Book Reviews

Sarah Büssow-Schmitz, *Die Beduinen der Mamluken: Beduinen im politischen Leben Ägyptens im 8./14. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2016). Pp. x + 169.

Reviewed by Frank H. Stewart, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Egypt has been called "the beloved of the Bedouin *(maʿbūdat al-ʿarab),*"[1] and with good reason: through the centuries, beginning even before the Islamic conquest, Arabic-speaking nomads have poured into the country from east and from west. Yet this Lorelei that so much attracts them has in fact lured them to their doom—not as individuals, but as tribes. For among the flatlands of the Arab world, Egypt is the least hospitable to pastoral nomads. The reason lies in its geography: broadly speaking, the country is divided between those areas that lend themselves so easily to cultivation that they have for millennia supported dense populations—these are the Nile valley, its delta, and the Fayyum; and other areas that are so barren that they can support almost no population at all—these are the Eastern and Western Deserts. The exceptions to this pattern, apart from a few oases in the Western Desert, are the northern margins of the Delta: al-Buḥayrah in the west and al-Sharqīyah in the east, both of which shade off into steppe. The tendency has been for the nomads who stayed in Egypt (many merely passed through) to settle down and gradually merge with the sedentary population; but for much of the Islamic period there was at the same time an inflow of new tribespeople, so that some tribal Arabs were always present. These immigrants have probably never made up a large part of the population, but their importance in Egyptian history has been disproportionate to their numbers.

That importance has been both political (of this more below) and cultural. It has been said that the main factor in the spread of Arabic in Egypt was the gradual settlement of Arab nomads in the rural areas.[2] To this day, rural upper Egypt, with its blood-feuds and customary law, is an unmistakably tribal society, and there is every reason to believe that this is not an inheritance from pre-Islamic times but rather the result of centuries during which the Bedouin dominated the

[1] Luṭfī al-Sayyid, *Qabāʾil al-ʿArab fī Miṣr* (Cairo, 1935), 82.

[2] C. H. Becker, *Islamstudien* (Leipzig, 1924), 1:151f. Becker contrasts the profound Arabization of Egypt with the superficial Hellenization that preceded it. The leading experts on Egyptian dialects write that "there is no dialect area in Egypt where Bedouin tribes were not present somehow, and still are, and have thus contributed through mixing and coexistence with the autochthonous population to its linguistic evolution." Peter Behnstedt and Manfred Woidich, "The Formation of the Egyptian Arabic Dialect Area," to appear in *Arabic Historical Dialectology,* ed. Clive Holes (Oxford, forthcoming). My thanks to the authors for providing me with a pre-print of this chapter.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.

DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

region. There are also undoubtedly wider Bedouin influences on Egyptian culture, though we cannot perceive them with any clarity; we lack not only the data, but also the intellectual tools, that would allow us to do so.[3]

From a historiographical point of view, one can distinguish three periods in the history of the Egyptian Bedouin. The pre-Ottoman centuries have attracted a number of scholars, and the general level of the research is high. Of particular relevance to the book under review is the unpublished doctoral dissertation by Yigal Shwartz, "The Bedouin in Egypt during the Mamluk Period," a study that laid solid foundations for all subsequent work on the subject.[4] For the Ottoman period (1516–1798) there is almost no secondary literature, in part, no doubt, because of the paucity of sources. The modern era is the subject of a fair number of publications, but most of them are of inferior quality.

The central theme of Büssow-Schmitz's book is the relationship between the Mamluks and the Egyptian Bedouin in the fourteenth century, or more exactly in the years 1310–99. This was the century that opened with the brilliantly successful Mamluk expedition against the Bedouin of Upper Egypt in 1302; that saw increasing Bedouin troubles in the 1340s, resulting in another major expedition to Upper Egypt in 1353; and that ended with the gradual loss of control over the western and southern border regions of the country.[5]

Büssow-Schmitz begins with two introductory sections: the Introduction proper and Part I of the book. The former covers the topics that one would expect (e.g., sources, methods, survey of the literature), and also deals with the question of who will count as Bedouin for the purpose of this work. The reply that Büssow-Schmitz gives—an eminently sensible one—is, in effect, that the Bedouin are the people whom the sources call *ʿarab, aʿrāb, ʿurbān,* or (much less often) *badw,* or who are referred to by tribal names. She describes these people as distinguished from others by "language, descent, values and traditions" (p. 5). This is broadly speaking correct, but it is perhaps worth adding that Büssow-Schmitz's statement should not be taken to imply that the people whom the Mamluk authors lumped

[3] See further Frank H. Stewart, "Tribalism," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Islamic Political Thought,* ed. Gerhard Böwering and others, 563–67, which argues that in about 1800 almost the whole rural population of the Arab world either still retained, or had to a large degree adopted, tribal values.

[4] Shwartz's dissertation ("Ha-Bedwim be-Mitsrayim ba-Tequfa ha-Mamlukit," 2 vols., Tel-Aviv University, 1987) is over a thousand pages long. Büssow-Schmitz uses a German translation of the central part of the work which has appeared under the title *Die Beduinen in Ägypten in der Mamlukenzeit*. In what follows references to Shwartz will be to the Hebrew original, since its pagination is given in the translation. The translation (which includes the English abstract of the dissertation) is available on line at http://www.nomadsed.de/fileadmin/user_upload/redakteure/Dateien_Projekte/SHWARTZ_BEDUINEN__2011_.pdf

[5] Shwartz, "Ha-Bedwim," 1:298.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

together as Bedouin had all these features in common, or that such features invariably distinguished between Bedouin and others. It is not even certain that all these Bedouin spoke Arabic, and those who did speak Arabic certainly spoke a variety of dialects, not all of them of a distinctly Bedouin type.[6] As for descent, it is likely that all or very nearly all the various Bedouin groups represented themselves as descended from Arabian ancestors. In reality, however, many groups were mainly of Berber, Beja, or native Egyptian descent, and there were people not classified as Bedouin who prided themselves on their Arabian descent. The values and traditions of the Bedouin groups must also have been quite varied: in particular, there must have been a contrast between those that came to Egypt from North Africa and those that came directly from Arabia; and this is to say nothing of the differences between recent arrivals, those who had been in Egypt for generations, and those who were in fact the descendants of native Egyptians. Büssow-Schmitz mentions two further features that distinguished the Bedouin: they were armed and they were organized in tribes (p. 36). The former feature they shared, of course, with the Mamluks; the latter—vague though it is—was perhaps their central identifying feature.[7]

Büssow-Schmitz's Introduction includes a useful section on the effects of the Black Death (1347–49). The Bedouin seem to have been more troublesome to the Egyptian authorities in the second half of the fourteenth century than they were in the first half. Some scholars have suggested that this was because the Bedouin suffered less from the plague than did other inhabitants, so that they came to form a larger proportion of the (now much diminished) total population. Büssow-Schmitz argues (on the basis of her extensive research on the subject, which she has published elsewhere) that the Bedouin were affected to much the same degree as other Egyptians.

Part I of the book is an excellent discussion of where and how the Bedouin lived in medieval Egypt. Here the author (quite rightly) does not limit herself to data from the fourteenth century. The main source of livelihood for the Bedouin was undoubtedly agriculture, and there is extensive evidence of their involvement in both animal husbandry and crop cultivation. Now there are plenty of communities in the Middle East and North Africa that combine these activities with a more or less nomadic way of life, but Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, writing in the first half of the fourteenth century, describes the Egyptian Bedouin as sedentary farmers.[8] As Büssow-Schmitz points out (p. 31), this was certainly not true of all of them, but it was true of many. The most detailed testimony to this effect comes from an-

[6] See the remarks below on the Bedouin of the Fayyūm.

[7] Cf. Shwartz, "Ha-Bedwim," 1:5.

[8] Quoted by Büssow-Schmitz, 21 and 31. (The statement about Rapoport in n. 99 of p. 21 actually belongs to n. 100.)

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.

DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

other work that Büssow-Schmitz uses here, Abū ʿUthmān al-Nābulusī's so-called *Tārīkh al-Fayyūm,*[9] a cadastral survey produced in the mid-1240s. His chapter on the inhabitants of the Fayyūm is headed *fī dhikr al-sākinīn bi-hi wa-inqisāmihim ilá al-badw wa-al-ḥaḍar.* What follows makes it clear that al-Nābulusī is not drawing a distinction between nomads and sedentaries, but rather between two groups of sedentaries: the Muslims, who constituted the great majority of the inhabitants and were mostly *badw* (organized in tribes, about which al-Nābulusī gives many details), and the small Christian minority, who were all *ḥaḍar.* In his publications on al-Nābulusī's work, Yossef Rapoport has argued convincingly that all, or virtually all, of these Bedouin were direct descendants of the ancient Christian population of the Fayyūm.[10] He is able to show that their conversion to Islam probably took place not more than a couple of hundred years before the time of al-Nābulusī, and was therefore simultaneous with, or quite closely followed by, their assumption of a Bedouin identity. Rapoport's views can be supported by the dialectological evidence. We are authoritatively told that "the Fayyūm dialects belong to the earliest linguistic stratum."[11] This indicates that, just as Rapoport argues, there was no major nomadic influx after the Arab conquest. It also shows that the Fayyūm *badw* did not speak a distinctively Bedouin dialect.

Rapoport demonstrates that the Fayyūmīs had excellent fiscal reasons for becoming Bedouin. The tribes whose identities they adopted are well known, and there must have been contact of some kind between them and the Fayyūmīs. The exact nature of that contact remains a matter of speculation.

Rapoport believes that what we know of the Fayyūm is largely true of the rest of Egypt in the thirteenth century (and no doubt later). In particular he holds that:

1. "The sedentary life of the Arab tribesmen of the Fayyūm was…not an exception, but rather the rule in most Egyptian provinces along the Nile valley."[12] Büssow-Schmitz seems to accept this, saying that Rapoport's thesis implies that the term Bedouin *(ʿarab* etc., *badw)* in fourteenth-century Egypt referred to people with a particular identity and status, not to people who engaged in distinctive economic activities and followed a special way of life (p. 34).

---

[9]Ed. B. Moritz, Cairo, 1898. A new edition (with an English translation) by Yossef Rapoport and Ido Shahar is in press. They discovered that the title *Tārīkh al-Fayyūm* was supplied by Moritz.

[10]Rapoport's arguments were first set out in "Invisible Peasants, Marauding Nomads: Taxation, Tribalism, and Rebellion in Mamluk Egypt," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 8 (2004): 1–22. A more developed statement of his views is to be found in "Where Did the Christians Go? Peasants and Tribesmen of the Fayyum, 1060–1240," to appear in *Egypt and Empire: Religious Identities from Roman to Modern Times,* ed. Elisabeth R. O'Connell (London, forthcoming). My thanks to Dr. Rapoport for providing me with a pre-print. He has in press a book entitled *Rural Economy and Tribal Society in Islamic Egypt: A Study of al-Nābulusī's "Villages of the Fayyum."*

[11]Behnstedt and Woidich, "The Formation."

[12]Rapoport, "Invisible Peasants," 18.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

2. Most of the Egyptian Bedouin were not (as is widely believed) descendants of Arab (or Berber) tribespeople who became sedentary, but rather of native Egyptian peasants. Büssow-Schmitz accepts this thesis (p. 34). Genetic research may at some future date give us a clearer picture of the ancestry of the inhabitants of the various regions of Egypt.

3. "Most of the Muslim peasantry in the Egyptian countryside had an Arab tribal identity."[13] Büssow-Schmitz notes this claim (p. 34), but does not tell us her own opinion of it. Whatever the truth of Rapoport's view, it is clear that some tribes—or perhaps one should say, the tribes of some regions—were much more important than others. These are the ones that had to be dealt with by the Mamluk sultans as more or less independent entities, and whose leaders were addressed with the respectful formulas that we find in the *inshāʾ* works.

Büssow-Schmitz offers much interesting detail about Bedouin stock raising, together with an account of the large herds of horses, camels, and small stock held by some of the Mamluks. She shows too how the Bedouin were involved in carrying and trading. Their basic food was grain, and in addition to growing it themselves, they sometimes acquired it by trade, sometimes by robbery, and sometimes were even supplied with it from the Mamluks' granaries. A section is devoted to the ʿĀʾid tribe, which gained substantial wealth through control of the routes to Syria and the Hijaz. Some of their number were in charge of the sultan's riding camels. Further sections of Part I of the book discuss particular regions of Egypt and the Bedouin activities peculiar to them, e.g., the natron trade of Buḥayrah and the slave trade of Upper Egypt.

Part II of Büssow-Schmitz's book tells of how the Bedouin are treated in the Mamluk chronicles. She contrasts the stereotypes of the Bedouin as he appears in works of religion and *adab*—poor, crude, and irreligious, a figure of fun because of his naiveté, though also eloquent and outspoken—with the more varied and down-to-earth representations in the chronicles. Here what counts is above all the significance of the Bedouin for the Mamluk empire (p. 57). Mostly they came to the attention of the authorities as disturbers of the peace. In this context Büssow-Schmitz analyzes at length the chroniclers' use of the two terms *fasād* and *nifāq*. They regularly apply the latter word to expressions of Bedouin unrest, and use the associated verb *nāfaqa ʿalá* in the sense of "to revolt against." Büssow-Schmitz describes how this usage developed from the terminology of the Quran and hadith. She then considers four different fourteenth- and fifteenth-century accounts of the great Bedouin rising in the mid-fourteenth century. They are of

[13] Ibid., 21. This statement applies especially to Middle and Upper Egypt (cf. ibid., 18). In a personal communication Dr. Rapoport writes that "it is possible (though unlikely, in my view) that in the Delta more peasants did not have tribal identity."

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

course not favorable to the Bedouin, but they show no trace of the stereotypes mentioned above.

Büssow-Schmitz goes on to report on what Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (1327–70) has to say about the Bedouin in his *Muʿīd al-Niʿam*. Like not a few other medieval Muslim authors, he contrasts the Bedouin *(ʿarab)* with "the Muslims," implicitly denying the former membership in the community of believers. He tells us that the nomadic *umarāʾ al-ʿarab* of his time were endowed (by the sultan) with great wealth *(al-arzāq al-wāfirah wa-al-iqṭāʿāt al-hāʾilah)* in order to induce them not to harm the Muslims; and that if the sultan withdraws the *iqṭāʿ* of one of these amirs, then the latter turns to highway robbery and bloodshed.[14] In her analysis Büssow-Schmitz points out that this theme of wealth combined with depravity is not one that has hitherto been noted in the classical literature. Al-Subkī adds that the worst of the Bedouin are those of the Ḥijāz, some of whom perhaps even think that it is legitimate to rob the pilgrims. He proceeds to list further evil practices of the Bedouin: many of them marry in a fashion that is not in accordance with the shariʿah; their daughters do not inherit; and no restrictions are placed on sexual intercourse between their slaves. There can be little doubt as to the accuracy of these three charges.

Part II ends with a discussion of what Büssow-Schmitz calls the instrumentalization of the Bedouin. By this she means the way in which certain authors used statements about the Bedouin as a means of putting over a particular message. She gives us three examples. Ibn al-Dawādārī writes about the Bedouin in such a way as to glorify his late father, who at one point in his career was in some sense responsible to the authorities for the Bedouin of the Sharqīyah. Al-Maqrīzī more than once uses episodes in the relations between the Bedouin and the government as an opportunity to criticize the Mamluk regime. Ibn Iyās, writing at the very end of the Mamluk period, may have intended his depiction of the great anti-Bedouin expedition of 1353 as an encouragement to the sultan to act with equal energy against the encroaching Ottomans (though Büssow-Schmitz also offers other possible interpretations of the chronicler's aims).

The last and longest part of the book, Part III, deals with relations between the Bedouin—including on occasion those of Syria—and the Mamluks. This part opens with a chapter that surveys various conflicts between Mamluks and Egyptian Bedouins in the fourteenth century. Büssow-Schmitz contrasts the determination of the Mamluks to crush and dominate the Egyptian Bedouin with their

[14] I follow here the translation of this passage given by Stefan Leder, "Nomadische Lebensformen und ihre Wahrnehmung im Spiegel der arabischen Terminologie," *Die Welt des Orients* 34 (2004): 72–104, rather than the one given by Büssow-Schmitz. It looks as if Leder reads at this point *qaṭaʿa* (as in the Beirut, 1983 ed., 54), while Büssow-Schmitz reads *aqṭaʿa* (as in the London, 1908 ed., Arabic text, 75).

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

more relaxed policy towards the Syrian Bedouin. She ascribes this partly to the difficult relations between the various Bedouin groups in Egypt—it was often their conflicts with each other and the resulting disorders, rather than revolt against the government as such, that led to Mamluk intervention. In Syria it seems that relations between the tribes were more stable, and Büssow-Schmitz suggests that this was because of the domination of the Āl Faḍl.

The survey of conflicts between Bedouin and Mamluks is followed by a chapter that details how such conflicts were settled, with special attention to the practice of intercession *(shafāʿah)*. Generally it was the Bedouin who were asking for peace and offering to return to obedience to the sultan. The sultan would demand that the Bedouin leaders assume certain responsibilities, and would offer them favors—notably *iqṭāʿāt*—in return.

The third chapter of Part III is entitled "Rules of Symbolic Communication." By "symbolic communication" Büssow-Schmitz means non-verbal communication, a term she also occasionally uses (p. 116 and cf. p. 6). She points out that a single action, e.g., an execution, may have both a practical and a communicative function, and indeed starts her discussion of symbolic communication between Mamluks and Bedouin with communications connected to the use of force. Among them are the triumphal procession through Cairo that followed the suppression of al-Aḥdab's revolt in 1354 and the display in 1378 of the heads of eleven leaders of the Awlād al-Kanz on the Bāb Zuwaylah in the capital. Büssow-Schmitz does not mention any cases of Bedouin using force with communicative intentions, and this is presumably because such cases—and they must have existed—left no trace in the chronicles. The sources are always niggardly with information about the tribes, but still, if the Bedouin had resembled the Mamluks in committing such acts as the public flogging of their captives or the building of structures from the skulls of their victims, then surely some record of it would have reached us.

The next section of this chapter deals with gifts and honors, and here the Bedouin appear on both sides of the transactions. Their notables were sometimes recipients of the robes of honor that were an important feature of Mamluk ceremony, and sometimes of the many other gifts and honors that were at the sultan's disposal, among them *iqṭāʿāt*. Horses were probably the most important gifts given by the Bedouin to the sultan, but they also offered (among other things) camels, wild animals, and slaves. Büssow-Schmitz offers a careful analysis of the varied circumstances in which gifts and honors were bestowed. One of the most important was when a Bedouin leader who had revolted *(kharaja ʿan al-ṭāʿah)* returned to obedience. This was usually done at court, and accompanied by an oath of fealty.

From here the book moves naturally into a chapter on the integration of the Bedouin into the Mamluk state. As was mentioned above, the Mamluks had to

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

deal with certain tribes, and not only those on their borders, as more or less independent entities. This is a situation in which many states have found themselves, and the Mamluk way of dealing with it was of a familiar kind: they gave the tribal leaders titles (accompanied by *iqṭāʿāt* and other favors) that implied that those leaders were part of the normal administrative apparatus of the state. We see this reflected in *inshāʾ* works and the like, where Bedouin tribal leaders with the title of amir are listed alongside other functionaries such as the qadis or the governors of provinces. Sometimes this integration was little more than nominal, a face-saving fiction, but at other times it was real enough.

There were various ranks of amir. The most senior offered to the Bedouin was *amīr al-ʿarab,* the holder of which was sometimes also called *malik al-ʿarab.* In general, there were at any given time several Egyptian Bedouin who bore this title. In principle an amir was supposed to rule not only over his own tribe but also over those in the area for which he was responsible. Büssow-Schmitz suggests, however, that in practice his powers were usually limited, and that he acted rather as the representative of the Bedouin in a given region. The Bedouin were people to whom the Mamluks found direct access difficult, and all communications to and from them were supposed to go through the amir. The title often became hereditary, but given the nature of Bedouin society, this probably did not in itself weaken whatever power the sultan had over the tribes.

The last chapter of Part III of the book is an extended account of the most spectacular Bedouin revolt of the fourteenth century, that of al-Aḥdab, who at some time around 1353 declared himself sultan, and surrounded himself with the ceremonial paraphernalia of the Mamluk court. Büssow-Schmitz uses the narrative as an opportunity to illustrate the various themes that were treated earlier in the book.[15]

With this the book ends, apart from a brief final summary. The strengths of *Die Beduinen der Mamluken* lie in the author's wide knowledge of the sources, clarity of language, and invariable good sense. The arrangement of the material leaves something to be desired—here and there the reader is conscious of some overlapping and repetition. But this is a work on an important subject, and one that deserves to be read by all serious students of Mamluk history.[16]

[15] A fuller version of this chapter is available in English: Sarah Büssow-Schmitz, "Rules of Communication and Politics between Bedouin and Mamluk Elites in Egypt: The Case of the al-Aḥdab Revolt, c. 1353," *Eurasian Studies* 9 (2011): 67–104.

[16] My thanks to Sarah Büssow-Schmitz and Etan Kohlberg for their helpful comments on a draft of this review.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

A Note on the Use of Nineteenth-Century Sources

In Part I of her book Büssow-Schmitz makes occasional use of sources from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in order to supplement the limited information available in the medieval material. This is a reasonable procedure provided that (as in this case) the modern data are used in a sensible fashion. There is, however, a minor problem here. Büssow-Schmitz depends mainly on three modern sources (p. 21 n. 101); two of them are unexceptionable,[17] but the third is badly chosen. It is *Les Bédouins* (Paris, 1816), a work in three volumes of which Büssow-Schmitz uses the first. The only name that appears on the title page of this book is that of F. J. Mayeux, and Büssow-Schmitz takes him to be the author (e.g., p. 34). In actuality Mayeux was (as he himself states in his preface) merely the editor. The author was Dom Raphaël de Monachis (1759–1831), a Greek Catholic monk who was born in Egypt. This remarkable man became a member of Napoleon's Institut d'Egypte and was later a colleague of Silvestre de Sacy, and a teacher of Jean-François Champollion, at the Ecole des Langues Orientales in Paris.[18]

Büssow-Schmitz refers several times to Dom Raphaël's report on the Hanādwah Bedouin of Upper Egypt.[19] On p. 22 n. 109, she writes that they were mainly nomadic (and similarly p. 34), while on p. 32 she implies that they were mainly sedentary. Dom Raphaël's account could be used to support either conclusion. He tells us that the tribe is one of the largest in Egypt, extending from Beni Suef to Girga; and that in this region, "qu'elle parcourt incessament à l'usage des Nomades," they allow no other tribe to set up camp.[20] But he also emphasizes the fertility of the region, and says that the tribespeople's main concern is agriculture, their days being divided between work in the fields and the care of their numerous

[17] Detlef-Müller Mahn, *Fellachendörfer* (Stuttgart, 2001), a work that, despite what its title suggests, contains useful information about a Bedouin village in the Minya governorate; and Fuad Ibrahim and Barbara Ibrahim, *Ägypten* (Stuttgart, 2001), a geographical study (of which an English version was published in 2003).

[18] The best biography remains Charles Bachatly "Un membre orientale du premier Institut d'Égypte, Don Raphaël," *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte* 17 (1934–35): 237–60. For Dom Raphaël's Bedouin studies, see Serga Moussa, *Le mythe bédouin chez les voyageurs aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles* (Paris, 2016), 141–49. The substance of these pages is also to be found in Sarga Moussa, "Le mythe des Bédouins à l'aube du XIXe siècle: l'exemple de dom Raphaël de Monachis," in *Livre du monde, le monde des livres: Mélanges en l'honneur de François Moureau* (Paris, 2012), 847–57. Downloaded from https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00910047.

[19] The tribe's name is usually given as al-Hanādī, but the form Hanādwah is recorded by Amédée Jaubert, "Nomenclature des tribus d'Arabes qui campent entre l'Egypte et la Palestine," in *Description de l'Égypte* (2nd ed., Paris, 1821–30), 16:107–37 at 131, noted by Max v. Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen* (Leipzig and Wiesbaden, 1939–68), 1:295n.

[20] *Les Bédouins,* 1:44.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

herds.[21] As Büssow-Schmitz points out, numerous herds do not necessarily imply nomadism, and my guess is that the people whom Dom Raphaël describes were largely sedentary. He mentions the Hanādwah's incessant coming and going not in the context of stock raising, but rather in the context of maintaining control of the tribal territory. We know from Dom Raphaël's contemporary Edme Jomard that each of the more powerful Bedouin tribes on the Nile had a well-defined territory, within which some of the land was directly exploited by the Bedouin themselves, while the rest was cultivated by the defenseless and oppressed fellahin. Each Bedouin tribe stayed within its own territory, guarding it jealously, and, in particular, preventing any other tribe from despoiling the fellahin who lived in that territory.[22]

The problems presented by Dom Raphaël's book do not, however, arise merely from some uncertainty as to what he wishes to convey to us. There is, rather, a general question as to the authenticity of his information. Certainly, what he writes about the Hanādwah does not inspire much faith. This is a tribe of North African origin, elements of which had recently arrived in the Nile Valley after much fighting with other tribes in the Western Desert. If Dom Raphaël had had any real contact with the tribespeople, he would surely have learned this and reported it. Instead he describes at some length what he views as Christian elements in the customs and beliefs of the Hanādwah, and suggests that the tribespeople are of Coptic origin.[23] And there is also another oddity in his account. While he is right in describing the Hanādwah as a large tribe, the claim that their territory ran from Beni Suef to Girga, a distance of some four hundred kilometers, is much exaggerated. Jaubert places them in Girga alone,[24] and Jomard, who writes in some detail about the Bedouin of Beni Suef and Minya (Ashmunein) provinces,[25] does not mention the Hanādwah at all.

Serga Moussa points out that Dom Raphaël was a scholar rather than a fieldworker, and that his data on the Bedouin are at least in part dependent on written sources.[26] Moussa himself does not attempt to trace these sources or to evaluate the reliability of what Dom Raphaël tells us. Until this has been done, we must exercise caution in using Dom Raphaël's book.

[21] Ibid., 46.

[22] E. Jomard, "Observations sur les Arabes de l'Égypte moyenne," in *Description de l'Égypte,* 12:267–327 at 294f.

[23] Büssow-Schmitz seems to accept this suggestion (p. 34), citing it (not quite consistently) in support of Rapoport's thesis that the Fayyūm Bedouin were of Coptic descent.

[24] "Nomenclature," 131.

[25] "Observations," 267n.

[26] *Mythe bédouin,* 142.

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

In the work under review, a small mistake on page 41 n. 257 needs to be corrected. In contrast to what is suggested there, the ʿĀʾid (or ʿĀyid) and the ʿAyāydah are two unrelated tribes.[27] The ancestor of the one is ʿĀʾid (or ʿĀʾidh), and of the other ʿAyyād. Both tribes still have descendants in Egypt,[28] and the present-day ʿAyāydah are quite well documented.[29] The passages from Murray, *Sons of Ishmael* (London, 1935), and Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys* (London, 1830), that Büssow-Schmitz refers to in note 257 relate to the ʿAyāydah, and are therefore irrelevant to her work: only the ʿĀʾid are known from the period that concerns her.[30] It may be added that the reference to Burckhardt's *Notes* given by

[27]Both Muḥammad Sulaymān al-Ṭayyib, *Mawsūʿat al-Qabāʾil al-ʿArabīyah,* 1:724 n.; 2nd ed. (Cairo, 1997), 1/2:557 n., and Aymān Muḥammad Zaghrūt, *Muʿjam Qabāʾil Miṣr* (Cairo, 2010), 646, explicitly reject the conflation of the two tribes. There is indeed no real evidence that the two names refer to the same tribe, though it has been asserted by reputable authorities, e.g., Alfred v. Kremer, *Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1863), 1:116, and ʿAbbās Muṣṭafá ʿAmmār, *Al-Madkhal al-Sharqī li-Miṣr* (Cairo, 1946), 126, 178. Even ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jabartī gets the names muddled up: he refers to a member of the Abāẓah lineage, which is well known to belong to the ʿĀyid, as shaykh of the ʿAyāydah. *ʿAjāʾib al-Āthār fī al-Tarājim wa-al-Akhbār* (Jerusalem, 2013), 3:43 = ibid (Bulaq, 1879–80), 3:38 = *Napoleon in Egypt: Al-Jabartī's Chronicle of the First Seven Months of the French Occupation, 1798* (Princeton, 1993), 116. De Chabrol, writing at about the same time as al-Jabartī, leaves no doubt that there were actually two distinct tribes. "Essai sur les moeurs des habitans modernes de l'Égypte," in *Description de l'Égypte,* 18/1:26.

[28]Zaghrūt, *Muʿjam,* 515–16, 646–48; for the Sharqīyah, see also Fahmi Abul-Fadl, *Volkstümliche Texte in arabischen Bauerndialekten der ägyptischen Provinz Šarqiyya* (Münster, 1961), 2f. (on the ʿĀyid and their villages in the area called Bilād al-ʿĀyid or Kufūr al-ʿĀyid); further village names in the Sharqīyah relating to the ʿĀyid are noted in Shwartz, "Ha-Bedwim," 1:513 n. 217, drawing on Muḥammad Ramzī, *Al-Qāmūs al-Jughrāfī lil-Bilād al-Miṣrīyah* (Cairo, 1953–63), 1:82 and 2/1:103, 162; see also Gabriel Baer, *Studies in the Social History of Modern Egypt* (Chicago, 1969), 4. My impression is that the modern-day descendants of the ʿĀyid no longer constitute a social unit of the kind we would call a tribe; the ʿĀyid are indeed already absent from the official lists of Egyptian tribes in the census of 1882 and the Qānūn al-ʿUrbān of 1906 (Luṭfi al-Sayyid, *Qabāʾil al-ʿArab,* 32ff.).

[29]Clinton Bailey and Avshalom Shmueli, "The Settlement of the Sinaitic ʿAyāydah in the Suez Canal Zone," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 109 (1977): 27–38; Joseph Ginat, *Bedouin Bishaʿh Justice* (Brighton, 2009); Salim Alafenisch, *Die Feuerprobe* (Zurich, 2007). For the Arabic dialect of the ʿAyāydah, see Rudolf de Jong, *A grammar of the Bedouin dialects of the northern Sinai littoral* (Leiden, 2000). There is a village in the Sharqīyah called Kafr ʿAyyād Kurayyim (Ramzī, *Qāmūs,* 2/1:80).

[30]The earliest certain mention of the ʿAyāydah that I know of is from the year 1739: Richard Pococke, *A description of the East and some other countries* (London, 1743–45), 1:137, noted by Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen,* 2:140 n. 4. It has been stated that a manuscript from St. Catherine's Monastery refers to the ʿAyāydah in about 1600. Clinton Bailey, "Dating the Arrival of the Bedouin tribes in Sinai and the Negev," *Journal of the Social and Economic History of the Orient* 28 (1985): 20–49 at 49 n. 92. This may be correct, but it has not so far been possible to identify the manuscript in question. Frank H. Stewart, "Notes on the Arrival of the Bedouin tribes in Sinai,"

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.

DOI: 10.6082/vcev-we98. (https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98)

DOI of Vol. XXI: 10.6082/X11b-km37. See https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04 to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html for more information about copyright and open access.

Büssow-Schmitz is taken from Murray, and was apparently not checked against the original: Burckhardt speaks of the ʿAyāydah as numbering about six hundred horsemen a hundred years before his time, i.e., in the early eighteenth century. Büssow-Schmitz, perhaps misled by Murray's paraphrase of this passage, says that Burckhardt gives this figure for the early nineteenth century.

JESHO 34 (1991): 97–110 at 98, 107 n. 15. Al-Ṭayyib (*Mawsūʿat al-Qabāʾil,* 1:721n., 2d ed. 1/2:554 n.) states that the ʿAyāydah are mentioned by ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Jazīrī (mid-sixteenth century) under the name Banī ʿAyyād. I have not been able to find exactly this name (al-Ṭayyib gives no page or folio number), but al-Jazīrī does refer to a people called the Awlād ʿAyyād. The context implies that they are a substantial group, and they may indeed be our ʿAyāydah. *Al-Durar al-farāʾid al-munaẓẓamah fī akhbār al-ḥājj wa-ṭarīq Makkah al-Muʿaẓẓamah* (Beirut, 2002), 2:119. Perhaps it should be mentioned that there is also a small group in Karak called Awlād ʿAyyād (Frederick G. Peake, *A History of Trans-Jordan and its Tribes,* Amman, 1934, 2:371) or ʿYāl ʿAyyād (Alois Musil, *Arabia Petraea,* Vienna, 1908, 3:97).

©2018 by Frank H. Stewart.
DOI: **10.6082/vcev-we98**. (**https://doi.org/10.6082/vcev-we98**)

DOI of Vol. XXI: **10.6082/X11b-km37**. See **https://doi.org/10.6082/v8sk-rk04** to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See **http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html** for more information about copyright and open access.