlling them, in particular the Khwârizmiyya, who were given to pillaging.

\(\text{d) The Arabs}\)

According to al-Maqrîzî, thirteen Arab tribes, including Ṭalḥa and Ja’far, had already completed their emigration to Egypt when Shîrkuh reached there in 1169\(^{(26)}\). Among them Judhâm was the earliest tribe to settle there.

(Judhâm) held many \(\text{iqtân}\) in Hurbayt, Tall Basta, Nuwab, and Ramm (located in the Sharqîyya province). All the \(\text{iqtân}\) of Tha’labâ were included in the authorization of grant (\(\text{manshûr}\)) to Judhâm. Sultan Saladin increased the Tha’labâ’s lands in the territory of Judhâm, and appointed some of them amirs with trumpet (\(\text{bûq}\)) and flag (\(\text{alam}\)) (Bayan, 23).
Since al-'Umārī also relates that Saladīn gave Hurbayt, a Judḥām's iqtā' to the Tha'ilabā\(^{27}\), the sultan had evidently adopted a policy in the Tha'ilabā's favor. Tha'ilabā once battled the Crusaders in Syria under the command of the sultan, and afterwards emigrated to Egypt (Nihāya, 183: Qalā'id, 84). Saladīn intended certainly to entrust the rule over the bedwins ('Urbān) in Sharqiya province to Tha'ilabā through the apportionment of iqtā's and amirates. According to al-Makhzūmī, the iqtā' of the 'Urbān was called "iqtā' of trust" (iqtā' al-i'tidād) which was exempt from military service\(^{28}\). But, as we find the 'Urbān in Fayyūm province being forced to provide 400 cavalry, we may well suppose that, in reality, military service was usually levied on the 'Urbān instead of the iqtā' holdings themselves.

The 'Urbān in Syria, as well as the 'Urbān in Egypt, were granted iqtā's by the sultan. For example, Hawtā in the province of Aleppo was an iqtā' held by the Arab tribe, Khīshshāb. Though it was once confiscated after Nūr al-Dīn's death, it was restored again when Saladīn conquered Aleppo in 579/1183 (A'īqqa-Halab, 124). Then in 638/1240-1, Dayfā Khāṭūn, princess of Aleppo, gave the iqtā' and the right to rule over the Arabs to Tāhir b. Ghannām from Rabī'a for taking sides with her\(^{29}\). As mentioned above, the iqtā' held by the 'Urbān was called "iqtā' of trust", which indicates a special relationship between the government and the 'Urbān. Concerning this we find an interesting summary by al-Bundārī:

If these 'Urbān (the 'Ibād tribe who participated in the sieges of Karak and Shawbak in 586/1190) wished to live in Egypt, Saladīn should bring them to Egypt. But they desired to remain in Syria. If the lord entrusted the 'Urbān with the local provinces granting them iqtā's, it should be the best policy to keep them out of the villages and towns, resulting in a decrease in burdens on the Muslims. If they are made to render services (khidma) in the provinces providing information on the borders and the roads, they will neither pillage the provinces nor slaughter the people (San'a al-Barq, 1, 126)

According to this, the iqtā' grants to the 'Urbān were designed to prevent them from pillaging the villages and towns, together with inducing them to provide information on the borders and the roads. Sultan al-Kāmil also requested the Rabī'a tribe to provide camels for the transportation of cereals during his campaign to Armenia\(^{30}\) As M.A.Hiyari relates, it was in the reign of al-'Adīl that "amīr al-'Arab" was first appointed to command the 'Urbān\(^{31}\). The first amīr was Hadīthā b. Faḍl from Rabī'a, and when Hadīthā died, the amirate was held jointly by Mānī b. Hadīthā, his son, and Ghannām b. Tāhir. The policy to appoint amīr al-'Arab was inherited successively by the later Ayyūbid and Mamlūk sultans.
3. Şâhib and Wâli

In Syria there had existed since the Zangid period the şâhîbs, who were more independent than iqṭâ' holders. When Saladin advanced to Syria in 570/1174, he allocated the conquered lands as iqṭâ's and, at the same time, allowed some of these şâhîbs to keep their previous positions. For example, al-Šâliḥ b. Nūr al-Dīn, who came from Damascus to Aleppo in 569/1173-4, was allowed to retain his right to rule there in a treaty (muhâdana) concluded with Saladin the following year (San'a al-Barq, 1, 164-165, Rawdatayn, 11, 639). From this time on, al-Şâliḥ continued to rule over the province of Aleppo as "Şâhib Ḥalab" until his death in 577/1181-2. All the contemporary sources, however, do not necessarily distinguish the term "şâhib" from "muqṭa'" in any strict sense. Ibn al-Muqaddam, muqṭa' of Ba'ilbakk, was also called its şâhib; (Kamil, XI, 437) and Shams al-Dīn Muhammad, who was granted Ḥamā as an iqṭâ', was also designated "Şâhib Ḥamā" (Kamil, XI, 436). It is said that amir Sa'd al-Dīn Kumshutakīn, Şâhib Ḥiṣn Ḥārim near Antioch, was envied by other amirs because he exercised his power freely (San'a al-Barq, 1, 264-265).

Now, let us look at the rights which the şâhîbs were granted in their territories. Concerning al-Malik al-Zâhir, who took the position of Şâhib Ḥalab in 583/1187, Ibn al-'Adîm relates as follows:

Al-Malik al-Nâşir (Saladin) sent a letter to his son, al-Malik al-Zâhir, in which he gave him the right to order and to sanction. The sultan told him also to allocate iqṭâ's and to conduct his affairs as if Aleppo was his own country (Zubda al-Halab, 111, 90).

This reveals that the şâhîbs had the right to grant iqṭâ as well as to issue proclamations and sanctions in their territories. In fact, al-Zâhir gave Latakia to 'Alam al-Dīn Qaysar as iqṭâ' when he came to serve him in 592/1196. Türânschâh, who was allowed to hold Ba'ilbakk on his request, also allocated iqṭâ's to his followers (aşhab) (Barq, 111, fol. 121 r).

The şâhîbs were thus half independent, but they, like the muqṭa's, were forced to offer military service (khidma) to the sultan. In 584/1188-9, when Saladin proceeded to Aleppo to conquer Jabala, al-Zâhir, Şâhib Ḥalab, joined him with his army (Zubda al-Halab, 111, 103). When Zayn al-Dīn Yûsuf, who served Saladin as Şâhib Erbil, died in 586/1190, his brother, Muzaffar al-Dīn, requested and was granted Erbil (Dawla al-Akrad, fol. 133 r, Mufarrîj, 11, 340). Furthermore, 'Imād al-Dīn Zankî, Şâhib Sinjâr, and Mu'izz al-Dīn Sinjârshâh, Şâhib al-Jazîra, asked the sultan to return to their countries when the war (baykâr) was prolonged till the winter (Mufarrîj, 11, 340-341). This indicates that even şâhib could not leave the battlefield without the sultan's permission.

On the other hand, there were no independent şâhîbs in Egypt as in Syria. While governors (wâlî) were appointed by the sultan to control local provinces,
we find only three instances of wāli during this period: Wāli Qūs, Wāli al-Sharqiyya and Wāli al-Gharbīya (San‘a al-Barq, 1, 113; Sulûk, 1, 74-75). This is probably due to the fact that the muqta’s held the right to rule over the Egyptian provinces. However, in Syria, provincial deputies (nā‘ib) or governors (wāli) were appointed by the sultan in addition to the aforementioned sāhībs or muqta’s. For example, a nā‘ib with administrative power had been assigned to Damascus since its conquest by Saladin in 1174 (Humphreys, From Saladin, 48-50). Al-Bundārī relates that Ibn al-Muqaddam, Nā‘ib Dimashq, was responsible for preventing the muqta’s from behaving unfairly vis-a-vis their villagers (Barq, V, fol. 48 r).

We find other instances in which wālis were appointed to Ḥims and Ghazza (Mufarrij, 11, 177; A’laq-Lubnan, 265, Barq, V, fol. 120 r). But, generally speaking, the rulership of towns and their surrounding countryside in this period was usually assigned to an amir other than the one who had the right to control the citadel (Mufarrij, 11, 22; San‘a al-Barq, 1, 69; Elisséeff, Nur al-Dīn, 788). For example, al-‘Adil, the lord of Aleppo, entrusted amir Sârim al-Dīn Bazghush with the citadel, and his son, Muḥammad b. Bazghush, with town administration (diwān), the iqṭā’s, military and financial affairs, and maintaining public order (shahnakiya al-balad) (Zubda al-Halab, 111, 75). Also in 582/1186-7 Saladin gave the right to rule over the town of Ḥims to Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh, while conferring the governorship of the citadel (wilāya al-qal‘a) on the Kurdish amir, Badr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm al-Hakkārī (Mufarrij, 11, 177). R.S. Humphreys has argued that wālis were synonymous with muqta’s, thus criticizing Cl.Cahen who considered these terms to be different (Humphreys, from Saladin, 373-374). But in fact, as can be clearly seen from the instances mentioned above, the muqta’s in this period were actually different from the wālis or nā‘ibs who held administrative authority within the provincial government.

II. Reformation of the Iqtā’ System

1. Disputes over and Demands made concerning Iqtā’ Holding.
One of the characteristics peculiar to the Ayyubid iqtā’ system was that demands to the sultan were often made concerning iqtā’ holding and frequently brought about various disputes among the muqta’s. Let me cite some examples. Tūrānshāh, who in 565/1169-70 was given Qūs, Aswān and ‘Aydhab as iqtā’s evaluated together at 266,000 dīnārs, demanded the following year a fourth part of the iqtā’, which was held by the Fatimid wazir’s son, Kāmil b. Shāwar. In response to this, Saladin granted him Būsh in Upper Egypt and Tuwwa and Şūs al-Manûfiyya in Lower Egypt as iqtā’s. (Ibn al-Fūrat, IV, 130). Moreover, in 573/1177-8, Tūrānshāh requested there be granted Ba‘lbak, where he was born; (Mufarrij, 11, 171; Lyons & Jackson, Saladin, 126, 131) but this brought about a dispute with the muqta’ of Ba‘lbak, amir Ibn al-Muqaddam. Concerning this state of affairs the following is recorded in Barq:
When we (the sultan and his followers) arrived at Syria, Ibn al-Muqaddam did not come to us to render service (khidma) or greeting (salām), in violation of the usual practice. This is because he knew well that, if he rendered service to the sultan, he would have had to return Ba‘lbbak, which was being strongly demanded by al-Malik al-Mu‘azzam (Tūrānshāh)\(^{(35)}\).

Ibn al-Muqaddam, who was appointed commander of the Syrian army by Nūr al-Dīn, cooperated willingly with Saladin when he advanced into Syria in 1174. As mentioned above, he was given Ba‘lbbak in 573/1177-8 for his distinguished service to the sultan. Saladin feared accordingly that his influential amir would be alienated from him if he consented to Tūrānshāh’s demand\(^{(36)}\). But in the end the sultan ordered Ibn al-Muqaddam to leave Ba‘lbbak, giving him instead Bārin, Kafar Ṭāb, and al-Ma‘arra and its surroundings. According to Ibn Wāsil, Ibn al-Muqaddam held out against the order on the ground of his treaty (‘ahd) with the sultan, which guaranteed him the district of Ba‘lbbak. (Mufarrjī, 11, 71). But when he found the town to be besieged by the sultan’s army, he finally left against his will\(^{(37)}\).

In 579/1183-4, a similar dispute occurred at Ḥārim, west of Aleppo. Amir Sarkhak, who had been appointed ruler of the citadel by Nūr al-Dīn’s son, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl, refused to surrender it to Saladin. The sultan thereby proposed that Sarkhak was given another iqṭā’ at his request. But due to the gravity of the demand, Saladin had to continue negotiating with Sarkhak over the conditions of its surrender for nearly a month (Mufarrjī, 11, 146; A‘laq-Shimal Sūriya, 387). When Saladin died in 1193, one after another of his amirs from the mamluks (al-‘Umarā‘ al-Ṣālāḥiya) became alienated from his successor, al-Afdal. Two of them, Maymūn al-Qaṣrī and Sunqur al-Kabīr, desired to serve al-‘Azīz in Egypt on condition that their iqṭā’s were guaranteed by him. In response to this, al-‘Azīz granted Nābulus to them, but since it was an iqṭā’ held by amir Ibn al-Mashṭūb, he changed sides in al-Afdal’s favor and rejected its surrender to them (Zūbda al-Halab, 111, 130: A‘lāq-luṭūn, 243-244).

These three instances were disputes originating from muqṭa’s refusals to surrender their iqṭā’s contrary to the sultan’s order. Among them only Ibn al-Muqaddam refused the request to surrender iqṭā’ on the strength of his treaty with the sultan. In every case, however, the amirs assumed firm attitudes toward the sultan, and if their demands were not met, they would even dare to change sides in favor of another lord. We also find not a few instances where amirs claimed to have been granted iqṭā’s they had designated themselves. Let me cite some examples:

1. In 579/1183-4, Saladin proceeded to ‘Ayn Ṭāb, which Ibn Khumāratikīn had been granted by Nūr al-Dīn. He wrote a letter to Saladin requesting ‘Ayn Ṭāb on condition that he serve the sultan obediently. The sultan
responded to the request and granted him the iqtā‘ (Mufarrij, 11, 139).

(2) In 582/1186-7 when al-‘Adil demanded iqtā‘ in Egypt, Saladin sent him to Egypt as his deputy and distributed Sharqiya province to him (Mufarrij, 11, 179).

(3) Mużaffar al-Dīn, who was the brother of Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf, Şâhib Irbil, continued to serve Saladin, and was granted Irbil upon his request when his brother died in 586/1190 (Dawla al-Akrād, fol. 133r).

(4) In 587/1191 when Ibn Shâhanshâh died, his son, al-Malik al-Manṣūr, claimed his father’s estates. But the sultan granted them to al-‘Adil, and assigned Ruhā‘, Harrān, and Sumaysāt to him instead (Bar Hebraeus, 338).

(5) In 607/1210-1, despite the fact that amir Izz al-Dīn Usâma demanded al-Fayyūm instead of the two citadels ‘Ajīlān and Kawkab, al-Malik al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isâ, lord of Damascus, rejected the demand and took the two citadels by force (al-Ta‘rikh al-Sâlihi, fol. 222r).

While the first three instances reveal cases in which demands were consented to by the sultan, in the latter two cases requests were refused once and for all. In any case, we find that the disputes over and the demands made concerning iqtā‘ holding were concentrated during the reign of Saladin. This custom probably originated from his intention to mobilize the army in as great number as possible against the Crusaders by meeting the demands made by the Ayyubid kinsfolk and various amirs. On the other hand, it was also partly due to the fact that the rules and regulations of granting iqtā‘s were not yet established at the early stages of the Ayyubid period. At any rate, in order to allocate sufficient iqtā‘s to the amirs or the soldiers, the annual revenues, received mainly from the peasantry, had to be evaluated exactly according to cadastral surveys (rawk).

2. The Şalâhi Cadastral Survey

H. Rabie relates, “The Şalâhi rawk was ordered by Saladin in the year 572/1176. He chose Bahā‘ al-Dīn Qarâqūsh to supervise the work on the Şalâhi rawk, the duration of which is not specified by the known sources”(39). But, how can we be certain that the Şalâhi rawk was carried out in the year 572/1176?

Let us look first at two historical accounts on which Rabie based his view of the cadastral survey ordered by Saladin: (1) The land tax (kharāj) on wheat, which was 3 išdabbas per faddān till 567/1171-2, was changed to 2.5 išdabbas in 572/1176 when the land survey (misāha) was carried out; (40) (2) In 565/1169-70, Saladin began to construct the city walls connecting Cairo with Fustat. The work was supervised by Qarâqūsh, who was the first to enforce the rawk in Egypt (Kanz, VII, 41-42).
The first account reveals that what was carried out in the year 572 was not a “rawk” but a “misāḥa”. As we know both from the Ḥusāmī Rawk and the Nāṣirī Rawk carried out by the Mamluk Sultans the rawk involves the ascertainment of annual revenues (‘ibra) and the redistribution of iqtā’s other than determined by the misāḥa (land survey). The second account designates only that the construction of the city wall was supervised by Qarāqūsh, who carried out the first rawk in Egypt. That is, we can not conclude from these accounts that Qarāqūsh actually executed the Ṣalāḥī rawk in 572/1176.

Saladin certainly had consolidated his authority in Syria by 572/1176 through entering into peace treaties (sulh) with al-Ṣāliḥ in Aleppo and the Ismā‘iliya stationed at Misyāh (Rawdatayn, 11, 679). He returned to Egypt after an absence of three years and began to construct the citadel (Qal‘a al-Jabal) at Cairo, as well as ordering Qarāqūsh to build the city walls. But it is clear that he did not carry out a cadastral survey (rawk) or redistribute iqtā’s during that year.

According to al-Bundāri, in Sha‘bān 576/January 1181, when Saladin returned to Egypt from Syria, he remained there to promote the public welfare (maṣālīḥ) of Islam and the state. He preferred to sit with the Egyptian ‘ulamā’ and to work at the office of approval (dār al-‘adl) (Sana al-barq, 182-183). Ibn Wāṣil relates that Saladin also supervised over the public welfare of Egypt after he returned from Syria (Mufarrīj, 11, 101). Concerning his policy to promote the public welfare, al-Maqrīzī relates as follows:

Qādi al-Fāḍil gave the following account in his diary (mutajaddidāt) dated Rajab 577 / November 1181. This year inquires concerning iqtā’s, ascertainment of the annual revenues, making sure of the acts to be praised, and increasing conducts to be thankful for were carried out according to the sultan’s order. As a result the total number of cavalrymen belonging to the sultan’s army was calculated at 8,640 (111 amirs, 6,976 tawāshis, 1,553 qaraghułāms), and their income at 3,670,500 dinārs (Khitat, 1, 86-87).

One of “the acts to be praised” or “conducts to be thankful for” is probably indicated in a letter that Saladin sent to the governor of Qūṣ ordering him to abolish the taxes (mukūṣ) levied both on the pilgrims and the merchants coming from Yaman. (Ṣulūk, 1, 75; Sesen, Salahaddin, 160-161). In any case, we may ascertain from al-Maqrīzī’s account that the government inquired into iqtā’ holdings in Egypt, resulting in a calculation of the sultan’s army at 8,640 strong. Saladin, in 581/1185-6, undertook to assign iqtā’s to his soldiers in the local provinces (Rawdatayn (1288 H.ed.), 11, 62; Sana al-BarqQ, 258), but this certainly does not mean that a rawk was conducted in its true sense. We may therefore conclude that the Ṣalāḥī cadastral survey was probably carried out in 577/1181, based on the land survey of 572/1176.
As for Qarâqûsh b. 'Abd Allâh al-Asadî, he was said to be a eunuch (khâdîm) under either Shîrkhûn or Saladin (Ibn Khallîkân, 111, 254). Although he was a Turk who knew nothing about books, he was appointed as the deputy (nâ'ib) to the sultan administering the political affairs of Egypt after the victory over Mu'tamin al-Khilâfa in 1169(43). He introduced "dînâr jayshi" as a unit to designate the annual revenues of the iqtâ', probably after supervising over a cadastral survey. This unit, which was also called "al-dînâr al-qarâqûshi", equaled 13 1/3 dirhams or the price of one irdabb of wheat, barley or broad bean(44). Qarâqûsh allocated iqtâ's estimated on this unit, and it continued to be used even in the Mamluk period (Kanz, VII, 42).

III. Duties of the Iqtâ' Holders

1. Military Service (khidma)

The service rendered by muqta' to the sultan was generally called "khidma". It contained various kinds of duties, among which military service was the most important. For example, in 569/1174 when the Crusaders stationed at Sicily attacked Damietta and Alexandria we find:

(On Tuesday, 28 Dhû al-Ḥijja) we ordered the army to proceed to two border cities, Alexandria and Damietta. Two amirs named Badr al-Dîn Ayyûb and Fâris al-Dîn Tamîrak first advanced to Alexandria in command of their soldiers. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the cavalrymen (mâfârid) and others from the iqtâ' in al-Buḥayra joined the amirs' party. Part of the 'Urbân under Taqi al-Dîn ('Umar b. Shâhanshâh) returned also from al-Barqa to continue the battle with the Crusaders (Sanâ al-Barq, 1, 172, cf. Kamîl, XI, 413).

According to this account, two amirs advanced their army to defend Alexandria on the sultan's order, and the cavalrymen from their iqtâ's also joined them without delay. As for the mafârid (sing. mufrad) in the Ayyubid period, we can not identify them from contemporary sources. But, from some examples in the early Mamluk period, they were probably not al-ḥâlqa, i.e. free-born cavalrymen, but part of the mamluks(45).

The muqta's, when they were requested to render military service to the sultan, usually entered under his command with their followers, whom they had already provided armor and provisions from the "Market of the Army" (sûq al-'askar) in Cairo (Raydatayn, 11, 897, Barq, 111, fols. 8 vqr, fol. 16r, Kamîl, XI, 471). We also find an example of an amir participating in a campaign leading the common people ('âmma) and the peasants (fallâhûn) (Akhûr al-Dîyâr al-Misriya, fols. 76v-77r). The sultan, when necessary, provided retired cavalrymen (al-ajnâd al-batâlûn) with stipends to mobilize them to the border (Sulûk, 1, 73). In 615/1218-9 when al-Ashraf Mûsâ, lord of Damascus, advanced to Aleppo to do battle with Kay Kâ'ûs, prince of the Rum Seldjûqs, several amirs came to him with military service. Al-Ashraf thereby contracted
with them and granted them gowns\(^{(46)}\). But the sultan did not usually contract with amirs or **muqta’**\(^{s}\), who offered their military service, because it was an absolute duty required of **muqta’**. If a **muqta’** rejected military service, he was considered to be a rebel in the eyes of the sultan\(^{(47)}\).

The number of cavalrymen the **muqta’** should lead to the battlefield was estimated according to their **iqtā’** revenue, (Rawdatayn, 11, 558) but the actual term of their service was still uncertain during this period. The **muqta’**, therefore, had to beg the sultan’s permission (**dustūr**) in order to leave the battlefield. Let me quote some related examples:

1. In 571/1175-6 when the Syrian provinces were visited by a crop failure, the sultan gave permission to the Egyptian army to return to their countries for harvesting crops there (Rawdatayn, 11, 643. Cf Rabie, The Financial System, 69).

2. When Saladin entered Aleppo after the conquest of Ḥārim in Rabi‘ I 579/June 1183, he gave permission to his soldiers to leave. They returned to their countries while the sultan managed political affairs and maintained order in Aleppo. (Nawâdir, 60; Mufarrij, 11, 147).

3. In 586/1190, Saladin, while besieging ‘Akkā, gave his soldiers permission to leave when winter came. While they were on leave, he faced the enemy with a small followers. When the winter season was over, he called the soldiers back and advanced to Tall Kaysān in Rabi‘ I 586/May 1190\(^{(48)}\).

These instances reveal that amirs and their soldiers were permitted to return to their countries for amassing provisions or for rest. But, whenever there was the fear of attack by the enemy, they were not permitted to leave the battlefield\(^{(49)}\).

On the other hand, whenever a **muqta’** left the battlefield without the sultan’s permission, he was punished for it. Ibn Mammâti says, “For example, if a soldier, whose annual income is 600 **dinârs**, was absent for two months without permission (**idhn**), his income is cut down by 100 **dinârs**. This is called “**ghaybânât**” (Ibn Mammâti, 355). Moreover, when a soldier who received **iqtā’** instead of a stipend (**jâmakiya**) did not offer military service over a certain period, he had to return the amount appropriate to the period as an “unproportionate payment” (**tâfâwut**). (Ibn Mammâti, 354-355-Cf. Minhâj, fol. 113r-v). We may well suppose from these instances that the Ayyubi **iqtā’** holders were strictly bound to offer the military service proportionate to their **iqtā’** revenues.

2. ‘**Imâra and Other Duties**

**Muqta’** during the Ayyubid period had to share in the responsibility for constructing public facilities (**‘imâra**) in addition to rendering military service. This was regarded also as service (**khidma**) to the sultan\(^{(50)}\). The construction
work in the year 604/1207-8 is described by Ibn Wâṣîl:

This year, Sultan al-‘Adil went to Damascus for a while. He ordered the reconstruction of the citadel and assigned a tower (burj) to each of the Ayyubid princes and his grand amirs (akâbir umarâ’îhi). They performed this work, bearing the expenses as a service to al-‘Adîl\(^{51}\).

According to this description, the Ayyubid princes and the grand amirs shared in the responsibility of reconstructing the citadel. And when al-Ẓâhir undertook the waterworks stretching from Ḥaylân to the Aleppo gate, the construction work was allocated also to the amirs. But at that time, al-Ẓâhir himself gathered together craftsmen (ṣunnâ’) and laborers (fâ’il), as well as provided lime (kils), oil (zayt), stones (hijâra), baked bricks (âjurra) and so on\(^{52}\). The muqta’s thus did not always bear all the expenses for these projects, but the practice of assigning the work to muqta’s was inherited by the later Ayyubid sultans, and continued even in the Mamluk period.

The muqta had another important duty to control the irrigation system in each of their iqṭâ’s. Ibn Mammâtî relates, “As for the local irrigation dikes (al-jusûr al-baladiya), the muqta’ and his peasants should control them at their own expense for the profit of each district”. (Ibn Mammati, 232). This indicates that the control of the local irrigation dikes was entrusted to the muqta’ and his peasants after the formation of the iqṭî system, while the sultan’s irrigation dikes (al-jusûr al-sultânîya) were under the control of the government officials. And if a muqta’ was transferred to another iqṭâ’, new muqta’ replacing him was obligated to return the value of the outlays he had made for managing the irrigation system. (Ibn Mammati, 232-233). Ibn Mammâtî further relates that the muqta’s and their peasants in Fayyûm province do not pay even a dirham for the control of those dikes and canals belonging to the sultan. (Ibn Mammati, 229). The muqta’s, moreover, were not eager to promote agricultural production under conditions where their iqṭâ’ holdings were not stable. This is reflected plainly in what occurred in 590/1194, when the Egyptian amirs abandoned their effort to promote the prosperity of their districts (‘imâra al-bilâd), when a rumor spread to the effect that their iqṭâ’s would soon be confiscated. (Sulûk, 1, 119).

As already mentioned above, Amir al-‘Arab, who was granted iqṭâ’, was obligated to provide various information and camels over and above his military service to the sultan. And muqta’ who held iqṭâ’ where some valuable resources were discovered was requested to supply quantities of them to the government. About this al-Maqrîzî relates as follows:

In Wâḥât, the valley near Udfû, white alum (al-shabb al-abyad) was mined. Both al-Kâmil and his son, al-Sâîkh, put the muqta’s in Wâḥât under an obligation to bring 1,000 qintârs (45,000 kg) of white alum annually to Cairo. In reward for this, they were granted the right to
collect poll tax (jawai). But this right was later cancelled because the muqta's in Wâhât were not diligent in its supply (Khitat, 1, 236).

In this period, alum, which was used for dyeing textiles and leathers, was exported in large amount to Europe as well as being consumed in Egypt. According to Sulûk, Saladin constructed a tower (burj) at Suways to guard the Upper Egypt Road, on which alum was carried to Cairo for export to Europe. (Sulûk, 1, 72). Ibn Mammâti says, “Alum was transported from Wâhât to Qûs, Ikhmîm and al-Bahnasâ by the Arabs, from where it was carried further on to Alexandria. The carriers were not trusted until its price was fixed at the market (matjar)” (Ibn Mammâti, 328). Alum, in some cases, was used also as a means of payment for goods imported from Europe (Ibn Mammâti, 327). The muqta's of Wâhât thus were granted the right to collect a poll tax, provided that they offered alum, an important export good to Europe. This indicates that the right to collect poll taxes was not commonly granted to muqta's, except in the “complete iqta” which I will mention later on.

As Cahen and Rabie state, the Ayyubid iqta' was freer economically than the Fatimid iqta', in the sense that it was no longer subject to the tithes (Rabie, The Financial System, 29). But, according to Luma', Sultan al'Adil II (1238-40) levied a tax of 10 dinârs per 1,000 dinârs of iqta' revenue, which was lower than the tithes (luma', 12). Such a policy, however, seems not to have been common, since we can not find another similar recorded instance in the Ayyubid period.

IV. Management and Control of Iqta'

1. Tax Assessment

In contrast to muqta's obligation to offer various services to the sultan, his most important right was to collect the taxes estimated in the 'ibra. For example, the 'ibra ofTurânshâ's iqta' located at Qûs, Aswân and 'Aydhâb was 266,000 dinârs (Rawdatayn, 11, 466; Khitat, 11, 37). The Kurdish amir Sayf al-Dirr Mashtûb was allocated Nâbulus as iqta', whose 'ibra was estimated at 300,000 dinârs (54). As mentioned above, the 'ibra was usually expressed in “dinâr jayshi” from the Şalâhi survey of 1181.

The Ayyubid 'ibra was estimated based on the revenue (irtifâ'), including cash ('ayn) and crops (ghalla), revealed in Ta'rikh al-Fayyum of al-Nâbulusî (55). Take the example of Itshâ, a village south of Madîna al-Fayyum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ayn (cash)</td>
<td>12 dinârs (kharaj al-râtib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghalla (crop)</td>
<td>432 irdabbs (kharaj al-munâjaza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakât</td>
<td>6 dinârs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rusûm (taxes)</td>
<td>110 dirhams, 19 irdabbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasm al-hasâd (harvest tax)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rasm al-khifāra (guard tax)
rasm al-ajrān (threshing field tax)\(^{(56)}\)

This indicates that 'ibra was estimated based on irtifā’, including the land tax in cash (kharāj al-rātb) and the land tax in kind (kharāj al-munājaza), other than zakāt, which was levied on fruit trees and cattle, and miscellaneous taxes (rusūm). The land tax (kharāj) in cash and in kind was evidently the main iqṭā’ revenue, though Rabie does not explain it distinctly as such in his work\(^{(57)}\).

Al-Nābulusī includes a poll tax (jawāli) in his estimation of 'ibra based on his investigation of each village in Fayyūm province. (Ta’rikh al-Fayyūm, 46, 47, 53, 63, 64, 83). Nevertheless, the poll tax during this period was usually regarded as the sultan’s income, except in the “complete iqṭā’” (iqṭā’ darbastā). Let us quote some examples:

1. In 577/1181-2 Sārim al-Dīn Khutlubā, who was entrusted with the governorship (wilāya) of al-Fayyūm, went there to collect its revenue as his private income (rusūmuh al-khās) (Sulūk, 1, 72; Khitat, 11, 120).

2. In 579/1183-4 Qalad, who entrusted his nephew, Taqi al-Dīn ‘Umar b. Shāhanshāh, with the governorship of Egypt, granted him iqṭā’ in Egypt, in addition to the Syrian iqṭā’ s. That is, he gave him all the revenues including the poll tax levied in al-Fayyūm, other than the districts of al-Qubaybat and Būsh\(^{(58)}\).

3. In 587/1191 Qalad assigned the Eastern Province (al-Bilād al-Sharqiya) to his brother, al-‘Adil, on the condition that he abandon all the Syrian iqṭā’s except al-Karak, al-Shawbak, Sālt, and al-Balqā’ and that he abandon half of his private lands (khās) in Egypt. Further, al-‘Adil had to carry 6,000 sacks (ghirāra) of crops from salt and al-Balqā’ every year. (Abūl-Fidā, 111, 80-81).

4. In 619/1222 Sultan al-Kāmil gave al-Fayyūm completely (darbastān) to amir Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Uthmān, including its revenues, sugar cane, oxen and tools (Akbar al-Ayyūbiin, 134).

The private income found in example (1) means probably all the revenue in al-Fayyūm including the poll tax, as example (2) indicates. Example (3) should also be understood similarly iqṭā’ kāssā was usually regarded as private land, which need not be allocated to the holder’s followers\(^{(59)}\). On the other hand, as to the income of the holder, he was given all the revenues just like iqṭā’ darbastā in example (4). The examples quoted above are all concerned with Egypt, and we find no example of private land, or iqṭā’ darbastā, having been granted in Ayyubid Syria.

According to Rabie, only three cases of the actual inheritance of an iqṭā’ are to be found in Ayyubid Egypt, because the sultans were sure that hereditary
iqtā' would have an adverse influence on military service (Rabie, The Financial System, 59). But in Syria, we find not a small number of instances in which iqtā's were passed from father to son. For example, in 570/1174-5 when Saladin conquered Ḥims, the iqtā' held by Shīrkhūn, he gave it to Shīrkūn's son, Mūḥammad, (Kanz, VII, 58-59) and in 581/1185-6 when Nāṣir al-Dīn died, Saladin ordered Nāṣir's son, Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh, to inherit his father's iqtā's, i.e Rahba and Salamyā (Dawla al-Akrad, fol. 13r; Kamil, XI, 518). Ṭabarīya, which had been held by amir Sa'd al-Dīn Mubārak, was also inherited by his son, Fath al-Dīn Ahmad, when Mubārak died in 583/1187-8 (Mufarrij, 11. 252). Further, we find that Ṣaydā, Ḍāniyās and Shayanār were inherited from father to son over three generations(60).

Also concerning the Syrian iqtā's, the sultan, of course, had the right to confiscate them or to exchange them for other iqtā's according to his own will. However in Syria, there seems to have still remained the Zangid tradition of inheriting iqtā's (Rawdatayn, 1, 20, Muffarrij, 1, 280). On the other hand, in Egypt an iqtā' held by a cavalryman was frequently granted to another even during the former's lifetime. This practice perhaps resulted in strict regulations concerning iqtā' transfers being established in Egypt, as revealed in the following description.

Take the example of a district where sugar cane was cultivated being given to a soldier (jund) in the year 588. If it was transferred to another soldier at the beginning of 589, the right to press sugar cane was still retained by the first muqta'. And he would be deprived of the right on 10 Tūl/5 January when the sugar cane is in the second year (khilfa), or on 10 Bashnas/6 May when it is in the first year (ra's). If the first muqta' does not intend to press it, the second muqta' takes over the right since the first muqta' is no longer rendering service (khidma). On the other hand, when the first muqta' is still concerned with the land after a certain period, he must pay 2+15/24 dinārs per faddān to the second muqta' as compensation ('uqr). When he has paid it, he can press the sugar cane at the government press house (al-Ma'sara al-diwanīya) using its oxen and tools. And when he leaves the iqtā', he must restore it to its former state and return everything he had borrowed from the government. If he is unable to return it, he is forced to pay its price (Ibn Mammātī, 366).

The sugar cane of khilfa was usually harvested in the Coptic month Khikak (27 November - 26 December), while the sugar cane of ra's was cut in Tūbā (27 December - 25 January), i.e. four months before Bashnas (26 April - 25 May)(61). We find no distinct reason why the term for an extention to press ra's, as quoted above, was granted for a longer time than usual. Anyhow, this indicates that the right of muqta' who was concerned with the cultivation of the commercial crops (i.e. sugar cane) was assured for a certain period, even when the iqtā' was delivered to another muqta'. It is also interesting to find the
condition that muqta‘ had to restore his iqtâ‘ to his former state before leaving it. Muqta‘ also customarily left wheat straw to the next muqta‘ for his finding a way to prosperity (‘imâra)(62).

Even though we may not assume that these regulations were enforced also in the Syrian iqtâ‘s, it is noteworthy that careful consideration was given to prosperity (‘imâra) in both the cultivation of sugar cane and in dealing wheat straw. This is because the iqtâ‘ system was only maintained when agricultural production was made stable under a policy to promote ‘imâra.

2. Real Conditions of Iqtâ‘ Management: The Case of Amir Fakhr al-Din

The Ayyubid muqta‘ usually sent a deputy (nâ‘b, wakil) to his iqtâ‘ to manage it(63). For example, Abû Shâma gives the following account in the year 565/1170:

Shams al-Dawla Tûrânsâh went to Qûsh to entrust its management to Shams al-Khilâfâ Muḥammad b. Mukhtar. Before the sultan gave Qûsh to Shams al-Dawla, he sent Risiân b. Daghmush to levy taxes there, but ‘Abbâs b. Shâdhî revolted against him in league with the Arabs and the slaves (‘abid) living in Marj Banî Humaym(64).

Other than Qûs, Tûrânsâh also held Aswân and ‘Aqâ’ab as iqtâ‘ where he may have likewise sent his deputies. Al-Nâbulusi says, “When he investigated into Fayyûm province, he requested documents from the executive (mustajidd) in the sultan’s domain and from the deputy (nâ‘ib) in the waqf land. In the case of iqtâ‘, he requested documents from the muqta‘s clerk (kâtib al-muqta‘) or from the village chiefs (mashâ‘ikh al-bilâd) when the clerk was absent” (Ta’rikh al-Fayyum, 23). This reveals that the muqta‘s clerk, in practice, took charge of levying taxes in the iqtâ‘. However, as Gibb relates, the muqta‘s in this period used to visit their iqtâ‘s to manage the spring harvest themselves (Gibb, The Armies of Saladin, 75). Their purpose was mainly to levy taxes and to supply provisions (Rawdatayn, 11, 643). They, at the same time, attached importance to refreshing their fatigued horses by putting them out to pasture from winter to spring(65). But, in some cases, the sultan could not mobilize the muqta‘s immediately when they were pasturing their horses in their iqtâ‘s(66).

Some Ayyubid lords or amirs lived at the towns located in their iqtâ‘s to administer the regions by themselves. Tûrânsâh in al-Fayyûm, Ibn al-Muqaddam in Ba‘lbak, Shîrkhû in Ḥims and Abû al-Hayjâ‘ in al-Quds were known as amirs who, except for their military services, stayed at their iqtâ‘s(67). These muqta‘s made efforts to construct convents for şûfis (khânqâh), caravanserais (khân ilî-sabîl) and citadels as well as to erect mosques and schools (madrasa)(68). As they exercised leadership over the residents in their iqtâ‘s, they sometimes were called the rulers of the districts (al-Akhâm al-Mulukiya, fol. 77v). For example, Ibn al-Muqaddam, muqta‘ of Ba‘lbak,
was regarded both as its governor (mutawalli) and controller (mudabbir) (Rawdatayn, 11, 669).

We can observe more concretely the real conditions of iqṭā’ management by taking the case of amir Fakhr al-Dīn. Fakhr al-Dīn Abū al-Fath ʻUthmān b. Qizil al-Bārūmī was born at Alepp to under the rule of Nūr al-Dīn in the year 551/1156. After changing service (khidma) to various masters, he seized the rank of amir in Egypt and became the Kāmil’s steward (ustādar) in charge of state politics (amr al-mamlaka).

When Mufaḍḍal Qutb al-dīn, šāhīb of al-Fayyūm, died in 619/1222, the sultan gave al-Fayyūm province completely (darbasta) to Fakhr al-Dīn, including the tax revenue (hāsil), sugar cane, oxen, and tools. If he was truly born in 551, he had already reached the age of sixty-eight years. According to al-Nābulusi, he intended personally to produce significant results everywhere he ruled. He, thereby, investigated into the factors which would lead to prosperity for al-Fayyūn, and cleaned out the Canal Yūsuf to increase irrigation water. (Ta‘rikh al-Fayyum, 15-16). However, when he did not find any good results in this, he went to Lāhūn by himself to remove the earth piled at the dam, recruiting engineers (muhandisin) from the villagers (Ta‘rikh al-Fayyum, 16). He also opened the Canal Tanbaṭwīya to transport the water of the Canal Yūsuf to the south part of al-Fayyūm, and succeeded, as a result of it, in reviving the village of ʻAlī, which had been in ruins since the Fatimid period (Ta‘rikh al-Fayyum, 128). Fakhr al-Dīn, who thus personally managed his iqṭā’ did not always stay at al-Fayyūm, however. Al-Maqrīzī relates in his Khītāt as follows:

At al-Barqīya outside Cairo, there is a tower known as the ‘‘Tower of al-Fayyūm’’ (Burj al-Fayyūm). This was constructed by amir Fakhr al-Dīn ʻUthmān b. Qizil, ustādar of al-Malik al-Kāmil. The name of the ‘‘Tower of al-Fayyūm’’ originated from the fact that the whole province of al-Fayyūm was held by Ibn Qizil as iqṭā’. When he received a letter (bīṭaqa) from al-Fayyūm, he would send his reply from the tower (Khītāt, 11, 231).

Fakhr al-Dīn, who constructed a tower outside Cairo, managed his iqṭā’ using carrier pigeons connecting Cairo and al-Fayyūm. Ibn al-ʻArabī says, ‘‘Fakhr al-Dīn sent his deputies (wulāt) and followers (mustakhamūn) to al-Fayyūm and assigned 200 cavalymen for carrying cash to his treasury (khizāna) and crops and to his granary (ahrā’).’’ (Akhbar al-Ayyūbi, 134-135). Accordingly, we may consider that those who were in charge of reporting necessary news to Fakhr al-Dīn at Cairo were like his deputies and followers sent to al-Fayyūm. The cavalymen mentioned above did not always stay at al-Fayyūm, but probably took charge in carrying the revenues to Cairo only at the time of collecting taxes. It is not clear whether crop transportation was carried out by land or river, but if the Nile was used, a boat called a ‘‘darmūna’’ was commonly used. According to al-Nuwayrī al-Iṣkandarānī four kinds of boats were navigating the Nile at that time; that is, ḥarrāka for lords and amirs,
markab for merchants, shakhtûr for villagers, and darmûna for transporting revenues in kind from the iqṭā's (11 mâm, 11, 249). Darmûna carried crops to Sâhil al-Ghalla at bûlāq, where a tax (maks Sâhil al Ghâş'a) was levied on them before being taken to the granary called "ahrâ" or "shûna".  

Fakhr al-Din, like other amirs, appropriated his income from this tax for various public works. Concerning this, we find the following account given by Ibn al-Amîd:

Fakhr al-Din, not only constructed madrasa and masjid, but also built a school (maktab) for orphans setting up a vast fund (waqf) for it. He also used to give cash, clothes and crop to the šûfi saints (arbâb al-buŷût) and the poor (munqaṭi'ûn) (Akbâr Al-Ayyûbiin, 135).

We can not tell, however, from this account whether these madrasa, masjid nd maktab were constructed in al-Fayûm or in Cairo. But al-Maqrizi relates that Fakhr al-Din built al-Madrasa al-Fakhriya and a masjid opposite to it in Cairo and further constructed a public bath (Hâmâm al-Sultân) and a convent (ribât) for the Šûfi saints also in Cairo (Khitat, 11, 46, 81, 367-368). On the other hand, Al-Nâbulusi gives an account of two great mosques (jâmi), nine masjids and five madrasas which existed at the town of al-Fayûm, but says nothing about their constructors (Ta'rîkh al-Fayyum, 29). Since he describes explicitly the irrigation works performed by Fakhr al-Din in al-Fayûm, lack of specific reference to the constructors of the mosques and schools probably means that they were built by someone else.

Historical sources do not tell us up until what time Fakhr al-Din held al-Fayûm as iqṭā'. Even after he resigned his post as ustâdâr in 622/1225, he continued in service to the sultan (Khitat, 11, 367). For example, in 626/1229 he participated in al-Kâmîl's campaign to besiege Hâmâ,72 and in 629/1232 he followed the sultan to conquer the Eastern provinces. But he was befallen by disease on the way and died at Hârrân north of Aleppo on 18 Dhû al-Hijja 629/6 October 1232.73 He was praised as a "noble and great amir" for his management of state affairs as ustâdâr and construction of many mosques and schools.74

Notes

1. Saladin's Syrian army, at first, was composed of al-Asadiya, al-Salahiya and al-Nuriya, the total number of which was 8,500. But al-Umara al-Nuriya, like Yaruk and Jardik, returned to Syria, consented to the advice of Nur al-Din who did not recognize the authority of Saladin in Egypt (Rawdatayn, 11,440). cf. A.S. Ehrenkreutz. Saladin, New York. 1972, p. 72. As to al-Asadiya, it was composed of 500 mamluks (Rawdatayn), 11.436).

2. Rawdatayn, 11,451-452; Kâmîl, XI. 345-347. Saladin who forestalled Mu'tamin's attempt killed him first, and then destroyed his black slave soldiers (Sûdân) at the battle of Bayna al-Qasrayn. It is said that the black slave soldiers, from this time on, was not adopted in the Egyptian regular army till the 18th century (B. Lewis, Race and Color in Islam, New York, 1978, pp. 72-73).
3. Accordingly, Cahen was in error to relate that Saladin introduced the iqt a' system to Egypt in 1171 (Cahen, L’evolution, p. 45).

4. Majmu’a al Watha’iq, 1, 172: Ibn Abi Al-Hayja’, fol. 165v: Itti’az, III, 304. Abú Shâma relates that Saladin was the person in charge (mubâshîr) of allocation when Shirkhq granted iqtas’ to the Syrian army (Rawdatayn, 11, 402). According to this account, Ehrenkreutz says that even before Shirkhq’s death Saladin had begun to distribute feudal assignments to the Syrian Commanders and their troops (Saladin, p. 70). But this would be a view to make vague who had the sovereignty of the Syrian Commanders and their troops (Saladin, p. 70). But this would be a view to make vague who had the sovereignty of the state. cf. M.C. Lyons and D.E.P. Jackson Saladin, Cambridge, 1982. pp. 53-54: N. Elisseef, Nur al-Din, Damas, 1967, p. 726.

5. Khitat, 1,97. Al-Maqrizi further relates that the Egyptian army was dissolved and the Syrian amirs, instead became to possess their families estates, horses, slaves and iqtas’. The Egyptian amirs consequently turned to be the gatekeepers (bawwāb) or the grooms (sâ’is) of the houses where they had lived, or the managers (wâkîl) of iqtas’ which they had held (Itti’az, III, 321).


7. Saladin distributed Ba’ilbakk to Shams al-Dawla tûrânshâh in 574 (Dawla al-Akrad, fol. 4r; Mufarrij, II, 71; A’lq Lubnân 48), al-Bira to Shihâb al Din Mahmûd in 578 (Dawla al-Akrad, fol. 6v) and Bayrût to izz al-Din usamâ in 583 (A’lq Lubnân, 102).

8. Pollik, The Ayyubid Feudalism, p. 431. Though Khubz in the Ayyubid period sometimes means allowance of pay (Gibb. The Armies of Saladin, p. 86). It was used also for the same meaning as iqtas’ as revealed in the following sources: Mufarrij, v, 68, 205-206, 277, 337-338; Dawla al Akrad, fols. 162v-169v; A’lq-Lubnân, 74-75; al-Ta’rikh al-Sâlihi, fol. 220v, Ibn Mammâtî, 233.

9. For example, against the assault of the Nubian troops on Aswân in 586/1173, tûrânshâh advanced his troops to upper Egypt to recover public order (Khitat, 11,37: Rawdatayn, 11, 530-533, Ehrenkreutz, Saladin p. 109). Two years later, the black slave soldiers attacked Qus under the command of ‘Abbâs H. Shâdhi (Rawdatayn, 11, 601-602; Lyons and Jackson, Saladin, p. 77).


11. The political condition in Syria as of 637/1239 is as follows (Kanz, VII, 335): Sâhib al-Shâm ........................................al-Sâlih Najm al-Din
Sâhib al-Karak ........................................al-Nâsîr Dawud
Sâhib Hamâ ........................................al-Muzzaffar Taqi al-Din
Sâhib Hims ............................................al-Mujâhid Asad al-Din
Sâhib Ba’ilbakk ........................................al-Sâlih Isma’îl
Sâhib Halab .............................................al-Nâsîr Salâh al-Din

12. Barq, 111, fols. 72v-73r, Rawdatayn, 11 693: Sulûk, 1, 64. According to Majma’al-Akhbâr, the abolition of the tax levied on the Meccan Pilgrimages was in the year 573 (fol. 378r), but here I took the account of the contemporary source, Barq.

13. Akhbaar al-Ayyûbin, 134-135. About iqtadarbâstâ, we will mention it afterwards.

14. For example, in 577/1181-2 Saladin intended to appropriate the revenues levied from al-Fayyum for the expenses to construct battleships. He, thereby, reduced two-third of the iqtas’ held by the Arabs to provide lands for the muqtas’ of al-Fayyum. Whole province of al-Fayyum thus turned to be the sultan’s domain, and its revenue was to be expended by the ministry of battleship (diwân al-ustûl) (Sulûk, 1.73: Khitat, 11, 194: cf. Ehrenkreutz, Saladin, p. 156).

16. Sulûk, 1, 238-239. The tawâshî we found here means a trooper belonging to the upper class of regular troops (Gibb, The Armies of Saladin, p. 87). Both Qây and Qâyât in the passage were located in the Rahnasâwiya province (M. Ramzi, al Qamus al Jughrâfî Lil-Bilad al-Misriya, vol. 2:i, i al Qâhirâ, 1960, pp. 162, 245), and Duiwa was a village on the east bank of the Rosetta branch of the Nile (Yâqût, 11, 443).

17. While the amirs in the Maimuk period were classified into the well ordered ranks such as “amir of hundred”,”amir of tabkhâna” and “amir of ten”, the influential amirs in the Ayyubid period were only called “al-amîr al-kabîr” or “al-amîr al-misfahsalar” (R.S. Humphreys, The Emergence of the Mamluk Army, Studia Islamica, vol. 45.1972. pp. 87-88).


20. In 642/1244-5 ajnâd al-halqa were given Nâbulus and other provinces as iqta’s by sultan al Sâlíh (Dawla al-Akrâd, fol. 153r. This is a single instance of granting iqta’s to the Ayyubid halqa cavalrymen.

21. Barq, v, fols. 12v-13r; Sanâ al Barq Q. 267. The Ayyubid princes and amirs also held their mamluks (Dawla al Akrâd, fols. 88r, 120v; Mufarrîj, 111, 184: IV, 269: V, 187; Kâmil, XII, 140; Kanz. VII, 124), but there remains no account to inform that these mamluks held iqta’s. It may be supposed that they probably received stipends (Jamaïka, râtib) from their masters.

22. Akhbar al-Ayyûbîn, 148; Akbar al-Diyar al-Misriya, fols. 74v-75r; Mufarrîj IV, 277-278.

23. Akbar al-Ayyûbîn 152; Mufarrîj V, 277; Dawla al-Akrâd. fol. 159r. see also Humphreys. The Emergence. Vol. 45. pp. 94f; D. Ayalon. Le regiment Bahriya dans l’armee mamelouke, Revue des etudes Islamiques, 1951, 133-141.

24. Humphreys. The Emergence, vol. 45. p. 91. In 578/1182-3 Saladin Assigned iqta’s to the Kurds and the Turks in the Eastern provinces (Barq, V, fols. 12v-13c). Then in 581/1185-6, he sent the Kurdish amir Ibn al-Mushtûb al-Hakkârî to al-Jazîrah to increase the number of iqta’s for the Kurds (Sanâ al-Barq Q. 258).


27. Masâlik, III, fol. 33r-v. cf. Qala’îd, 58.


30. Masâlik, III, fol. 26r. In 629/1231-2 al Kâmil advanced his army to take ‘Amid (Mufarrîj, v. 12), and in 631/1233-4 he left Egypt to conquer al-Rûm (Mufarrîj, v. 47). Further, in 633/1235-6 he went toward east to region Harrân and Ruhâ, (Mufarrîj, v. 100). But we can not ascertain which expedition among these corresponds to the one described by al’Umari. About al-Kâmil’s management of the eastern provinces, see II.1. Gottschalk, Al-Malik Al-Kamil Von Egypten und seine zeit, Wiesbaden. 1958. SS. 181f.

32. Sana al-Baq, 1, 65. And both in Hims and Hamā, which were granted to Amir Fakhр al-Dīn Masʻūd as iqṭā’, dīzdar similar in meaning to sāhib was assigned to each citadel for its management (Mufarrij, 11, 22).


35. Barq, III, fol. 62r. cf. Sana al-Barq, 1, 293; Ibn Abī al-Hayjāfol. 177r.

36. Barq, III, fol. 63r; Sana al-Barq, 1, 293-294; Ehrenkreutz, Saladin, pp 118f; Lyons and Jackson, Saladin, pp. 79-80.


38. Ibn Shāhanshāh’s estates mentioned here designate Hama and Salamyā which were granted by Saladin in 575/1179-90 (Mafarrij, 11, 74, 108).

39. Rabie, The Financial System, p. 51. He also says in his al-Nuzum al-Māliyya that the land tax (Kharāj), which rate was 3 irdabbs per faddān in the Fatimid period, was changed to 2.5 irdabbs at this cadastral survey (pp. 42-43). About Saladin’s survey we find brief accounts in the following works: too: Turkhān, al-Nuzum al-Iqta’iya. p. 96; Seseh, Salahaddin, p. 160.

40. Ibn Mamnūt, 259. Al-Maqrizi relates, “While the tax on Wheat in Upper Egypt was 3 irdabbs per faddān in the Fatimid period, it was fixed on 2.5 irdabbs at the land survey (misāḥa) in 572, and then was changed to 2 irdabbs” (Khīṭat, 1, 107). Incidentally in the Hijra year 567, the kharāj year 565 was transferred to 567 according to the old practice of tahwil (khīṭat, 1, 281).


43. Sana’ al-Baq, 1,234; Kāmil, IX 346; Ibn Khallikān, 11, 254; Lyons and Jackson, Saladin, pp. 118, 323. Ibn Mammati later wrote a book entitled al-Fashūsh fi Hukm Qarāqūsh (al-Qahira, n.d.) to criticize Qarāqūsh’s impolite administration in Egypt.

44. Kanz, VII, 42. Ibn Mammati did not call this “dinar jayashi” but “dinār Jundi”, and explained its exchange rate to dirham was different according to the ranks of troops (Ibn Mammati 369. cf. Gibb: The Armies of Saladin, p. 76).

45. Sulūk, 1,493, 507, 518. D. Ayalon, quoting the instances in the early Mamluk period, relates that it is not clear whether the troop of mufadliyya belonged to the halqa or to the other (Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army 11, BSOAS, vol. 15 1953. p. 450, N. 3). But, according to Ibn Shaddād, 400 Mamluks held by Sultan Baybars were composed of amir Isfahsār, mafarida (pl of Mufrad), Khasakṣā, Silahdārya, and Kuttābīya. (Ta’rikh al-Zāhir, 244). We may suppose from this account that the mufrad also was part of the royal mamluks in the later Ayyubid period.
46. Zubda al-Halab, III, 182. Ibn Wāsil relates simply that the Arabs under the command of Mani entered Aleppo and Stationed there (Mufarrij, III, 266). But I described here according to the contemporary source, Zubda.

47. Kāmil, XI, 437-438. On the other hand, muqata' who offered earnest services to Sultan was praised as a model (qudwa) of all the cavalrymen’’ (Sana’ al-Barq Q. 254).

48. Hulâ al-Qāhirat, 162. Tall Kaysán was a pasture near ‘Akkā (Yaqūt, 11, 43). According to Ibn Wāsil, dissatisfaction increased among the soldiers at this time because the term of battle (mudda al-Baykār) had been prolonged (Mufarrij, 11, 340). As to the dissolution of military service in the winter season, see further Mufarrij, 11, 124; Dawla al-Akrād, fol. 135r.

49. Dawla al-Akrād, fol. 48v; Mufarrij, 11, 340-341; Hulâ al-Qāhirat, 166-167. For example, Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf, Lord of Irbil, was not permitted to return to his country even though he had taken illness at the Sultan’s military camp (Mufarrij, 11, 339).

50. Al-Ahkām al-Mulūkiya, fol 35r; Mufarrij, V. 13-14; Khitāt 1. 87-88. Besides, presence at the Sultan’s banquet (ṣimāt), was also regarded as a service muqata’ should offer to Sultan.

51. Al-Ta’rikh al-Sālihi, fol. 221v. Ibn Shaddad says, “At this time twelve towers (burj) were constructed at the citadel of Damascus”. (A’lāq-Dimashq, 39).

52. A’lāq-Halab, 144-145. Haylān was a village (qaryā) belonging to Aleppo, where there was a spring of Fawwara with plentiful water. The water was brought to the city of Aleppo through the canal which length was 35,000 dhīrā al-najārīn (27.125 Km) (Yaqūt, 11, 332).


54. Dhayl Mir’at al-Z, 11, 225, Shamārikh fol. 166v. In 588/1192 when Amir Mashtūb died, Saladin kept two thirds of Nubulus for the waqf of Jerusalem, and distributed the remainder to his son, 'Imād al-Dīn Ahmad b. al-Mashtūb, and two amirs of his comrades (Mufarrij, 11, 410-411; Sulūk, 1, 196; Shamārikh fol. 166v, A’lāq Lubnān, 243-244). Incidentally, when Sultan al-Aziz advanced his army to Damascus in 591/1195, Amir of Ibn (al-jund al-‘ashara) held iqtā’ which revenue was about 1,000 dinārs (Bustān, 155).


56. Ta’rikh al Fayyūm, 43-44. About the tax collection in the Fayyūm province, see further Cahen, Makhzumiyät, Leiden, 1977.

57. R. Irwin, Iqtā’ and the end of the Crusader state, P.M. Holt ed., The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the period of the Crusades, Warminster, 1977, p. 70. According to Rabie, until 715/1315 the taxes like marā’j and hllāl were levied by muqta’s while Zakāt jawāl and mawārith hashriya were collected by the government officials (The Financial System, p. 41).

58. Barq, v. fol. 120v; Sanā al-Barq, 234, Sulūk, 1, 82. Al-Qubaybat was a well with scarce water on the road to Mecca (Yaqūt. IV. 308), and Bush was a town in Upper Egypt on the west bank of the Nile (Yaqūt, 1, 508).


61. Ibn Mammātī, 242, 244. The Cultivation of sugar cane (qasab al-Sukkar) had already diffused in lower Egypt from the Abbasid period, and it spread further to Upper Egypt from the 10th Century on. As the sugar production increased, it became to be one of the most important goods to be exported to Europe and it was consumed in plenty by the Egyptian rich. About the cultivation Lippmann, of sugar cane in Egypt, see the following works: E.O. von lippmann Geschichtedes Zuckers, Leipzig, 1890, j. Mazuel, Le source en Egypte, Caire, 1937, A.M. Watson, Agricultural innovation in the early Islamic world, Cambridge, 1983.
62. Ibn Mammâti, 344, As a rule, wheat straw was divided into three, and each third was a share of diwân, muqla, and muzan’ün cultivators.


65. Ibn Wasil says, “When al-Malik al-Afdal reached the entrance of Egypt with his army in 596/1200, most of them left him and went to their countries for putting their horses out to pasture. Al Malik al-Afdal, thereby, entered Cairo with a few of his troops” (Mafarrîj, III, 108).


67. Ilmâm, IV, 49, Rawdatayn 11, 669, Mufarrîj, 11, 174, Kâmîl, XII, 125, 218.


70. Akhbâr Al-Ayyûbînî, 134-135. According to al-Nâbulusî, the Iqta’ grant to fakhr al-Din was in the year 620 (Ta’rîkh al-Fayyum, 15).


73. Kanz, VII, 306. Khitât, 11, 357, Sulûk, 1, 244.

74. Akhbâr al-Ayyûbînî, 27. His son, Nur al Din ‘Ali, was also one of the influential amirs in the reign of al-Kamîl (Sulûk, 1, 261, 281).
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