Charity, Endowments, and Charitable Institutions in Medieval Islam

Yaacov Lev

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF FLORIDA

Charity, Endowments, and Charitable Institutions in Medieval Islam

Florida A&M University, Tallahassee
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton
Florida Gulf Coast University, Ft. Myers
Florida International University, Miami
Florida State University, Tallahassee
New College of Florida
University of Central Florida, Orlando
University of Florida, Gainesville
University of North Florida, Jacksonville
University of South Florida, Tampa
University of West Florida, Pensacola

Charity, Endowments, and Charitable Institutions in Medieval Islam

Yaacov Lev

University Press of Florida
Gainesville/Tallahassee/Tampa/Boca Raton
Pensacola/Orlando/Miami/Jacksonville/Ft. Myers/Sarasota

Printed in the United States of America on recycled, acid-free paper

A record of cataloging-in-publication data is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-0-8130-3589-5

The University Press of Florida is the scholarly publishing agency for the State University System of Florida, comprising Florida A&M University, Florida Atlantic University, Florida Gulf Coast University, Florida International University, Florida State University, New College of Florida, University of Central Florida, University of Florida, University of North Florida, University of South Florida, and University of West Florida.

University Press of Florida
15 Northwest 15th Street
Gainesville, FL 32611-2079
http://www.upf.com

This book is dedicated to the memory of Simha Sabari (1916–2004), my mentor and teacher of classical Arabic and medieval Islamic history during my undergraduate and postgraduate studies at Tel Aviv University, 1968–74. In this age of narrow specialization she brought broad vision and humanistic values, moving freely between Abbasid *belles lettres*, the palaces and streets of medieval Baghdad, and social history of Mandatory Palestine. Her approach was humanistic, marked by great empathy for the people whose lives and deeds she had studied. Her teaching and work (*Mouvements populaires à Bagdad à l'époque abbasside IXe-XIe siècles* [Paris, 1981]) are a constant source of inspiration. It is a great pity that her work about the labor movement in Mandatory Palestine was never published but it served some of her postgraduate students as well as other scholars.

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments

This book is a study into the religious beliefs of medieval men, their social practices, and the institutions they created that shaped their lives and conduct. Although medieval Islam is the primary framework of this inquiry, much of what follows also applies to the Jewish and Christian worlds. The notion of charity (Arabic *sadaqa*, Hebrew *tsedaqa*), in the most basic sense of giving, is deeply embedded in the religious thought and ethics of the three monotheistic religions and was central to the lives of medieval Jews, Muslims, and Christians. It represented the essence of their piety and quest for nearness to God.

In recent years, the study of medieval Islamic charity has been advanced by a great proliferation of studies into the Islamic institution of pious endowment (*waqf*). The Islamic pious endowment system was a remarkable institution that embodied not only the religious beliefs of the founder of the endowment but also his altruism and his desperate attempt to defend his property and interests. Although, like many other institutions, the *waqf* system functioned quite well, it was also susceptible to widespread abuse. We owe much of our understanding of the *waqf* institution to the work of Muhammad Muhammad al-Amin, whose book on pious endowments and social life in medieval Egypt is a landmark in the field of Islamic social history, as is his extensive publication of pious endowment deeds, which opened new vistas for research. Students of medieval Islamic history also owe an immeasurable debt to the scholars who were behind two scholarly undertakings: the *Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum* and the *Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe*. Most of the epigraphic data used in this study is drawn from these two works, which corroborate information derived from other sources and provide new data and fresh insights.

The need to integrate the study of charity into a wider context of economic history and the history of poverty is obvious. The economic history of medieval and Ottoman Islam is an advanced field of study, but any attempt to correlate salaries and charitable expenditures quoted in pious endowment deeds with wider trends that reflected monetary changes is problematic. Frequently, the results obtained are too fragmentary to provide any meaningful picture, and this type of study is also hampered by the fact that the economic aspects of charity are rarely referred to in the literary sources. Nonetheless, future research, perhaps conducted on a narrower local scale, should be carried out before any broader generalizations are attempted. In this work, poverty and

the need for charity are taken for granted, and, wherever possible, the economic effectiveness of charity in alleviating individual and social misery is addressed.

In the course of my research and preparations for this book, I received assistance from many individuals and institutions to whom I would like to express my gratitude. My thanks go first to Yehoshua Frenkel of Haifa University, with whom I have discussed the practice of charity and social history of medieval Islam over many years. I am much indebted to Mark R. Cohen of Princeton University for sharing his views about the issue of *ahl al-satr* with me and for the offprints of the articles he made available to me. In his forthcoming book about poverty and charity based on the Geniza documents, Cohen offers an alternative interpretation of *ahl al-satr* to the one suggested in my article (*JSAI* 24 [2000]). I am grateful to my colleagues Eliezer Tauber, Michael M. Laskier, and Zeev Maghen of the Department of Middle Eastern History at Bar Ilan University for providing the stimulating academic environment that helped clarify the orientation of my work. I owe a debt of gratitude to Hilda Nissimi, another Bar Ilan colleague, for her explanations about English housework and for posting my query about Alexander Russell at H-Albion@H-Net.MSU.edu, as well as to the people who responded and directed me to Barbara J. Hawgood's article on Alexander Russell (see *Journal of Medical Biography* 9 (2001): 1–6). I also benefited from many of the comments and suggestions made by the two anonymous reviewers on behalf of the University Press of Florida, which I incorporated into the text. I would also like to express my thanks to Amy Gorelick of UPF for her guidance and patience. I am also greatly indebted to Elaine Otto, the copyeditor, and Susan Albury, the project editor, for their work and efforts to bring the book to publication. Finally, I am pleased to acknowledge the generous assistance of the librarians and staff of the following institutions: the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London; the Oriental Reading Room, the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem; and the Bar-Ilan University Library.

Introduction

The notion of charity in medieval Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, being rooted in a religiously inspired system of beliefs and thoughts, acquired the status of a sacred duty. My main argument is that monotheistic sacred charity, meaning redemptive alms giving, transcended time and place and showed remarkable uniformity in the face of changing historical circumstances. Consequently, my second argument is that the basic meaning of medieval sacred charity maintained itself in different historical contexts. The reformation of Christian charity that took place during the early modern period in Europe and the rise of what is termed the "early modern poor relief system" were European developments with no parallels in Islam.

I would like to argue that the charity bestowed by the Abbasid caliphs, the Fatimid imams, and the sultans of medieval and Ottoman Islam sprang from the same religious perception of charity as sacred redemptive alms giving and that its primary aim was the achievement of personal salvation. What was true for the rulers also applied to ordinary people, whatever their position on the social ladder. The perception of medieval charity as sacred and transcending does not mean that it was not used as a tool to legitimize political rule and enhance social position, and these uses, or misuses, constituted a secondary range of meanings superimposed on its basic sacred content.

The use of sacred charity for political and social ends falls within a broader pattern of the use and abuse of religion in medieval times wherein political rule of every kind, wars, social order, and social practices were presented as religiously inspired and sanctioned. A clear distinction must, however, be made between meaning and function. Medieval Islamic charity, like prayer and other religious obligations such as pilgrimage and observing Ramadan, retained its fundamental meaning even though it also assumed political and social functions. Eventually a fusion between meaning and function was forged, and this synthesis emerged in the form of a religious-social construct that remained unchanged (even in different contexts) throughout medieval and Ottoman Islam in the Middle East and the Iranian world. If one is left with a sense of a timeless repetitive cycle of offering charity and creating pious endowments, this is exactly what the sources convey and reflect.

This book attempts to present an overview that surveys medieval sacred charity (hereafter simply referred to as charity) and pious endowments across a wide span of time and space, from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries in the

Middle East and the Iranian world. This is an overview that also aims to provide a synthesis that utilizes the numerous monographs and case studies devoted to various aspects of Islamic charity. To this end, a great deal of attention has been paid to the choice of sources. Since the practice of charity was important to medieval people in fundamental ways, it is reflected in a wide range of literary and documentary sources and epigraphic evidence. Among the sources used are legal and administrative manuals, historical and geographical writings, biographical dictionaries, works devoted to urban topography, and travel accounts of Muslim pilgrims and travelers.

European pilgrims and travelers to the Middle East from medieval to modern times have left us a large body of literature, and these writings have been used selectively and cautiously because, even though they offer valuable information and insights, they also contain biases. My use of this type of literature is limited to the writings of Edward William Lane and Alexander Russell, both of whom lived for long periods in the Middle East, spoke Arabic, and made knowledgeable and valuable observations about Middle Eastern society. Lane's book on Egypt in the early nineteenth century is well known. Alexander Russell (1715–68) was a Scottish physician who lived and worked for the Levant Company trading station (factory) in Aleppo between 1740 and 1758 where, while treating patients, he also learned Arabic and Turkish. His book on Aleppo, although less known than Lane's book on Egypt, is no less valuable for its information and insights.

Pious endowment deeds (*waqfiyyas*) are crucial for the study of Islamic charity, since any type of pious endowment, whether for charitable or familial purposes, constituted *sadaqa*. The language of pious endowment deeds reflects the perception of *waqf* as an embodiment of *sadaqa*—something that is true for any pious endowment irrespective of time or place. The documentary and epigraphic evidence for this is overwhelming, examples are legion, and only a combination of the literary and documentary sources with the epigraphic evidence can provide the sufficient evidence that can be claimed to be normative and representative for the entire period and area discussed in this book. I can only hope that the attempt to provide a synthesis is not premature, but the abundance of inscriptions and documentary sources, as well as a growing body of studies dealing with various aspects of the *waqf* institution, inspire confidence that some broader generalizations can be offered (see, for example, the works of Carl F. Petry, Jean-Claude Garcin and Mustapha Anouar Taher, Miriam Hoexter, Richard van Leeuven, and Maya Shatzmiller).

The structure of this book (chapters 1–4) reflects the need to deal with both the practice of distributing charity and the establishment of charitable institutions that were supported by the pious endowment system, or what can be described as "institutionalized charity" (a notion expressed by the Arabic terms *sadaqa mawqufa* and *sadaqa jariya*). The study of charitable institutions

in medieval Islam is still in its infancy (see, e.g., the works of Doris Behrens-Abouseif, Leonor Fernandes, Adam Sabra, and Uri Hazan), and my findings on charitable *ribats* and hospitals are primarily drawn from the source material. The literature dealing with Ottoman charitable institutions is at a more advanced stage (see, e.g., the works of Amy Singer and Miri Shefer) and offers a valuable comparative framework. A comparison with European historiography is frustrating, however, and one can only envy the many illuminating studies of broad and narrow focus devoted to charity and charitable institutions in medieval and early modern Europe.

The inclusion of learning institutions (chapter 5) in a book dealing with charity mirrors the fact that, in the medieval Islamic world, schools were also charitable foundations supported through the pious endowment system. Moreover, the fusion between *waqf* and learning was of intrinsic value and reflected the patron's desire to seek salvation through the support of learning because it embodied a key cultural value. In medieval Judaism and Islam, religious learning was of paramount significance and came to be regarded as a form of worship. Because of this, the founders of schools were eager to secure for themselves the *du'a'* (intercession) prayers of the pupils and teachers of the learning institutions they established in addition to being associated with an activity appreciated by all. The use of the pious endowment system for the support of learning is covered in the scholarly literature, but the motives of patrons are usually examined from the point of view of their public goals: the quest for legitimacy and control of the learned class (*'ulama'*) through patronage and the solidification of their position in society. In this context it is important to differentiate between meaning and function. Chapter 5, while focusing on the functional importance of learning in medieval Muslim society, attempts to pinpoint the personal motives of the patrons. The focus of this chapter is different from that of recent works on learning in medieval Islam: Michael Chamberlain's *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350* (Cambridge, 1994) and Daphna Ephrat's *Learned Society in a Period of Transition* (New York, 2000), both of which focus on the process of learning, the social function of learning, and the role of the *'ulama'*.

Chapter 6 provides an overview of the charitable institutions and functions that existed in medieval Muslim societies and complements the discussion of the learning institutions outlined in chapter 5, whereas chapter 7 moves between the two key topics discussed in this work: the meaning and the function of charity.

1

Charity, Society, and the State

Obligatory and Voluntary Alms Giving

In Islam the term *zakat* denotes the obligatory alms tax that constitutes one of the five Pillars of Islam, and *sadaqa* represents voluntary alms giving. Both terms are Koranic and have a wide range of meanings. In Hebrew the term *tsedaqa* (justice and righteousness) assumed the meaning of charity, but the Koranic terms *sadaqa* and *zakat* (the basic meaning of the root *zky* is "to be pure") are less clearly defined, and their shifts in meaning have recently been studied by Jörgen Baek Simonsen and Suliman Bashear. While Bashear's examination of the root and other cognate words in Middle Eastern languages has led him to the conclusion that these words convey the meaning of "purification and exemption of taxes," Simonsen has concluded that *zakat* and *sadaqa* developed during Muhammad's lifetime into two separate financial institutions. *Zakat* became associated with the payment of an alms tax by the faithful, and *sadaqa* stood for the tribute paid by the Bedouins who allied themselves with the rising political power of Muhammad.[1]

Data on the collection and distribution of *zakat* in early Islam is limited, and some confusion between *zakat* and *sadaqa* exists in the literary sources, since *sadaqa* occasionally meant taxes collected from Muslims and the terms could have been used interchangeably.[2] Ninth-century works dealing with taxation and the structure of the Abbasid administration continue to reflect the unsystematic use of both terms. For instance, Yahya ibn Adam (757–818) says that *zakat* is levied both on land owned by Muslims and on crops and fruits, but his use of *zakat* and *sadaqa* is inconsistent. For example, in reference to crops such as wheat, barley, dates, and raisins he uses the term *sadaqa*.[3] While both Abu Yusuf (731–798) and Qudama ibn Jaʿfar (d. 932) use the term *sadaqa* in their discussion of the taxes paid by the Muslims for their livestock (camels, cattle, and sheep), when Qudama ibn Jaʿfar refers to taxes levied from merchandise, he uses the term *zakat*.[4] Abu ʿUbayd (d. 839) also provides a very long and complex discussion of *sadaqa* and *zakat* that is not easy to summarize. He

employs the term *sadaqa* when dealing with the duty of the Muslims to pay taxes for their livestock and land, and uses both *sadaqa* and *zakat* in his discussion of the duty to pay taxes for capital. From what he says, it can be inferred that *sadaqa* paid for capital purifies it and is a duty incumbent only on Muslims. Abu ʿUbayd not only indicates who is entitled to benefit from the payments of *sadaqa/zakat* but also notes the merits and rewards of *sadaqa*, so that in this context the term acquires the clear meaning of a voluntary charity.[5]

The question of *zakat* was once raised in the circles of the Abbasid caliph al-Ma'mun (813–33), who asked for clarifications about the rules for paying it. One of those who explained the rules gave an answer that tallied well with Abu ʿUbayd's specifications. Later the payment of *zakat* for various sorts of merchandises was clarified for the caliph.[6] The whole conversation reflects both the urban and commercial character of Baghdad and the interest of the ruling circles in commerce. Outside the ruling circles of early Islam the question about whether *zakat* should be paid to the authorities or directly to the poor was much debated. This issue was dealt with by the Hanafi jurist Sarakhsi (d. 1097), who presented the view of his legal school that the collection of *zakat* was a duty incumbent on the head of the state, the imam, and direct payment to the poor infringed upon his rights and therefore was not allowed. The Shafiʿis, whose point of view he also mentioned, however, permitted direct payments. The distinction between *zakat*, the obligatory alms tax, and *sadaqa*, voluntary charity, evolved over time and was virtually fully crystallized in the writings of the great sage Ghazzali (d. 1111). Ghazzali reviewed the rules of *zakat*, specifying who was obliged to pay it and who was entitled to receive it, and then dealt with the voluntary charity. On one occasion, however, the distinction between the two was blurred when Ghazzali, under the heading of *zakat*, also dealt with *zakat al-fitr* (charitable payments given on Breaking of the Fast of Ramadan), which he referred to as *sadaqat al-fitr*. Although the motivation for these payments relies on the Prophetic sayings and not on the Koran, Ghazzali goes into details about who was supposed pay it and how, and one gets the impression that he was torn between the wish to accord the payments a status as sacred as that of *zakat* and the need to distinguish it from the Koranic *zakat*. The jurists considered the payment of *sadaqat al-fitr* as an act of devotion, and Ghazzali says that the rules of paying *zakat* for capital also applied to the *zakat/sadaqat al-fitr*. The lack of precision in the terminology seems to be deliberate and instrumental to Ghazzali's aim, and the reader is left with the feeling that Ghazzali envisaged a direct payment of the *zakat/sadaqat al-fitr* to the needy.[7]

In the early Abbasid tax system (seventh–tenth centuries), taxes known as *sadaqat al-ʿArab* were collected from Bedouins in Arabia and Basra. In other cases, taxes in the category of *sadaqat* were used to finance state-sponsored

policies, for example, in 117/735–36, when the state encouraged Qaysi tribesmen to settle in Egypt. They were allocated the revenues generated by *sadaqa* paid from tithe lands, i.e., lands held by Muslims. With these subsidies they established a transportation business between Egypt and Arabia, which proved to be very successful.[8] From documentary sources we learn that in early eighth-century Egypt *zakat* was distributed among the poor and needy villagers.[9] There is evidence that zakat was collected in Iraq during the tenth through twelfth centuries, but the information occurs sporadically and mainly concerns the ways it was distributed. In the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, a leading scholar in Baghdad received *zakat* money and charities for distribution from the vizier and other high-ranking people to distribute among his poor followers. These sums were substantial, amounting to 160 *dinars* (gold coins) per week.

Some wealthy people in Baghdad took the duty of paying *zakat* very seriously. A local notable and landlord who possessed forty villages and died in 480/1087–88 was scrupulous in paying *zakat,* and he dispensed vast charities. The emphasis on the dispensation of *zakat* in addition to charities is also noted in reference to some Mamluk emirs of the first half of the fifteenth century. Although references to the direct payment of *zakat* to the poor are rare, this must have been practiced at least by some. The slave girl of the Abbasid caliph al-Mustadi' (1170–80), for instance, did this and became known as a charitable woman of many pious deeds who also wielded political power behind the scenes.[10]

Information on the collection and distribution of *zakat* for the high Middle Ages is scant, and we lack concrete information concerning *zakat* for the whole span of the Fatimid period in Egypt, from the tenth to the twelfth centuries.[11] On the other hand, the literary sources for this period contain abundant references to *sadaqa* and the way it was distributed. The first concrete information on *zakat* in Egypt appears at the beginning of Saladin's rule in Egypt when, on 4 November 1171, shortly after the overthrow of the Fatimid dynasty, Saladin ordered the distribution of *zakat* to those who were entitled to it, such as the poor, travelers, and insolvent debtors.[12] Although the existence and activities of the Office of Zakat is attested to for the rule of Saladin and his successors, the Ayyubid rulers of Egypt and Syria, the most detailed description of how *zakat* was collected is provided by Asad ibn Mammati, the scion of a well-known family of Coptic administrators in the service of the Fatimids and Ayyubids. In 1169, Ibn Mammati's father converted to Islam and the family was thus able to maintain its position in the administration. Asad ibn Mammati's most famous work, *The Rules for Administrative Offices*, was written for Saladin between 1182 and 1193. Scholars have pointed out that it is difficult in this work to distinguish between the realities of the Fatimid period and those of the Ayyubid. It can thus be argued that the description of the collection

of *zakat* as described by Ibn Mammati reflects both Fatimid and Ayyubid practices. Whatever the merits of this argument are, the lack of any other explicit references to *zakat* in the Fatimid period is baffling.[13] Ibn Mammati's description of how the Office of Zakat functioned is at odds with the testimony of the Maghribi traveler Ibn Jubayr, who visited Egypt in 1183. He was bitter and critical of the customs officials at the port of Alexandria who collected *zakat* from Maghribi pilgrims passing through Egypt on their way to the Holy Cities of Arabia. On the other hand, Ibn Jubayr does say that the Maghribi travelers who arrived at Alexandria after an arduous journey through the desert were entitled to a daily portion of bread. To cover these expenses, two sources of incomes were used: the revenues of the *zakat* tax, and money generated by a special pious endowment set up by Saladin. Saladin's deeds were in line with Koran 9:60, which states that wayfarers are among those entitled to funds from the alms tax.[14]

Saladin, however, also used money accumulated at the Office of Zakat for other goals, such as his wars against the Crusaders. In 587/1191–92, during the bitter and protracted war for Acre, 50,000 *dinars* were transferred from the Office of Zakat to the Office of the Navy, since the navy played a crucial role in this struggle and Saladin was desperate to equip and dispatch ships to Acre. This use of funds was in line with the declaration made in November 1171 that *zakat* was being collected for those fighting the Holy War. These practices, rooted in the interpretation of Koran 9:60, were embodied in Ibn Mammati's writings. He says that the volunteers for the Holy War were the rightful recipients of *zakat*. In the age of Saladin, the Holy War served as a powerful pretext for many things, including the levy of taxes not authorized by law. Holy War, as *zakat*, was manipulated for political ends. The most revealing example of this is from 567/1171–72, when Saladin considered an expansion into the Barqa region along the Mediterranean coast of Libya. Much attention was given to the public aspects of the impending campaign, and it was presented as an attempt to curb the robbery of the Bedouin tribes in the area who were also required to pay *zakat* on their livestock.[15]

Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir (1223–92), a close associate and the biographer of the Mamluk sultan Baybars (1260–77), writes that the sultan was much concerned with the collection of *zakat*. He emphasized the religious, and not the financial, aspects of *zakat* and reminded his readers that the payment of *zakat*, and by implication its collection as well, was a religious duty and one of the five pillars of Islam. The sultan is depicted as a true Muslim ruler who upheld Islam and its commandments, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir provides us with some examples of the Bedouins and fellahin from whom *zakat* was collected. Such payments were brought in from Yemen, the Holy Cities of Arabia, the Barqa region of Libya, and Sawakin, on the Red Sea coast, which had been conquered by Baybars. He writes nothing about the rates of collection, and the emphasis

placed on Baybars's rule in Arabia served a political purpose, which was to accord him legitimization in the wider context of the Muslim world. There is a great deal of information about the collection of *zakat* in the Mamluk period (1250–1517). It served as a form of taxation in the hands of the government, who introduced new types of *zakat* dues while abolishing others.[16] Nonetheless, at least on some occasions, *zakat* payments reached the poor who were entitled to this money. It is said that the famous Mamluk emir Tankiz (d.1340), viceroy of Syria, renewed the Office of Zakat and spent the sums collected on the poor and those who lived in seclusion (*arbab al-buyut*).[17]

The Beneficiaries of Charity

The Koranic verse 9:60 specifies who is entitled to *sadaqa* payments: the destitute, the needy, tax collectors, those whose hearts are to be conciliated, slaves, debtors, those whose purpose is serving God (alternatively those who fight for God, *fi sabil 'llah*), and wayfarers. This verse, especially in its references to tax collectors and those whose hearts are to be conciliated, reflected the realities of the time of the Prophet. But, following the conquest of the Middle East by the Arabs and the establishment of the caliphate, these realities changed greatly. Tax collectors became well-paid employees of the state, and the spread of Islam made the reference to those whose hearts are to be conciliated obsolete. The tenth-century Qudama ibn Ja'far tried to make sense of these two injunctions of Koran 9:60 by saying that the collectors of the *sadaqa* were entitled to draw their salaries from the revenues collected by them, and he understood the reference "to those whose hearts are to be conciliated" as meaning underpaid auxiliary troops.[18] Significantly, writing in the twelfth century, Ibn Mammati, in his chapter on *zakat* (not *sadaqa*), is very brief and formal in his discussion of these two groups.[19] Clearly, these Koranic injunctions had little relevance. On the other hand, Muslim jurists have identified who the *fuqara'* and *masakin* mentioned in Koran 9:60 are. A *faqir* (pl. *fuqara'*) is defined as a destitute person who neither owns anything nor earns a livelihood by engaging himself in any occupation, while a *miskin* (pl. *masakin*) is defined as a poor person who has some possessions, though not enough for sufficient sustenance. To a considerable degree, certainly in historical sources, these two terms are used interchangeably, and when the collocation *fuqara' wa-'l-masakin* appears in the sources, we can be sure that the poor are meant. Far more problematic is the term *fuqara'* when it appears alone, since it can mean either the mendicant mystics or the ordinary poor. Furthermore, the distinction made between the orthodox mystics (*al-sufiyya*) and the mendicant mystics (*fuqara'*)—and occasionally the uncontrollable dervishes—was not perfectly clear even to the medieval people themselves. No less an authority than Ibn Taymiyya (1263–

1328) even devoted a short work to this. The main problem here lies in the making of a distinction between the ordinary poor and the mendicant mystics, since both can be referred to as *fuqara'* and since in many cases the context does not clarify the meaning. For example, it is impossible to tell who were the *fuqara'* to whom, in March 1122, bread was distributed during the celebrations of the birthday of the reigning Fatimid ruler. We can be certain, however, that the poor referred to as the *du'afa'* (meaning the frail, sick, infirm, and poor) and the *masakin* were the recipients of sacrificial meat distributed in the same year on the occasion of the Festival of Sacrifice. The collocation *al-masakin wa-'l-du'afa'* or *al-du'afa' wa-'l-masakin* came to denote the poor in general. In some cases the historians did make an effort to clarify to whom charities were dispensed. For example, in reference to a Kurdish emir who died in 555/1160–61 in Damascus, it is stated that he dispensed charities to mystics (*fuqara'*) and the poor referred to as *al-masakin wa-'l-du'afa'*. This collocation is also used in reference to the urban underclass. For example, an eleventh-century Fatimid dignitary was accused of employing *al-du'afa' wa-'l-masakin* (denoting here unskilled workers) on a building project without pay.[20] Late medieval historians who wished to be precise referred to the poor as *du'afa'* and thus avoided the ambiguity of the term *fuqara'*. However, *fuqara'* (unqualified)appears frequently in late medieval and Ottoman sources, which testifies to the increasing presence and role that mystics and dervishes played in contemporary society. The mystics attracted growing support from the rulers in the form of charities, entitlement to payments of *zakat,* and the establishment of pious endowments for them, thus competing successfully with the jurists for the patronage of the rulers and the allocation of economic resources.[21]

Mystics and jurists belonged to a social class that was distinctive from the poor. Maqrizi (1364–1442), in a small treatise dealing with famines, economics, and the monetary history of Muslim Egypt, also provides a description of the society and its social hierarchy. He placed the *fuqara'*, the majority of the jurists, the students, and many of the troops of the non-Mamluk regiments of the army in the fifth category, two categories above the poor who practiced begging and were at the bottom of his list of the social classes. Maqrizi's text, although well known and much translated, is far from original, for under Persian and Greek influence, ideas about the division of society into classes and categories had permeated medieval Muslim writing on society. What is interesting in the text derives from Maqrizi's remarks on how the different classes earned their living, in which he goes beyond the standard schematic listing of social classes. The groups described in the fifth category lived off their property or were recipients of allowances from the state, while the poor were reduced to begging and were totally dependent on others for their existence.[22]

In contrast to the sparse and fragmentary information concerning the col-

lection and distribution of *zakat*, the obligatory alms tax, abundant information is available on the distribution of *sadaqa*, the voluntary charity. Quite obviously the poor were beneficiaries of charity, but so were other groups, and a clue to the identity of these groups is provided by the account of the building of a well by Ahmad ibn Tulun, the quasi-independent ruler of Egypt (868–84). Balawi, his tenth-century biographer, writes that during the day the well was used by ordinary people, literally those who unveil their faces, while others sent their *ghulams* (young boys or slaves) and slave girls. During the night, however, the users of the well were the *du'afa'* and men and women who veiled themselves (*al-masturun wa-'l-masturat*). The reference to those who unveil themselves meant the simple working-class people who had to appear in public and mix with others to earn their livelihood and provide for their daily needs. The better-off could conduct a more secluded lifestyle, avoiding public exposure by sending servants to secure provisions for their daily needs. The term *mastur*, nonetheless, is problematic. It appears twice in the Koran (17:47, 18:89) and refers to a thick veil, but it means "preventing" or "hindering," and in historical sources it is used when referring to men and women in singular and plural forms. In Balawi's account it denotes people who lived in a certain degree of seclusion or detachment from society. It can also be inferred that seclusion was associated with pietism and poverty and that those who adopted this way of life were usually referred to collectively as *ahl al-satr*, meaning pious, honorable people.

References to people by the term *mastur* are quite common, and the precise meaning must have been clear to the medieval readers, for both Ibn Banna', the contemporary eleventh-century chronicler of Baghdad, and Ibn Jawzi (1126–1200), the renowned historian of twelfth-century Baghdad, employ it rather frequently, but the reports are too terse to provide us with an exact meaning. This term is also attested to in Jewish sources— the documents of the Cairo Geniza where, as has been recently demonstrated by Mark R. Cohen, it is used to refer to a formerly well-off person who was hit by poverty and is ashamed to beg, preferring to seek private charity.[23] It must be noted that in medieval Arabic terminology not all of the people referred to as *ahl al-satr* were necessarily poor, although we must assume that most were. Caution is in place in view of a report by an eleventh-century Egyptian chronicler, Musabbihi, who reports that a certain woman, described as a poor (or weak) *da'ifa*, a *mastura*, a chaste (*tahira*), and someone who fasted for long periods, was robbed and murdered. She had lived in a house with a *ghulam* (a servant or a slave), who operated the oven, and the criminals and the *ghulam* were apprehended by the police, who also found items taken from her house.[24] Here the term *mastura* does not refer to poverty, certainly not utter poverty, since her circumstances can be described as basic or modest, but indicates a certain pious and detached way of life that was both recognized and appreciated. Even more revealing is

the account of the request submitted in 365/975–76 to the Fatimid rulers of Egypt by a member of the ruling family of Mecca who asked for the return of the rural and urban properties of his sister, described as a *mastura*. The complex relations between the Fatimid rulers and the Shiite families in Egypt and Arabia were volatile, and leaving aside the political aspect of this request which was promptly fulfilled, we are dealing here with people of wealth, power, and social prestige. It thus appears that piety expressed in the form of seclusion did not necessarily mean the renunciation of riches but could have been a lifestyle adopted by the rich as well as by people of modest means. Some indication of what this lifestyle could have meant is reflected by the habits of the cadi ʿAli ibn al-Husayn ibn Harb, who served between 293/905 and 311/923 in Fustat. It is said that he was never seen eating, drinking, or performing the ritual ablution. People of his household reported that, even in the confinements of his house, he used to take his food and drink and perform the ablution behind a curtain (*sitr*) in complete privacy. The concept that eating is a private matter not to be done in public—and certainly not in the company of strangers—is frequently mentioned in a moral guide written in fourteenth-century Egypt.[25] The account concerning Ibn Harb offers a rare glimpse into the private habits of a person characterized as one who led a life of *satr*. In many other reports, however, the precise meaning remains elusive. For example, the Tulunid administrator known as al-Utrush of the Madhara'i family (d. 934) is described as a person of *satr*, respectability, and generosity toward his own family. Whatever al-Utrush's private habits were, he did not live a life of seclusion as an administrator. Here *satr* probably indicates piety, and the term *mastur* was interchangeable with other terms indicating virtue and righteousness.[26]

The social standing of people referred to as *ahl al-satr* is reflected by the behavior of Ahmad ibn Tulun, who showed a certain fascination with this group. He used to inquire about them, as he did with both the morally upright and the poor. He did not discriminate against women in his charities to them, and Balawi says that his charities to these groups reached thousands of *dinars* every month. This was in addition to money that he had pledged for them and the money bestowed on them in gratitude for the renewal of God's grace to him. Ahmad ibn Tulun fed the poor every day in his house and praised God for providing for them. He showed a personal interest in those who ate at his table and, in one case, bestowed a considerable sum of money on an old man whose plight moved him. Balawi, on the authority of a person who was in charge of Ahmad ibn Tulun's charities, writes that he regarded *ahl al-satr* as a social class, *tabaqa*. The term *tabaqa* belongs to the medieval Islamic social nomenclature and indicates a concept of social stratification. The allusion to this concept and the use of the term indicate that Ahmad ibn Tulun viewed *ahl al-satr* not as pitiable and wretched but as a normative social class within the overall social model.[27] The sociological terminology of medieval Islam is not

easy to decipher, however, and Arabic sources frequently make a connection between people who lived in *buyut* in the Qarafa and *ahl al-satr*. Qarafa is the name given to the great cemeteries found around Fustat and Cairo, and in this context *buyut* means rooms or any other kind of living unit found in this area. The expression *arbab al-buyut* remains, nonetheless, enigmatic. For example, a Mamluk vizier of the fourteenth century used to distribute charities to *arbab al-buyut* and sweets to officials and emirs every month. He also supported the Holy Cities of Arabia, sending 10,000 *dirhams* (silver coins) there annually. The term *arbab al-buyut* as it is used in this account seems to stand for the more common designation *ahl al-buyut*, meaning pious poor people who lived in seclusion. This term could, however, also assume a completely different meaning. The Ayyubid vizier, Ibn Shakir (1153–1225), was accused of impoverishing and humiliating the civilian elite of Egypt (*ru'asa' Misr wa-arbab al-buyut*), meaning the local notables. He also ceased the state payments that amounted to 400,000 *dinars* annually, thus causing a great uproar among those affected by his new policy.[28]

A life of piety and a certain degree of seclusion or detachment from everyday life (*satr*) not only granted respectability to the wealthy and those high on the social ladder but also transformed the poor, referred to as *ahl al-satr* or *ahl/arbab al-buyut* (those who adopted pietism and poverty) into the deserving poor, whom the powerful patronized and supported. The notion of the deserving poor (the shamefaced poor) and the distinction drawn between them and the undeserving poor (the shameless poor) prevailed in medieval Europe as well. These concepts evolved slowly and eventually became deeply entrenched in the conceptual framework and social practice of European medieval charity. The deserving poor were respectable citizens who had deteriorated into poverty and were too ashamed to beg for alms. Charitable confraternities in late medieval Italian and Spanish towns frequently preferred to distribute charity to the deserving poor rather than to the masses of poor "undeserving" beggars, and the Middle Eastern realities were not much different.[29] A poor Jew who appealed to a community leader in Fustat seeking private charity depicted himself as one who was not accustomed to unveiling his face, meaning that he was not a habitual beggar but had been reduced to begging due to adverse circumstances. He asked for private charity to preserve his honor or, within the parameters of the European concept of charity, saw himself as one of the shamefaced poor who were deserving of support. Another Jew who appealed to an unknown lady, beseeching private charity, explained that he had no experience in requesting alms and was too ashamed to argue with a community leader who had bestowed a few pennies on him, which were insufficient for his real needs.[30] In Islam the distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor not only existed but had its roots in the Koran and tradition and was

articulated in the writings of the sages. In the sphere of social life and institutional arrangements, the supervisor of the markets was supposed to make a distinction between these two groups.[31] The mystics, for their part, invariably presented themselves as the deserving poor, a claim that found a response in Muslim medieval society and among the powerful, who bestowed charities and pious endowments on them.

Charities and the State's Payroll

In most cases the vocabulary of charity is inspired by Koranic concepts, and terms such as *birr*, *ma'ruf*, *ihsan*, and *sadaqa* unequivocally indicate charities (see chapter 7). Some ambiguity concerning the terminology of charity remains, and the classification of deeds according to whether they were inspired by charitable attributes or by other considerations is not always clear. These difficulties are illustrated by the wording of Musabbihi's account of the visit of the Fatimid imam al-Zahir (1021–36) to a hospital in 1025 in the capital, Fustat-Cairo.

During his visit he bestowed 50 *dirhams* on each of the mentally ill patients and gave 500 *dirhams* to the person in charge of the hospital. He also ordered to carry out maintenance work and to ensure the supply of water, food, and medicines. The importance of al-Zahir's provision for the hospital was immense, especially as the first signs of impending famine were already visible. Despite the above, al-Zahir himself was not a particularly benevolent ruler, and during the famine he was quite callous, maintaining his royal lifestyle for a long time. Only during the worst period of the 1025 famine did the regime stop collecting taxes on grain, explaining that this was an act of favor (*ni'ma*) on the part of al-Zahir toward the population, even though it was too little to have any impact on either price or availability of grain. He was more concerned with the need to ensure a proper burial for the victims of the famine, and for this purpose he provided 500 shrouds. Neither his provision for the hospital nor the supply of shrouds was referred to as *sadaqa*. Providing a proper burial for the dead is a religious duty, and special pious endowments were often set up for this specific purpose, indicating the charitable nature of this function. Provision for the mentally ill in a hospital is considered a charitable deed by modern standards, but, surprisingly or not, it did not invoke similar appreciation from Musabbihi. Regardless of Musabbihi's sensitivities or lack of them, the term *ni'ma* is well understood within the context of Fatimid political nomenclature and indicates favors conferred on people by the ruler in the service of the state that are maintained or revoked only at his behest.[32]

When the actual administrative practices of the various Muslim medieval states are examined, the problem of what constitutes charity is complicated by

the fact that not only were the employees of the state on the state's payroll but also other people, and the payments rendered to them seem more as charities than salaries. Exactly who these recipients were is not a simple question to answer. For instance, in 361/971–72, Jawhar, the Fatimid general who conquered Egypt, paid 1,000 *dinars* as salaries to those who were "entitled" to it (*ashab al-ratib*).[33]

This report is open to several interpretations, since it can be assumed that such recipients were the officials of the former Ikhshidid regime whom Jawhar had continued to pay in order to ensure a smooth transition of power. When salaries of state officials are considered, however, 1,000 *dinars* is a negligible sum. Furthermore, one must ask what was so special about this payment for it to be mentioned two years after the conquest of the country? It seems that this sum represented some sort of regular payment made by the previous regime, which Jawhar considered prudent to continue. Enigmatic as this account is, it draws attention to the problem, alluded to above, which was the need to distinguish between payments of salaries to state officials, including other regular payments made by the state to various people, and charities distributed by the state and members of the ruling elite. Although officials were paid through the Office of Payments, who was, or was not, on the list also depended on the internal configuration of political power in the state. In 996, following the coronation of al-Hakim (996–1021), the new men in power were determined to undermine the position of groups that had risen to eminence under the former ruler, al-ʿAziz (975–96), and they did so by canceling the payments to those who received them during al-ʿAziz's reign.[34]

The state paid salaries not only to its officials and political supporters but also to people of the religious class. This type of payment had a long history in medieval Islam and expressed the state's wish to extend its patronage over both the religious class and religious life in general. On the other hand, such payments created an ideology of disassociation from the state and its corruptive powers in some religious circles. In the early Abbasid period the caliphs lavished money on the people of religion during visits to towns and pilgrimages to the Holy Cities of Arabia, as well as by inviting scholars to the court.[35] This sporadic form of largesse evolved into a more orderly system of payments, and in 406/1015–16, for instance, a list (*istimar*) was presented to al-Hakim that included the names of jurists, Koran reciters, and muezzins who were to be paid the very high sum of 71,733 *dinars* every year. This system of payment must have collapsed in the 1060s during the civil war in Egypt, for in the first half of the twelfth century, payments according to the *istimar* dropped to between 12,000 and 16,000 *dinars*.[36]

In any case, these payments were not charities but salaries, and this was not a uniquely Fatimid phenomenon. In 982, the Buyid sultan ʿAdud al-Dawla (978–83) began the rebuilding of Baghdad, an extensive project involving the

restoration of mosques and houses and the repair of the water-supply system, as well as supplying food to the poor and foreigners who had found shelter in the mosques. On a different level, the sultan also invested in the restoration of cultural life by renewing the payments (*rusum*, stipends) to the intelligentsia, or the cultural elite. Those who benefited from his patronage were the mystics (*fuqara'*), jurists, experts on the interpretation of the Koran, the transmitters of Prophetic tradition, genealogists, poets, grammarians, physicians, astrologers/astronomers, algebra experts, and engineers. He also allowed non-Muslims to restore their houses of worship and dispensed charities among their poor (*fuqara'*).[37] In a narrow sense these payments, although serving a social policy, were not aimed at relieving social misery and should not be regarded as charities. The same applies to Saladin's policy of supporting people of the religious class in Damascus. No less an authority than ʿImad al-Din al-Isfahani (1125–1201), one of Saladin's closest aides, noted that, in 581/1185–86, 600 jurists of various law colleges were supported by the state. The real number, however, must have vastly exceeded 600. In 584/1188–89, Qadi al-Fadil (1135–1200), another of Saladin's closest aides, estimated that the overall annual expenditure on so-called people of the turban had reached between 200,000 and 300,000 *dinars*. The fact that the state made payments to diversified social groups did not escape the attention of Nasir Khusraw, the Persian traveler who visited Egypt in the mid-eleventh century. He noted that, in addition to payments made to the army, the state rendered payments, which must be understood as regular salaries, to "scholars, literati, poets, and jurisprudents." Nor did he fail to mention that mosques and their staffs were maintained by the government throughout the Fatimid domains.[38] Documentary sources add another dimension to Nasir Khusraw's testimony. In a petition submitted to a Fatimid vizier in the first half of the twelfth century, a jurist complained about a reduction in the monthly payments to which he was entitled. He was registered in an office that remitted him the high monthly payment of 400 *dinars* (or *dirhams*) derived from taxes collected from non-Muslims and European traders. Yet another petitioner, whose professional and social identity remains unclear, asked a Fatimid vizier in the mid-twelfth century for the remittance of the yearly grain allowance that had been allocated to him as a favor and charity (*ihsan*).[39]

Other payments carried out on a regular basis according to lists of names were actual charities. In 373/983–84, al-ʿAziz arrested his powerful vizier Yaʿqub ibn Killis (975–89) for a few months yet continued the payments, described as pious deeds, that the fallen vizier made to people every month. The amount was 1,000 *dinars,* and the message was clear that the ruler himself took over as the patron of these people. Ibn Killis's systematic charities were not unique, however. Another Fatimid vizier, al-Yazuri (1050–58), who was as mighty and influential as Ibn Killis, also performed many pious deeds and

lavishly distributed generous charities. The beneficiaries were *ashraf* (descendants of Hasan and Husayn, the two sons of ʿAli, the fourth caliph in Islam, and Fatima, the Prophet's daughter), the poor, *ahl al-buyut*, and *ahl al-satr*—meaning the honorable, pious people who lived in seclusion in the cemeteries. The person in charge of these distributions, or payments, was the Jewish agent of Lady Rasad, the mother of al-Mustansir (1036–94), the Fatimid ruling imam of that time. The recipients were misled by the identity of the agent and had no idea that the vizier was responsible for these payments.[40]

The poor and needy were also among the *ashraf,* and both the state and the powerful were attentive to their needs due to their social prestige. In these cases the charitable nature of such payments is clear, but the most explicit evidence for the regular distribution of charities in the form of regular payments comes from the Fatimid budget of 517/1123–24. This budget included expenditure for charities conferred on those who had embraced Islam and, more significantly, charities bestowed on the poor and beggars (*saʿalik*). Regular charities allocated to beggars in the form of a budgetary item were a rarity, and beggars had to resort to various dubious means in order to evoke the compassion and generosity of the public. Charities for converts to Islam are rarely mentioned in the sources. In the Fatimid Egypt of the 1120s there was no massive movement of conversion to Islam. These charities must therefore have been designated for individuals, and the most probable candidates for conversion were high-ranking administrators and court physicians. Another comparable example comes from a very different milieu, thirteenth-century Anatolia, where certain pious endowments defrayed the costs of the religious instruction and material support given to converts.

Support for poor converts coming from the middle or lower echelons of society was a problem common to all three monotheistic religions. Proselytes formed a significant proportion of the indigents that were supported by the Jewish community of Fustat. And going beyond the borders of the Mediterranean world, King Henry III (d. 1272) established a house for Jewish converts to Christianity in London that also provided for Muslim converts until the sixteenth century.[41]

Abbasid viziers, like their Fatimid counterparts, maintained various groups on their payrolls. The well-known tenth-century Abbasid vizier ʿAli ibn ʿIsa, for example, spent vast sums of money each year on unspecified charities, support of Mecca and Medina, Shiites, members of the Abbasid family, and the descendants of the first members of the early Muslim community (literally *ansar*, the Prophet's supporters in Medina, and *muhajirun*, those who had emigrated with him to Medina). It can be argued that support of the *ansar* and the *muhajirun* typifies pietistic behavior being an expression of esteem for the venerated first generations of Muslims, but payments to Shiites and Abbasids must be seen as politically motivated. The account about another famous

tenth-century Abbasid vizier, ʿAli ibn al-Furat, is more ambiguous. He paid 5,000 people various sums ranging from a few *dirhams* to 100 *dinars*, and the essence of these payments remains vague.[42] The report referring to charitable payments dispensed in 574/1178–79 in Damascus based on information derived from a highly authoritative source, ʿImad al-Din al-Isfahani's letter sent to Saladin, is equally ambiguous. In this letter officials in Damascus describe their difficulties involving payments made to *arbab al-sadaqat*, those who were entitled to charities, and they write that among them are many people of means. Saladin instructed ʿImad al-Din to continue these payments, which amounted to 11,000 *dinars*, without questioning the recipients about their means. Saladin's financial generosity was a well-known and much admired trait, but the ambiguity about who exactly the recipients were and how these payments were financed remains. Did the financing come directly from the sultan, meaning the treasury, or did this money derive from incomes of pious endowments set up for charitable purposes?[43] The existence of a fund for charitable purposes in the tenth-century Abbasid caliphate is clearly borne out by the sources, but no one knows how it was financed. Charitable distributions to clearly defined groups, on what seems to be a regular basis, evolved into a long-standing tradition in Baghdad and continued well into the 1230s. The clearest distinction between salaries and charities, however, comes from the reign of Muhajid al-Din Qaymaz, the ruler of Mosul who died in 594/1197–98. He was a eunuch of Greek origin who earned a name for himself as a religious and pious person, the epitome of an exemplary Muslim ruler. He became known for the building of an endowed complex outside the city's walls that included a mosque, a law school, a lodge for the mystics (*ribat*), and a hospital. In Mosul he paid salaries (*rawatib*) to many people and dispensed 100 *dinars* as charity every Friday.[44]

The payment of salaries to people of religion was a policy adopted by many rulers, and some, like the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-Kamil (1218–38), who preferred the jurists, pious, and mystics over the poor, donated money of the *zakat* to them and not to the poor.[45] This does not appear to be an isolated whim but a calculated move, signifying a shift in preference, and the same preferences are mirrored by the charities distributed by his successor, sultan Salih Ayyub (1238–49), in Damascus and other Syrian towns. Salih Ayyub's motives were political and the recipients were carefully chosen, among them people affiliated with law colleges, the lodges of the mystics, and those who lived in seclusion (*arbab al-buyut*). One should keep in mind that the vast majority of the people in law colleges and those who lived in lodges for the mystics enjoyed incomes and food rations from the foundations that supported them, and they did not represent the typical urban poor who had to fend for themselves. No less indicative are other examples of sultanic patronage, involving food distributions. In Muharram 677/June 1278, meals were offered to

commemorate the death, a year earlier, of the sultan Baybars. Food was offered at the cemeteries where Koran reciters and *fuqara'* were invited. Such meals were also enjoyed by people of different classes (*tabaqat*) in other places, such as the central mosques and law colleges, and meals were sent to lodges of the mystics (*zawiyas*). Among those specifically mentioned as beneficiaries of these food distributions were the West Africans, for whom a special table was set up that was also attended by the *fuqara'* and the righteous. In any case the urban poor are not mentioned, and the term *tabaqat* should not be understood as meaning them. This omission is rather surprising, since the deceased sultan was known for his generous distributions of grain and bread among the poor (see chapter 6). Why West Africans were honored on this occasion remains unclear, but the preferential treatment given to groups of the religious class was rather typical. In 690/1291, for example, prior to the campaign against Acre, the Mamluk sultan Ashraf Khalil (1290–93) distributed charities and clothes among Koran reciters, *fuqara'*, and the people affiliated with law colleges and lodges for the mystics.[46]

The Mamluk regime, like earlier regimes, paid salaries, distributed support, and dispensed charities. For instance, an administrator who was dismissed from his post in 724/1323–24 received a monthly payment of 300 *dirhams* from the sultanic charities until his death four years later.[47]

It would be wrong to conclude that the state maintained a pension system for its retired employees. This kind of payment depended on the goodwill of the sultan, and the term *charity* reflects its nature well. How one could become entitled to support distributed by the state is illustrated by the case of the Damascus sheikh Muhammad al-Mula, who in 679/1280–81 was allocated a specific amount of wheat on a permanent basis. In order to receive this bounty, an order from the sultan and a written confirmation issued by the head of Chancery were needed.[48] The most important charitable provisions the Mamluk regime made were the payments rendered to the weak segments within the Mamluk military society itself and affiliated groups. These took the form of *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya,* in other words, fiefs, or more precisely incomes from fiefs, granted to ill or disabled emirs, discharged emirs, widows and orphans of the Mamluk class, and sons of the Mamluks. These were charitable grants given to groups unable to perform military service, and *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya*, like military fiefs, were handled by the Office of the Army.[49] The value and income derived from *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya* must have been significantly lower than those of the ordinary military fiefs, so the regime was highly motivated to remove disabled troops from the ranks of the Mamluk army and degrade them to *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya*. In 741/1340–41, following a review, fiefs were taken away from the chronically ill, the blind, the weak, and the crippled as well as from auxiliary troops, and the newly available fiefs were redistributed among the Mamluk troops of the ruling sultan. It remains unclear what kind of pro-

visions, if any, were made for the troops who were denied their military fiefs. Although lands in this category were aimed at supporting disadvantaged groups within the Mamluk military society in 844/1440–41, these lands were taxed. *Al-rizaq al-jayshiyya* was a distinct type of charitable provisions. The nature of other payments rendered by the Mamluk regime is more difficult to ascertain, since salaries and charities tended to conflate.

The institutionalized arrangements to support the weak segments of the Mamluk military society did not always work smoothly and the recipients had difficulties in securing their rights. In Muharram 740/July 1339, for example, when the widows, the orphans, the chronically sick, and the blind who were entitled to salaries and charities came to the citadel of Cairo to receive their dues, they found that their entitlements were being threatened by the controversial finance minister, al-Nashw (who was executed a few months later). On that occasion, however, they managed to maintain their rights.[50] Certain groups in the Mamluk court were entitled to salaries, and who should be included in this category was an issue much fought over.[51] In 781/1379–80, the recipients of salaries and charities complained to the emir Barquq, the future sultan, that the vizier had withheld their remuneration. In this case Barquq acted swiftly and punished the vizier, but such events occurred repeatedly, and in the fifteenth century, the weak segments of the Mamluk society found it more and more difficult to defend their rights. The Mamluk state was in decline, and the sultans were increasingly unwilling to allocate resources to marginal groups within the Mamluk military society and to those outside it.

This trend is exemplified by a number of conflicts that took place between the state and various social groups. In 828/1424–25, the administrators stopped receiving grain portions as part of their remuneration, and similar measures were intermittently taken by other sultans as well. In 837/1433–34, jurists and other holders of religious posts stopped receiving allotments of grain, while in 868/1463–64 frail and poor soldiers and the sons of Mamluks were deprived of their allotments of clothing.[52] In the second half of the fifteenth century, the struggle for the control and allocation of state resources intensified, and in 858/1454–55 the sultan tried in vain to stop the payments made by the regime to the sons of the Mamluks, the poor, and orphans. It seems that the orphans of the Mamluk class had been supported, but it is difficult to determine the nature of this support, whether it was systematic or sporadic and depended on goodwill and circumstances.[53] The sultan Qaytbay (1468–96) made several attempts to stop the payment of salaries and charities to beneficiaries, and in 873/1468–69 he made a serious effort to curtail the salaries paid to the sons of the Mamluks, jurists, and the holders of religious posts. The military skills of the sons of the Mamluks were tested, and those who failed to meet standards were removed from the military payroll whereas other groups were deprived of their meat portions supplied by the state. Qaytbay tried to

secure the cooperation of the four chief cadis of the Mamluk state in an attempt to authorize the termination of the monthly payments to disabled soldiers, women, and orphans, and he blamed the shrinking state revenues and the ruin of villages for forcing him to adopt this policy. The infringement of the hitherto established prerogatives must have caused much concern, and the regime felt it necessary to pacify the worried people. An inscription from 883/1478–79, from the town of Qus in Upper Egypt, testifies to widespread social unrest. People who enjoyed revenues from various types of *rizaq* were assured that they would continue to receive it. The list of the beneficiaries included cadis, court witnesses, the pious, widows, and orphans. What is striking is the reference made to people of lower and higher social classes, all of whom were assured their rights would be honored.[54] In 896/1490–91, Qaytbay removed eighty disabled soldiers from the military payroll, but there are no references to any designation of alternative sources of income for them. The focus of his attempts to gain control over resources that had slipped from the hands of the state was placed on the incomes generated by various types of pious endowments where the big money was. In 919/1513–14, the sultan Qansawh al-Ghawri (1501–16) renewed payments to women and orphans of the Mamluk class as well as to disabled and aged soldiers. This should not be interpreted as indicating any dramatic improvement in the finances of the Mamluk sultanate in its hour of twilight; it simply signified a gesture of goodwill. With all the significance these payments had for the recipients, they were not of the kind that could produce large savings for the state.[55]

To what extent the Islamic medieval state was concerned with the welfare of its subjects is a complex question. The provisions made for the weak segments of the Mamluk class were unique and unrelated to this question. These were the result of the foreign composition of the Mamluk class itself and reveal, if not social cohesion, at least a certain degree of intraclass Mamluk loyalty. The other data presented in this chapter show that various Islamic regimes were attentive and committed to the welfare of the religious class and supported it through a variety of administrative arrangements. This support was motivated by political, social, and religious considerations among which were the quest for political legitimization, recognition of the important social role of the religious class, and the genuine religious beliefs of the rulers. Care for the religious class, however, says nothing about the broader social commitments of the rulers toward the subjects—or lack of them (see chapter 7).

2

Charity, Piety, and Politics

Charity and the Individual: Communicating with God

On the personal level, the distribution of charity in medieval Islamic society served as a way for the individual to communicate with God. It served to implore God for deliverance at times of personal distress, to thank God for success, and to expiate sins. Using charity as a tool for atonement was common, and Balawi writes that Ahmad ibn Tulun was fully aware of his sinful deeds and the harm he had inflicted on others. Following events of this nature, he distributed generous charities and implored God to cleanse him of his crimes.[1] In Muslim Spain, jurists ordered rulers to fast and to feed and clothe the poor as expiation (*kaffara*) for transgression of sexual mores.[2] The distribution of charity by rulers and fasting as an expiation for sins also took place in Fatimid Egypt, but in the context of Ismaili Islam, such sensitive cases tended to touch upon central issues pertinent to Fatimid religious beliefs. The most revealing case concerns the Fatimid imam al-Amir's (1101–30) appointment of a Christian monk as a tax collector who terrorized the people and extorted vast sums of money. Eventually the outcry against his deeds reached al-Amir, who ordered him to be put to death but became concerned about how these events might affect the concept of his infallibility as an imam. He subsequently consulted a jurist, Sultan ibn Rasha, about how he should atone for the whole mishap, and the jurist offered him an easy way out of the problem: return the money. Rather surprisingly, al-Amir declined to do this, claiming that the victims were unknown to him, and he suggested freeing the slaves and distributing charity as a form of expiation. Ibn Rasha pointed out that this option was always open to him but would not be enough. He instructed al-Amir to fast on alternate days, but this was not acceptable to the ruler. Eventually they reached a solution whereby, in addition to the Ramadan fast, al-Amir would also fast during the holy months of Rajab and Shaʿban.[3] One way of approaching this account is to regard it as a hostile version aimed at ridiculing the Fatimid

concept of the infallibility of their imams by showing al-Amir as someone who was bargaining for expiation—which in itself contradicts the doctrine.

Maqrizi, who presents this account, is a late source, but not a historian, who was hostile to the Fatimids. It seems that something is missing from this account, and the missing link is supplied by another account given by Maqrizi. We can say with great confidence that this account is based on the tenth-century historian Ibn Zulaq, who is much quoted by Maqrizi in his accounts of the first years of the Fatimid rule in Egypt. In Ramadan 363/May–June 974, 1,300 Qarmatian prisoners of war were executed in Cairo. The Qarmatians were an enemy of the Fatimids from within the ranks of the Ismaili movement, but execution of prisoners was not a standard practice. Such atrocities did take place, however. The Fatimid imam al-Muʿizz, who ruled in Egypt from 972 until 975, denied any responsibility for the execution, saying that he had given orders to set the prisoners free and pay them money. Grief-stricken, he distributed charity and freed slaves.[4] The question of expiation is not mentioned at all, since al-Muʿizz denied personal responsibility for what had happened, and although his infallibility was not at stake, what he did was typical of one atoning for sins. A very subtle distinction is revealed here. Although al-Muʿizz denies personal responsibility, he does accept responsibility as the head of state for shedding blood. The notion that Fatimid rulers are responsible for the deeds of people in their service was common. In practice the Court of Complaints (*al-nazir fi 'l-mazalim*) examined the grievances of people against state officials, and the procedures of the court were supervised by the ruler himself or by a representative on his behalf.[5]

A tale about the building of a mosque in Mosul by the Zankid sultan Nur al-Din (1146–74) exemplifies the prevailing concept about the ruler's responsibility for the misdeeds of his subordinates. The supervision over the construction work had been entrusted to a local sheikh, 'Umar al-Mala', known for his piety. When people approached Nur al-Din and told him that he was not the man for the job, Nur al-Din offered them the following explanation: An emir or an administrator would inevitably oppress people, but the sheikh would not. If he did, the oppression would be the sheikh's sin and would not blemish Nur al-Din's own reputation. Nur al-Din added that this was the proper legal way to dissociate oneself from oppression.[6] The sheikh, obviously not in Nur al-Din's service, was a much admired independent man who was judged by his own deeds. Not coincidentally, one of his admirers was Nur al-Din, who in this case had used him for his own purposes.

To return to al-Muʿizz's acceptance (as the head of state) of responsibility for shedding the blood of the Qarmatian prisoners of war, it must be said that this is one of the rare cases of somebody carrying out expiation for allowing killings. In 143/760–61, the cadi of Basra authorized the killing of rebellious black slaves who had been driven to violence by hunger. It seems that he came

to regret his role in the affair, and each year he dispensed charity equal to the market value of these slaves. The example following, although it does not exactly belong to the same context, does point in the same direction, and the justification for presenting it is its uniqueness. It is said that the Seljukid sultan Malikshah (1072–92) distributed 10,000 *dinars* as charity for killing 10,000 animals during a hunt. He said that he was afraid of God's wrath for aimlessly spilling blood.[7] For the Turks and Mongols of the Euro-Asiatic steppes, hunting was an important part of their subsistence economy, but for Malikshah, the ruler of an empire, it was merely a pastime and part of his royal lifestyle. His inner religious world was still animistic, but his modes of expression—expiation and charity—were already Islamic.

In other circumstances, financial extortion brought rulers to seek repentance (*tawba*) for their misdeeds. For instance, in 356/967, when the Buyid sultan Muʿizz al-Dawla felt that his end was approaching, he transferred the rule to his son and became interested in how true repentance should be carried out. He was instructed in the rules of repentance by leading jurists and theologians. Acting on their advice, he distributed most of his money as charity, manumitted slaves, and returned unlawfully gained riches to their injured owners.[8] The notion of repentance was also the underlying motive behind the deeds of the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Musa (1229–38), who is described as a charitable ruler who built the Mosque of Repentance. The mosque stood on the site of a former caravansary, which had become infamous as a place where wine was sold and prostitutes congregated. Al-Malik al-Ashraf demolished the caravansary and instead built this mosque, for which he set up a special pious endowment. In his case pietism did not mean the renunciation of worldly possessions and pleasures, since he built a very nice palace for himself in Damascus.[9]

The dispensation of charity was an act in which one implored God for deliverance at times of personal distress, especially during sickness. In Ramadan 381/November–December 991, the son and heir-apparent of al-ʿAziz, the future al-Hakim, fell ill and al-ʿAziz distributed 10,000 *dinars* as charity among the poor. As a father and ruler, the survival and well-being of the son was al-ʿAziz's primary concern. In this case, charity can be viewed as a way that the imam communicated with God. Al-ʿAziz's deed here can be compared and contrasted with his behavior when general Jawhar fell sick during the same month. Al-ʿAziz sent him 10,000 *dinars* and garments, while the very young al-Hakim sent him another 5,000 *dinars*.[10] The money sent to the sick and, at that time, estranged general who had rendered outstanding services to the Fatimids was an expression of recognition of his bygone glory and personal interest in his health. Although al-ʿAziz was not indifferent to Jawhar's fate, his illness was not a pressing personal concern, and al-ʿAziz felt no need to implore God for Jawhar's recovery by distributing charity. The money sent by al-Hakim was

politically motivated and part of a larger effort undertaken by al-ʿAziz to consolidate his position as the heir-apparent. No less evocative is the account describing the conduct of the Mamluk sultan Mansur Qalawun (1279–90) during the illness of his son and heir-apparent, Salih. Qalawun, who was very generous with money distributions and charities, offered money to two leading mystics to pray for the delivery of his son, but both refused to do so, claiming that this request was beyond them.[11] In this case the distribution of charities during sickness signified a request for the redemption of the soul because sickness was seen to be a fate ordained by God and, even more, as a punishment for sins, while recovery was seen as divine absolution. Perhaps the most telling example of conduct during illness is provided by the deeds of Khayrbak, the first Ottoman governor of Egypt. In 1522, during the illness from which he eventually died, he not only distributed charity but also reversed his fiscal policy by returning *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya* to their beneficiaries. It seems that he was driven by bad conscious and was aware of the misery his policies had brought to so many, and his charity, specifically targeting certain groups, reflected the same mood. Young children at Koranic schools and their teachers were given alms and asked to recite the opening verses of the Koran for the benefit of the donor's soul. His other charities involved the distribution of grain among devotees at their places of sojourn. All of his efforts were aimed at turning innocent children and the pious into his advocates before God. As his sickness intensified, the scope of his charities broadened and involved the manumission of his male and female slaves, the release of prisoners from jails, and dispensation of alms to the poor.[12]

The powerful grip the concept that charity delivers one from death had on the minds of medieval people is further illustrated by the following cases. In 581/1185–86, in Harran, Saladin fell sick and issued orders to the administrative officials in his territories to distribute charity among the poor. In Damascus alone, 5,000 *dinars* were assigned for that purpose.[13] The belief that charity was a way of fighting sickness is explicitly stated in the sources, and in 485/1092–93, when the great Seljukid vizier Nizam al-Mulk (1072–92) fell ill, the contemporary historian writes that "he cured himself through charity." This was expressed through charities distributed on his behalf at the doors of the Nizamiyya law college he had earlier established in Baghdad. In 521/1127–28, when the Seljukid sultan became ill, the Abbasid caliph sent him medicines and distributed food and charities, beseeching God for his recovery.[14] In this context the most personal and emotional account is that of Musabbihi, who in an autobiographical note records the death of his father on 9 Shaʿban 400/21 March 1010, at the age of ninety-three. His father, writes Musabbihi, lived a comfortable life and died with his faculties intact, although he was confined to his home during his final years. On the night he died, Musabbihi went to the Ancient Mosque in Fustat, the most venerated mosque in Egypt, which dated

back to the Muslim conquest of the country. He not only distributed charity for his father but also asked a group of pious men (*ahl al-satr*) and Koran reciters to pray for him. Less personal, but no less revealing, is the conduct of another eleventh-century individual, Ibn Radwan of Baghdad, who is mentioned several times in Ibn Banna''s diary. He was a wealthy man of high social standing in his town, and during his sickness he distributed vast charities, amounting to 10,000 *dinars*.

The same approach is reflected by the deeds of certain Mamluk sultans, among whom was sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun (1310–41), who in 740/1339–40, during the illness of his favorite emir, canceled his usual schedule and, upon the recovery of the emir, invited mystics, the pious, and state officials to a great banquet. The sultan also set prisoners free after paying their debts. Several years later, in a similar situation, al-Nasir Muhammad's son, the sultan Hajji I (1346–47), behaved in the same way. He distributed charity and set prisoners free, beseeching God for the recovery of his emir, Arghun al-Kamili.[15] The sultan al-Zahir Barquq (1390–99), during three periods of sickness in the last year of his rule, tried to "cure himself through charities," to use the medieval expression. His historian, who was well aware of the instrumental nature of his charities, wrote in his obituary that the sultan respected the mystics and dispensed charities mostly during his sickness. Barquq's charities dispensed at that time were vast and consisted of handouts of money, grain, and clothes. In one of these events, fifty poor were crushed to death in the tumult.[16]

Obituary comments written about emirs and rulers supplement data recorded in the chronicles, and since they reveal the same patterns of behavior, a few examples are sufficient to illustrate this point. During Ramadan 610/January–February 1214, emir Faris al-Din, the last high-ranking officer of Saladin's private corps, the Salahiyya, died. On the night of his death, he manumitted eighty male slaves and married them to slave girls. In 1216, when the Ayyubid ruler of Aleppo, al-Malik al-Zahir (1186–1216), fell ill, he set 100 of his slaves free; upon his recovery, he set another 100 slaves free and provided for their marriages. He died shortly afterward. In 691/1291–92, a Mamluk emir who recovered from a serious illness performed many charitable deeds, distributing charities during Ramadan, returning properties he had unlawfully seized, and freeing prisoners.[17]

Musabbihi's personal testimony, the conduct of Ibn Radwan, and the deeds of mighty monarchs provide incidental glimpses into the lives and perceptions of medieval people. The use of charity during sickness as a tool to beseech God for deliverance and, upon recovery, to thank God was widespread in medieval Islam and crossed the lines that divided Shias, Ismailis, and Sunnis. In Abbasid Baghdad and Fatimid-Mamluk Cairo, it became standard practice to distribute charity, clothing, and food to the poor during sickness and upon recovery. This

type of conduct was common to all, irrespective of social divisions, and was practiced by the rulers and common people alike.

In other cases, charity was distributed to express gratitude to God for deliverance from the hands of enemies and for surviving life-threatening incidents. Of these the most revealing is the account of the deeds of the Fatimid imam al-Mansur in August 946 after he defeated the rebel Abu Yazid, whose uprising almost brought about the fall of the Fatimid state in North Africa. Al-Mansur distributed charity both to needy soldiers of his army and to the poor and needy Muslims at large, meaning people beyond the narrow pale of his Ismaili supporters. He ordered his governors to distribute charity in the districts under their rule and instructed his confidant, the eunuch Jawdhar, to dispense charities in Mahdiyya, the Fatimid capital city and bastion of Ismaili supporters of the regime. Charity is also mentioned in an open letter proclaimed after the suppression of the rebellion in which the people were urged to distribute charity and free slaves as a token of gratitude to God for the restoration of peace and security after the turmoil of war. Al-Mansur himself set an example by freeing slaves, and in a letter he informed Jawdhar about his manumission from slavery and wrote that he had granted him the title of Client (*mawla*) of the Commander of the Believers. Such detailed reports that offer an insight into the inner world of a ruler during a moment of personal and political triumph are rare but not altogether unusual. More typical are references to the conduct of rulers who have survived personal disasters. For example, in 417/1026–27, the Fatimid imam al-Zahir (1021–36) survived a bad fall from a horse and subsequently dispensed 100,000 *dinars* as charity. He sent 40,000 *dinars* to the Holy Cities of Arabia, and the rest was split into three even shares for distribution in Syria, North Africa, and Fustat. In 730/1329–30, the same thing happened to al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun, who also fell from a horse. Upon his recovery he also distributed charity to orphans and invited his emirs and administrators to a banquet.[18] In 565/1169–70, in Damascus, Nur al-Din granted robes of honor, made payments to high-ranking people, and handed out charity to express his gratitude for the birth of a son. In the same year, in Cairo, Saladin distributed charity to thank God for the safe arrival of his father and other family members from Damascus. The same attitude is revealed by the deeds of the Fatimid military vizier al-Afdal (1094–21), who distributed charities after the failure of an attempt on his life (509/1115–16).[19]

There is a striking similarity between what the Fatimid rulers did as individuals and the public conduct of the Fatimid state. In 1123, the Fatimid regime foiled a plot by a rival Ismaili group in which five agents were caught and executed and the money in their possession was seized. Although extensive deliberations took place over what should be done with this money, the way the regime chose to mark its triumph is more significant. There were no celebrations but only pious deeds and the dispensing of charity, including the

granting of 10,000 *dirhams* to three congregational mosques in the capital and to the poor Ismailis at the gates of the royal palace. In addition, wheat was distributed from the royal granaries, a number of royal women (*jihat*, meaning wives or concubines of the ruler) received large grants, and a number of slave girls were set free.[20] The granting of charity was the main element in the celebration of other great political events such as military victories. In 992, following the public announcement of victories over the Byzantine army in Syria, al-ʿAziz distributed extensive charity. In 1265, Baybars celebrated the conquest of the coastal town of Arsuf, in Palestine, by distributing clothes, money, and grain among the *fuqara'*. Other rulers gave charity as part of their prewar preparations in an attempt to secure God's support for their future military endeavors.[21]

The function of charity as a channel for communication with God is epitomized by the behavior of the grief-stricken. The distribution of charity following the death of a person symbolized the acceptance of the fate ordained by God. In 996, al-ʿAziz quickly suffered the loss of both his wife and mother, and although his donations were modest (1,000 *dinars*), the Koran reciters who took part in the funeral rites were handsomely rewarded with 3,000 *dinars*. In contrast to al-ʿAziz's restrained solemnity, there is the more exuberant conduct of the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir (1180–1225). In 599/1202–3, following the death of his mother, a charitable woman in her own right who was popular with the people of Baghdad, the caliph sent money to religious and educational institutions in the capital. He also handed out money and robes of honor to notables, and her estate, which included gems, gold, and silver, was divided among her slaves, while the medicines and potions she had accumulated were given to the ʿAdudi hospital. In 604/1207–8, in Baghdad, the unnamed daughter of a high-ranking Abbasid courtier who was married to a high-ranking emir died. Her funeral was massively attended, and she was buried at the doorstep of the mausoleum of the mother of the caliph al-Nasir. During the mourning period, people of various groups of the religious class visited her grave, and charity was distributed to the poor and needy, while money was handed out on the day of her death by the caliph himself. The death of the wife of the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-ʿAdil (1200–1218) and the mother of his heir, the future sultan al-Kamil, in 608/1211–12 is another example of the use of charity as a way of communicating with God. The sultan chose one of the most venerated sites in Egypt for the burial of his wife, the mausoleum of the renowned jurist al-Shafiʿi (767–820) in Cairo, but also installed a group of Koran reciters at her tomb and distributed charities liberally. In addition, water was brought to the place to encourage people to move from their dwellings at the Qarafa cemetery to the new site. An additional insight into the function of charities distributed after the death of a person is provided by Ibn ʿAsakir (1105–74), the renowned historian of Damascus. The narrator of Ibn ʿAsakir's tale is a former slave,

Salih, who eked out a living as a gravedigger in Basra. He was promised the fabulous sum of 1,000 *dinars* to guard the grave of the daughter of the cadi of Basra for a year. The cadi explained to Salih that he intended to spend 3,000 *dinars* for the burial of his daughter, dividing the money in equal sums for shrouds, charities, and guarding the grave. Salih suggested a different way of spending the money: only 100 *dinars* for the shrouds and the rest for clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, and providing water for the thirsty. The cadi followed this advice, and his daughter was saved from Hell.[22]

In total contrast to the acceptance of the death of a person as a fate ordained by God, epidemics were perceived as punishment for the sins of society as a whole. In such cases communal repentance was needed, and the provision of funds for charity was at the heart of these endeavors. In 449/1057–58 an epidemic (*waba'*) struck Baghdad, leading people to expiate their sins by destroying jugs of wine and dispensing charity. The mosques were massively attended, and large sessions of Koran recitations also took place. When the plague came to Baghdad some decades later, the caliph distributed medications and money, and these deeds, carried out by the spiritual leader of the Muslims, were a manifestation of his piety and charity and his beseeching of God for deliverance.[23] In 749/1348–49, the year of the Black Death in the Middle East, people in Damascus gathered in the mosques to repent their sins and beg God for deliverance. Many sacrifices were offered, and the sacrificial meat was distributed among the poor. This communal response had its desirable effects, and the epidemic abated a little each day. In Cairo the wealthy renounced their riches and distributed money among the poor.[24] Similar communal conduct also took place when other calamities befell the people. In 652/1254–55 in Aden, a volcanic eruption was perceived as a sign heralding the end of the world, leading people to massively repent their sins and amend their ways.[25]

The Charities of People of the Ruling Class

The distribution of charity served as an expression of personal piety and is thus mentioned in biographies of rulers, women of ruling families, members of the ruling class, slaves, eunuchs at the royal courts, emirs, and people of the civilian society. It can be argued that what people of the ruling class did was always politically motivated or at least had political meanings. While this may be true, it must also be said that politics and religion were not separate spheres, and the intricate entanglement of politics, religion, and public considerations is exemplified by the following case. In 551/1156–57, a preacher from Ghazna came to Baghdad. He had gained popularity with the Iranians in the capital, and the wife of the caliph had built a lodge for him, endowing it with agricultural land. It might well be argued that her motives were religious and pious, but her deeds

also had political and public consequences, and the caliph supported her, for he had purchased the land endowed for the lodge.[26]

The elusive term *ruling class* is used here to mean people who wielded political authority. This is true of some but not all the people at the court, whether slaves, eunuchs, or women belonging to ruling families, wielded political power. And so they can best be described as belonging to a broader group, the "ruling circles." They did move in the corridors of power, were wealthy, and they were involved in politics. In terms of personal or class conduct, the distinction between these two groups is rather blurred, and the only differences that exist are in the far greater economic capabilities of the people of the ruling class. Making distinction between people of these two echelons, although difficult, is necessary when politics are discussed.

Piety was both a motive and a driving force as strong as any possible political considerations, and in many cases to be discussed, piety was the overriding, if not the sole, motive. Balawi writes that Ahmad ibn Tulun had an aptitude for pious deeds (*birr*), and he cites the building of the congregational mosque bearing his name, a hospital (well stocked with the most expensive medicines and bottles of drinking water), and a well in Fustat as examples of such deeds.[27] Ahmad ibn Tulun's example must have influenced the ruling class and the administrators of his period, and the most revealing example of this is Yusuf ibn Ibrahim, whom Ahmad ibn Tulun put under house arrest. Yusuf was the patron of 100 *ahl al-satr*, pious and honorable men living in seclusion who were highly respected for their way of life, and it was through their intercession with Ahmad ibn Tulun that Yusuf was set free. Thus the recipients of his charity rendered him a great service. The sources indicate that Ahmad ibn Tulun himself had his own following among the urban poor and *ahl al-satr,* although he obviously needed their active support less, since he had the secret police and army at his disposal. They nonetheless made an impressive appearance at his funeral. Kafur, the quasi-independent ruler of Egypt midway through the tenth century, financially supported a sheikh who, although secluded, was popular among the mystics and people of religion because of the money he distributed.[28] The extensive biographical note written about the Egyptian administrator Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn ʿAli al-Madharaʾi (872–956) is very informative about the topic under consideration. In his lifetime, he made the pilgrimage to the Holy Cities of Arabia twenty-one times, and on each occasion he distributed money among the *ashraf* and descendants of the Prophet's companions. He kept a register with their names, and each of them received a sealed bag of money. His generosity was not limited to select, socially prestigious groups among the inhabitants of the Holy Cities. It encompassed everybody, and the people of Medina called him their provider because he distributed money, clothing, grain, and food.[29] Abu Bakr's charities in Egypt were also extensive

and broadly targeted, and he built a lodge for *ashraf* women in the Qarafa that was supported by a pious endowment, indicating that it provided not only housing but also food for its occupants. His monthly distributions of flour in Fustat were very large and included the people of his household, *ahl al-satr*, influential people, and strangers. Among his other charitable deeds were the freeing of slaves, ransom of prisoners of war, and construction of water facilities. For example, a partially preserved inscription from the town of Ramla, in Palestine, commemorates the endowment and establishment of a cistern and public drinking installation that he had ordered to be built.[30] Although Abu Bakr was outstanding among the people of his age by virtue of the extent of his deeds, he was not unique, and other people of the ruling circles behaved in a similar, although more modest, way. An Egyptian administrator of the first half of the tenth century, for example, is described as a person who distributed much charity and gifts and performed numerous pious deeds.[31] Among the administrators of Saladin's age, Qadi al-Fadil also became well known for his philanthropy, establishing a renowned law college in Cairo that was supported by a pious endowment and included a school for orphans. Another pious endowment he created was dedicated to the ransom of prisoners of war.

Displays of piety and charity were instruments used by converts to Islam in their attempt to integrate into Muslim society. Although conversion to Islam was not necessarily a prerequisite for employment in the administration, many administrators converted in order to keep their posts and advance their careers. The sincerity of conversion may have been a topic much debated in Islam, but the mere recitation of the proclamation of the faith was regarded as sufficient, and on the legal level, Islam was satisfied with the outward acceptance of the new faith. Muslim society, however, developed a negative, occasionally even hostile, attitude toward converts who merely adhered to their newly adopted faith and showed neither sincerity nor devotion. They were labeled *muslimani*, a term that had a clear pejorative connotation, and this became a hindrance to their assimilation into Muslim society. On the other hand, converts who behaved like devoted Muslims and immersed themselves fully into Muslim religious life became socially accepted and were able to maintain their posts and position; many of these devoted converts to Islam became renowned for their charities. In 497/1103–4, a Christian convert to Islam, Amin al-Dawla Abu Saʿd al-ʿAlaʾ, who served the Abbasid caliphs for sixty-five years, died, and although he must have converted late in his life (only in 484/1091–92), he was praised for his full conversion, charities, and endowments for charitable causes. A year later his nephew, who was the only one among his family who had continued to adhere to Christianity while serving the Abbasid caliphs, also died, but he became renowned for his charity in spite of his miserliness. In thirteenth-century Jerusalem, a Coptic convert to Islam who held the administrative position of supervisor of the army, whose conversion was full and sin-

cere and whose charities and endowments were many, established a lodge for mystics. He became especially well known for his positive attitude toward people of religion and learning. Non-Muslim court physicians faced similar dilemmas. Muslim rulers massively employed Jewish and Christian physicians, but many others converted. Saladin's physician, Asʿad ibn Mitran al-Muwaffaq, for example, was a Christian convert to Islam who had earned himself a name for treating poor patients whom he supplied with medicines, potions, and money to visit the bathhouse.[32]

Women also figure prominently as distributors of charities, and in some cases their charities must be seen in the context of their political roles. The most notable cases are perhaps those of Khayzuran, the mother of the Abbasid caliph Harun al-Rashid (786–809), and his wife, Zubayda, two royal women who became famous because of their charitable works, building of mosques, and water installations in Mecca and Medina. Another two twelfth-century royal women also gained fame due to their involvement in politics and charities. One was Khatun Safwat al-Mulk, mother of Duqaq, the Seljukid prince of Damascus, and wife of Tughtakin, the powerful Atabek and ruler of Damascus. The other was Duqaq's sister, Zumurrud Khatun. In the obituary note written about Safwat al-Mulk (d. 1119) by Ibn al-Qalanisi (d. 1160), the historian of Damascus, she is described as a virtuous, religious, and charitable woman who had always sought goodness and refrained from oppression. Endowed with a strong character, sound political judgment, and a talent for management, she inspired *hayba*, awe, a quality associated with royal authority. Clearly Ibn al-Qalanisi was more impressed with her political acumen than with her piety or charities. Zumurrud Khatun's involvement in politics was even deeper, and she was held responsible for the downfall and execution of her son, Shams al-Mulk, and the installation of Mahmud, her second son, as the ruler. Her deeds were in response to Shams al-Mulk's reign of terror and her determination to preserve the dynasty in power. Nevertheless, her historians praised her not only for her political actions but also for her piety, her charities, her learning of Koran and the Prophetic traditions, and her adherence to the Hanafi legal school.[33]

Most women of the ruling circles were not involved in politics, and the following examples are more typical. Jiha Maknun, the wife of the Fatimid ruler al-Amir, is characterized as a God-fearing woman who performed many pious deeds, sent handsome gifts to *ashraf,* and gave money to those living in seclusion (*arbab al-buyut* and *ahl al-satr*). She was also a builder. Under her patronage, two mosques and a lodge for aged women and widows were built.[34] During the Fatimid period, the Qarafa cemetery around Fustat-Cairo attracted a lot of building activity by royal women who established mosques and sponsored other utilitarian projects. The first to build in the Qarafa was Sayyida al-Muʿizziyya, the mother of al-ʿAziz, who built a cistern and the well-known

congregational Mosque of the Qarafa and established an orchard. Two other mosques and two lodges were built in this area by royal women and women of the court, one by al-Amir's wife, and another, designated for old widows, by a slave girl of a high-ranking administrator of the 1020s. Both institutions were supported by pious endowments. Qarafa was not only a cemetery but also an inhabited area with a permanent population, called the Qarafiyya. The cult of shrines and tombs in the Qarafa had a long tradition in pre-Fatimid Egypt, and it continued into the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods. Thus the activities of women and men of the Fatimid ruling circles in the Qarafa enjoyed wide public exposure and must have been greatly appreciated.[35]

The wives and women of the households of the Seljukid sultans of eleventh-century Baghdad and those of the Abbasid caliphs were just as well known for their charities and benevolence as their Fatimid counterparts. This was true for the wife of the sultan Tughril Beg I (1038–63), the slave girl of the sultan Malikshah, and the slave girl of the Abbasid caliph al-Qa'im (1031–75). Other Abbasid royal women of the first half of the thirteenth century were behind the establishment of religious and learning institutions in Baghdad, setting up pious endowments to support these institutions and dispensing charities.[36] Like the examples presented so far, the deeds of 'Ismat al-Din Khatun (d. 1185), the widow of Nur al-Din and later wife of Saladin, are part of a familiar pattern. The sources praise her as an honorable, virtuous, and resolute lady of pious deeds and vast charities who, like some of the Fatimid royal women, was an avid builder. She sponsored the building of a law college, a lodge for mystics, and a mausoleum for herself. The institutions she established were supported by pious endowments, while other endowments were set up in favor of her manumitted slaves.[37] Other Ayyubid princesses followed her example. Saladin's sister, Sitt al-Sham (d. 1220), for example, became renowned for her patronage of religious institutions in Damascus and her extensive charities and pious deeds. Her philanthropy included the preparation and distribution of food to the needy, while her eunuch, Kafur, also earned a name for his charitable deeds and utilitarian works, such as the restoration of roads and water reservoirs.[38]

Throughout the Islamic Middle Ages, there were some members of the military class who were philanthropists on a large scale. One was Badr al-Kabir, one of Ahmad ibn Tulun's military slaves who rose to the position of a leading emir and who used to give charity to the poor using the services of a well-known sheikh. His charities involved the distribution of food, clothes, and money, and he also provided water for ablution and drinking at the Ancient Mosque in Fustat.[39] Other examples of such people are legion. Masrur, for example, was a eunuch at the Fatimid palace whom Saladin appointed as the commander of his bodyguard and who, upon his retirement from military service, devoted his life to God, restricting himself to the confines of his house.

He is referred to as a person of pious deeds and munificence who established two endowed law colleges. The deeds of another emir of similar background and career, Husam al-Din Lu'lu', made even a greater impression on his contemporaries and later generations. Lu'lu', an officer of Armenian stock in the service of the Fatimids whom Saladin had made admiral of his navy, was involved in two major military events of the period: the defeat of the Crusader raid in the Red Sea and the battle for Acre. Upon his release from captivity following the fall of Acre to the Crusaders in 1191, he retired from military service. His first concern was to provide for and marry off his four daughters, but the rest of his assets were devoted to charity. His charities were unusual because of his personal involvement and the vast distributions of food. Every day he brought pots of food and 12,000 loaves of bread to the Qarafa cemeteries, increasing this amount during Ramadan. He supervised the whole operation and distributed the food himself, with the first to eat being men followed by women and the young, and when the needs of the poor were satisfied, he laid out food for the better-off. Maqrizi says, "He did things that the kings were not capable of." The charities of other emirs of the Ayyubid age were more conventional and involved the establishment of law colleges, mosques, schools for orphans, and distributions of charity. Typical was an Ayyubid emir, Fakhr al-Din 'Uthman, who received the district of Fayyum in Egypt as a fief in 619/1222–23. He is characterized as a man of many charities, some of which were given in secret, who created pious endowments for the foundation of religious and learning institutions, among them a Koranic school for orphans.[40]

The biographical dictionary of Safadi (1297–1363) is a rich source of information about this type of behavior of members of the military class during the Mamluk period. For example, the emir Badr al-Din Abu 'l-Mahasin, an Ethiopian eunuch, earned a name for himself as a pious and charitable person and was several times entrusted with the prestigious and responsible task of leading the annual pilgrimage to the Holy Cities of Arabia. It is said that some of his charities were given in secret. In a similar way is depicted the senior member of the eunuch corps at the Prophet's tomb in Medina. The charities of the Mamluk emirs for Mecca and Medina were many, and some were performed in conjunction with their own pilgrimages. The supply of grain and food was always the main component of these charities, but other pious deeds performed by this class often involved alms giving and the endowment of religious and educational institutions.[41] Mamluk emirs were great founders of religious and educational institutions, and in some cases their works also extended to provincial towns. This pattern of activity is epitomized by the works of Tankiz in Damascus, where he built two funerary complexes, one for himself and another for his wife. These complexes also included a Koranic school for orphans and a mosque. His other charitable deeds involved water-supply projects for

the towns of Damascus, Jerusalem, and Caesarea as well as an endowed hospital in Safad. The town of Gaza was developed by another Mamluk emir, Sanjar ʿIlm al-Din al-Jawali, who established a complex that included the usual mixture of religious, learning, and charitable institutions with a law college, a charitable caravansary, a bathhouse, and a hospital.[42]

Certain clear preferences are discernible in the charitable deeds carried out by the Mamluk emirs, with religious and learning institutions, especially law colleges, attracting most of the endowments, whereas most of the charities were dedicated to the Holy Cities of Arabia. In third place were the charities devoted to the needy society at large. Rather surprisingly, in only a few reported cases were the charities of Mamluk emirs devoted to their fellow soldiers and comrades-in-arms. The felling of comradeship among Mamluk cadets who were trained together was a strong and binding sentiment that governed intra-Mamluk relations, and one would have expected to hear more about such deeds, and the paucity of information on this subject remains unexplained.[43]

Courtiers at the courts of the Fatimid, Abbasid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk rulers were great philanthropists. In Cairo during the first half of the twelfth century, two slaves of al-Amir, Barghash and Hizar al-Mulk, were known for their charities. Barghash distributed 80,000 *dinars* given to him by al-Amir as charity, and Hizar al-Mulk is described as "the most generous person God has ever created." Each Friday he distributed 4,000 *dirhams* among 1,000 people in the Qarafa according to a list of names. In this particular case we can try to estimate the possible economic value of Hizar al-Mulk's charities. Judging from a document from 1181 studied by S. D. Goitein, a person who earned four *dirhams* per week could hardly keep body and soul together. Shaqiq al-Mulk, a eunuch of the Fatimid ruler al-Hafiz (1130–39), and his treasurer also characteristically distributed food according to a list he had prepared, among the people of the mosques and the *buyut* in the Qarafa and the Muqattam Hill area, and he established a mosque in the Qarafa. Two slaves at the Abbasid court also became renowned for their charities, which included clothing the needy, rescuing prisoners of war, and feeding the poor, while other charities involved the creation of pious endowments. Safi (d.479/1086–87), the freedman of al-Qa'im, set up pious endowments for charitable purposes, but unfortunately the essence of these endowments is not specified.[44] We are better informed, however, about the deeds of Shabashi, the chamberlain of ʿAdud al-Dawla's son, who died in 408/1017–18. His pious endowments were given for a hospital, and his building activities included bridges, water-supply works, and shrines. Probably a eunuch, he regarded his buildings as memorials to himself, but he was not concerned only with posterity, for his other charities were dispensed among orphans and the poor. Religious beliefs, piety, concern

for the welfare of the Holy Cities, and charities are recurrent motifs in biographical sketches of other eunuchs as well.[45]

The Charities of the Commoners

Although some of the most renowned medieval historians earned a reputation for distributing charity and founding religious and educational institutions, the focus of their historical writings is on the world of the rulers and their courts, not on the civilian society. The question to what extent people of the wealthier segments of the civilian society also made a practice of dispensing charity poses many difficulties. But, first, the expression "people of the civilian society" needs explanation. It is used here to denote people who were outside the ruling class, meaning that they neither wielded political authority nor belonged to the courts of rulers. This term is used loosely to mean people in the medium and low ranks of the administration, in the judiciary system, teachers in law colleges and other institutions, and merchants. Its use is not related to the broader concept of civil society, and any question about the extent of its existence, or lack of it, in medieval Islam certainly has nothing to do with the modern ramifications of this issue.

The accounts concerning the historians who themselves dispensed charities are interesting in their own right and exemplify the intricate entanglement of personal conduct with the values of society as depicted in the historical writings. One of the most famous historians of the Abbasid caliphate, Muhammad ibn Hilal al-Sabi (d. 480/1087–88), of the well-known Sabian family, died wealthy, leaving 70,000 *dinars,* and during his lifetime he spent some of his wealth on charities. Far more modest were the charities of Khatib al-Baghdadi (1001–71), whose voluminous *History of Baghdad* is a biographical dictionary of people connected with the town. During his sickness he gave away all of his money, 200 *dinars*, as charity, and his estate comprised only his clothes and books, which were also doled out as charity.[46] Two of Saladin's historians, Qadi al-Fadil and Baha' al-Din ibn Shaddad (1145–1235), who belonged to his innermost circle, were great philanthropists, and Qadi al-Fadil's charities and endowments for the ransom of Muslim prisoners of war are even noted with appreciation by Ibn al-Athir (1160–1233), a historian hostile to Saladin.[47] Following Saladin's death, Ibn Shaddad moved to Aleppo and continued to serve the Ayyubid rulers of the town. There he built his funerary complex, which was supported by an exceptionally rich pious endowment and which included a mausoleum flanked by a large law college and *dar al-hadith*, a learning institution designated for the transmission of the Prophetic traditions. He himself served as the law professor at the college, and only upon his death was another appointment made. Qadi al-Fadil and Ibn Shaddad were involved

in the politics of Saladin's time and served as Saladin's administrators, but their deeds as statesmen and private people conformed to the established values of their society and age. The same type of involvement in political life and adherence to the accepted social norms also characterized the Mamluk historian Baybars al-Mansuri (d. 1325), who rose from servitude to high military and administrative posts. His charities were given in secret, but like so many other people of the military class of the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods, he also established an endowed law college in Cairo.[48]

Some information about people of the civilian society who dispensed charity is offered by Ibn Jawzi, and other data are scattered in a wide range of historical writings. For instance, Abu 'l-Qasim al-Dinuri, preacher and ascetic who died in 397/1006–7, used to distribute food among widows and orphans. A mystic who served as the sheikh of a lodge accommodating mystics in Damascus used to hand out his belongings to people in need, including the clothes and shoes he wore.[49] Yet another ascetic, al-Makhzumi, who died in 463/1070–71, was renowned for his charities and the sponsorship of large building activities, some religious and some described as for the benefit of the public. In this case the source of his wealth is well attested to, since his blessings were much appreciated and sought after by people of the ruling class who undoubtedly rewarded the sheikh handsomely for his benedictions. Other people were wealthy in their own right and not interested in governmental positions. Abu Ishaq, who originated from Jazirat ibn 'Umar on the Upper Tigris, for example, died in 598/1201–2 in Egypt, where he had settled after refusing an administrative appointment by the local ruler. He bought agricultural land in Upper Egypt and lived a life of piety and religious practice while immersing himself in charitable work.[50]

People who, by education or profession, belonged to the *'ulama'*, the religious class, figure prominently among philanthropists and as patrons of endowed institutions. For instance, a specialist in the recitation of the Koran, who lived in Egypt between 670/1271 and 749/1348, is mentioned in an obituary note as a person of many charities. Another person of the *'ulama'* class in fourteenth-century Egypt regularly provided food for ten orphans and the needy in Ramadan.[51] There are many such examples in Safadi's biographical dictionary, and we find cadis, muftis, jurists, and administrators among the charitable persons recorded by him. Their deeds are occasionally specified, although in many cases they are only praised as charitable people, and when details are supplied, familiar patterns emerge. Charity was given on the occasion of religious festivals to the poor, righteous people, and mystics, and many charitable deeds involved the establishment of endowed institutions. The foundation of law colleges enjoyed the greatest popularity among the people of the religious class and merchants, and many of these were built in Cairo and other towns such as Alexandria and Isna in Upper Egypt.[52] Rarely are Safadi's ac-

counts more personal, going beyond the standard conventions of biographical dictionaries when reporting on charitable people who typified piety and righteousness. The obituary note on a Shafiʿi jurist, Mubarak ibn Nusayr, who died in 711/1311–12 is exceptional in this respect. Ibn Nusayr held a position as a teaching assistant at the Mashhad al-Juyushi in Cairo, rendering many services to students of law, but his reputation came from the fact that he personally cooked and cared for the sick.[53] In contrast to the rich evidence that exists about the involvement of royal women in philanthropy, information on women of the civilian class is scarce, and Safadi's large biographical dictionary only contains three pertinent biographies. In the first case, the woman belonged to a family with a long tradition of learning, in the second the woman herself was involved in the world of learning, while the third case involves a woman who handed out charities among members of her family and relatives. From earlier periods one notable example concerns a female secretary (d. 574/1178–79) employed in the household of the Abbasid caliph who made a name for herself as a pious, charitable, and learned woman who studied Prophetic traditions.[54]

The sources attest to the existence of a powerful link between the mercantile class and their support of learning through the establishment of endowed institutions. The obituary note on the Coptic patriarch John IV (1189–1216), which illustrates the two categories of people discussed, a merchant- philanthropist and a member of the religious class, is particularly interesting here. John IV, who occupied his post for twenty-seven years, made his fortune (17,000 *dinars*) in trade with India and spent it on the poor, never accepting gifts or money while serving as patriarch.[55] The best-known merchant-philanthropist of the 1170s was Ibn al-Arsufi from Arsuf in Palestine, who lived and died in Fustat in 593/1196–97 and whose honorific title, ʿAfif al-Din, bears testimony to his religious practice and its expression in his charitable works. In 570/1174–75 he built a law college in Fustat; a year later, he established a similar institution and a lodge for mystics in Mecca. The law college in Fustat was supported by a pious endowment consisting of commercial urban properties.[56] Judging from an autobiographical remark made by Ibn Jawzi, the realities in Baghdad must have been the same, for in 574/1178–79 in the presence of a great crowd, Ibn Jawzi conducted the funeral prayers for a merchant in the law college that he had earlier established. This merchant, who was known for his piety and charities, was a supporter of the Hanbali community in Baghdad to which Ibn Jawzi himself belonged.[57] Accumulation of riches could, however, have its drawbacks, as we can see in the case of Burhan al-Din (745–806/1344–1403), a great Egyptian merchant whose assets were confiscated by the rulers of Yemen, Mecca, and Egypt. Despite this he was capable of building an opulent residence for himself in Fustat adjacent to his law college, and he undertook the work of restoring the Ancient Mosque in Fustat. Judging by the places

Burhan al-Din visited for his trading ventures, we can surmise that he was involved in trade with India or at least that he traded in Indian products. Many other merchants are explicitly identified as trading with India and attaining great fortunes. One of these India traders (known as the Karimi merchants), who died in 714/1314–15, established a law college in Alexandria and became renowned for his charities. The information about the involvement of merchants with charities that is derived from literary sources is corroborated by Corinne Morisot's study of several pious endowments created by the merchants of Cairo between 1393 and 1508. Despite the fact that the aim of these foundations was to preserve family wealth, they did support charitable causes, including Koranic schools for orphans and law colleges.[58]

Some people of the civilian society had high positions that brought them into contact and even a certain level of integration with the ruling class. One of the better-known men who moved freely between the world of the rulers and the upper echelons of the civilian society was the sharif Ibn Abi Jinn of Damascus, who in 1025 organized the defense of the town against a Bedouin siege and secured cooperation between the Fatimid garrison and the local armed militia. In terms of wealth, status, and involvement in politics, he belonged to the class of urban notables and, as befitted his high social standing, his charities were large, amounting to 7,000 *dinars* annually.[59] The sheikh of the Salahiyya quarter in Damascus, who died in 607/1210–11, enjoyed greater status and wealth, but other people of this top echelon of the civilian society could attain immense wealth. In 502/1108–9, for example, the death is recorded of the civilian head (*ra'is*) of Hamadhan, who is described as a charitable man with a huge estate worth 900,000 *dinars* that was confiscated.[60]

The epigraphic evidence supplements and enhances the information derived from literary sources. The deeds of charitable people were recorded by medieval historians and biographers, and this aspect of their life and activity was engraved on their tombstones. The epigraphic evidence spans a long period and wide geographical area and testifies to uniform mood typical of the Islamic medieval world as a whole, and the wording of the tombstone inscriptions pertaining to support of the needy is diversified and far from being standardized or stylized. For example, among the titles inscribed on the tomb of a chief cadi from Akhlat in western Turkey, we find the title, or attribute, "the helper of the poor." Another inscription from Akhlat of the 1310s describes the deceased as a young, chivalrous, virtuous martyr, who is also referred to as the father of the widows, while in a third inscription, the deceased person is depicted as the brother of widows, orphans, and the poor. The attributes: "helper," "protector," or "servant" of the poor, and "he who strengthens them," as well as "provider of widows," were all in use in the Turkish-, Persian-, and Arabic-speaking parts of the Islamic medieval world. They were

engraved on tombstones and occasionally inserted into foundation inscriptions of institutions set up by people of the civilian society.[61]

Personal charity was highly acclaimed in medieval Islam, and the deeds of charitable people were duly recorded, earning them social esteem and the gratitude of society. On a higher level, personal charity was equated with a life of piety and was considered the epitome of the human ideal.[62] In Islam, as in Judaism and Christianity, charity not only served as a channel of communication between the believer and God and manifested the piety of the believer and his or her quest for salvation, but also enhanced the position of the donor in his or her society. Charity was instrumental in providing social support for rulers and earned them the appreciation and legitimization they needed for their rule. In Islam charity served as a powerful tool for the integration of marginal groups into mainstream society, and the charity distributed by eunuchs, both the people at the courts and retired generals, epitomizes this mechanism of integration. The charity given by slave girls, be they concubines of rulers and mothers of their sons or those belonging to the households of other powerful people, reflects these efforts to be included in society. From the point of view of marginal groups vis-à-vis the larger society, the position of eunuchs and slave girls at the court was not that different. Eunuchs were excluded from society due to their inability to establish a family, the basic building block of medieval society, while slave girls were segregated from society by virtue of being owned by rulers or other high-ranking people at the court. Both eunuchs and slave girls overcame their disadvantages through charities, pious endowments, and monuments, which served them as a bridge into the awareness and hearts of freeborn people. Any act of charity must thus be seen from a dual perspective: that of the inner religious world of the donor and the social meaning and consequences his or her deed had.

Charity as a Political Tool: State Sponsorship and the Manipulation of Charity

Charity, being a voluntary almsgiving, was inherently open to manipulations that served political ends. A blatant utilization of charity to advance political claims is made by Balawi in his biography of Ahmad ibn Tulun. Balawi reports on the dreams of two people about Ahmad ibn Tulun in paradise. The first dream is told on the authority of a certain righteous person, who lived according to a punishing ascetic regime. To him Ahmad ibn Tulun explained that he had been granted paradise due to his commitment to the Holy War, his care for the people of the Muslim-Byzantine frontier, and his charity. The second narrator was a person of similar background, a God-fearing ascetic who had devoted his life to worship. To him Ahmad ibn Tulun told that what had saved him from Hell was the well he had built.[63] Balawi's biography is an important

tenth-century text that reflects contemporary political thinking. Ahmad ibn Tulun's rule in Egypt was legitimized by the Abbasids, with whom he maintained complex relations marked by many ups and downs. His regime was based on a mixture of high-handedness, outright violence, and benevolence. What Balawi says is that Ahmad ibn Tulun earned legitimacy for himself, even in the eyes of the most pious, because of his deeds. It seems that Balawi leads his readers to the conclusion that legitimacy cannot be bestowed only by an external power but must be something pertinent both to the individual who seeks it and to his deeds. Thus the deeds of the ruler who seeks legitimacy must accord with the values of the society; and those who grant it, claims Balawi, are the pious or, by extension, the religious class—the possessors of knowledge and religion.

Other uses of charity for political ends were simpler ad hoc measures taken in certain politically charged situations. In 969, for example, immediately after the Fatimid conquest of Egypt, general Jawhar announced that charity would be distributed in Fustat, and people were urged to go to the house of a local Fatimid supporter, sharif Abu Jaʿfar. The person in charge of the distribution was the cadi of Jawhar's army, and the place chosen for it was the Ancient Mosque in the heart of Fustat.[64] Every aspect of this event was political: the cadi represented the new regime, the role of a local supporter was emphasized, and the most venerated mosque in Egypt was temporarily appropriated for this purpose. Above all, the motives behind this distribution were political: to win the good will of the public for the new regime, which was making an effort to appear to be benevolent. The political use of charity continued for the whole span of the Fatimid period, and one of the most sensitive and crucial events in the political life of the Fatimid dynasty was the designation of the heir-apparent, which was followed by a public announcement. Such events were carefully staged, the aim being to provide a wide public exposure for the chosen prince and to mobilize the people's support for the reigning ruler and his successor. In 421/1030–31, al-Zahir designated his eight-year-old son as the future ruler, the imam. The celebrations took place at the court, and the high point was the swearing of an oath of allegiance by the people of the ruling circles to the heir-apparent and the bestowal of robes of honor. Vast amounts of food and large sums of money were laid out on this occasion. Three years later, when the heir-apparent made his first public appearance riding from Cairo to Fustat, money was also liberally spent, but the internal breakdown of the sums is revealing: 5,000 *dinars* were divided among the common people and 20,000 among the elite, making it clear that the regime aimed, first of all, to secure the goodwill of the elite. Significantly, the word *charity* is not used, and rightly so. This was not charity in the strict sense of the word but a political payoff. The use of money, under the pretext of charity, for political leverage was widespread—certainly not unique to the Fatimids. The coronation of a new Abbasid caliph,

in 566/1170–71 in Baghdad, reveals conduct and political considerations that were identical to those of the Fatimid rulers in similar circumstances. In this case the magnanimity of the caliph toward his subjects was in general manifested by the cancellation of illegal taxation and the return of money and property seized unlawfully. However, specific groups were particularly targeted by direct distribution of money. These were the people of the religious class, high-ranking dignitaries at the court and the military, all of whose support was critical for the smooth transition of rule.[65] The most patent example of the use of charity as a political statement concerns the Ismaili-Sunni rivalry. In 417/1026–27, the Abbasid caliph received a robe of honor from the Ghaznavid sultan, which had originally been presented to him by the Fatimid imam and which the Ghaznavid sultan, a zealous adherent of Sunni Islam, had contemptuously sent to the Abbasid caliph, who burnt it. The gold that had been woven into the fabric of the robe was melted down and handed out as charity among the poor of Banu Hashim (members of the clan of the Prophet to which both the Shias and the Abbasids belonged).[66]

The distributions of charity during royal tours or visits was a common occurrence, and in 644/1246–47, when sultan Salih Ayyub entered Damascus, he treated the population well, distributing 20,000 *dirhams* as charity among the people of law colleges, the mystics at their lodges, and *arbab al-buyut*. Money was also distributed in other Syrian towns and in Jerusalem where, to emphasize its higher status, the payments were made in *dinars*.[67] In 672/1273–74, the vizier of sultan Baybars came to Damascus for state business, and on his way he stopped in Gaza and Ramla, distributing charities to the poor and clothes to pilgrims returning from Arabia. During his sojourn in Damascus he busied himself with state affairs, but did not miss the opportunity to display magnanimity toward state officials and the poor by sponsoring the redemption of Muslim prisoners of war from the Franks and supplying a hospital with provisions. What the vizier did, the sultan did on a grand scale, and during his visit to Hebron and Jerusalem, Baybars distributed charities and manifested his political authority by examining petitions and complaints. The beneficiaries of his charities were people of the religious class in Hebron, leaders of prayer and Koran reciters, as well as simple folk—but he also forbade Jews and Christians to visit the Tomb of the Patriarchs.[68]

It is difficult to speak about patterns in the use of *sadaqa* for political ends, but such occurrences were common and took many forms. There were many ways and means for enlisting support for rulers and regimes. For example, in 403/1012–13, al-Hakim handed out money to the poor when the price of bread in Fustat-Cairo soared. Although fluctuations in the price of bread were frequent, this always brought great misery to the poor and had a potential for violence as well. In 1130, when al-Hafiz rose to the throne in Cairo, the reins of power were actually in the hands of the vizier, Kutayfat, who in order to

combat the high price of grain and bread distributed vast quantities of grain from the state granaries. In addition he returned money confiscated from people by the Christian monk who had been active under al-Amir, refuting al-Amir's claim that the victims had been unknown to him. His efforts to win popularity and support for himself proved successful. The same mixture of benevolence and political considerations was behind al-Zahir's contribution to the repair of a water conduit in Kufa, a town holy for the Shias. In this the Fatimid ruler of Egypt, eager to win wider Shiite recognition, undertook to do what the local authorities had failed to do.[69]

During certain events, like major religious festivals, charity was distributed by the Fatimids and other regimes as well. The Fatimid budget of 1123–24, for instance, provided for financing stipends and charities on the occasion of festivals and such distributions, which consisted of money and food, took place during religious festivals created by the Fatimids, and had distinctive Shiite-Ismaili character. These festivals, the Prophet's Birthday and the birthdays of the Fatimid ruling imam, and Ghadir Khumm were occasions when money and food were distributed among high-ranking religious dignitaries of the state as well as the poor in the mosques of Cairo and Fustat and the mausolea. The sums were rather modest, and the money was taken from *mal al-najwa*, the tax paid by the Ismailis. Other festivals were common to Sunnis and Shias alike, such as the Festival of Sacrifice, which in Islam is considered to be the Great Festival and where the offering of sacrifices is part of the concluding rituals of the Pilgrimage. On this occasion the Fatimid rulers used to perform the sacrifices themselves and distribute the meat among the elite and the poor. In 1122, for instance, over 2,000 animals were sacrificed, including three she-camels designated for the poor and one she-camel for the poor living in the Qarafa cemetery.[70] The sacrificial meat served as a vehicle for transmitting the holiness of the Fatimid imam, his *baraka*, to the people, and the recipients considered it to be a blessing. Thus the distribution of the sacrifices primarily served as a tool for reinforcing the bonds of loyalty between the ruler and the ruling circles. Not surprisingly, the poor were considered to be the less important and received only a small fraction of the total sacrifices. The consumption of food distributed by the regime was also a central feature at the celebrations of other festivals, and the same pattern wherein food served religious and political ends and the poor received very little of it is repeatedly revealed. Al-ʿAziz is credited with the introduction of food distributions on Ramadan when, during the evenings of Ramadan, he used to give dinner to "the people of the Ancient Mosque" at the headquarters of the Fustat police. The people invited were apparently holders of religious posts at the mosque, such as leaders of prayers, preachers, and Koran reciters, and the fact that the dinner was not given at the mosque itself might indicate that it was not an open event. Nonetheless, the Fatimid regime made considerable efforts to display magnanimity toward the

wider public on the occasion of Ramadan and other religious festivals, and in the early 1120s rents paid by the occupants of state properties in the capital were reduced on the occasion of Ramadan. In another case alms were distributed to poor children and orphans in the month of Dhu 'l-Hijja to mark the pilgrimage, and food distributions also took place during the festivals of Rajab and Shaʿban, which were celebrated by all Muslims. The Buyid vizier, Fakhr al-Mulk (executed in 407/1016–17) used to send charities, clothing, and food to shrines in Baghdad to be distributed among the poor and people of the religious class. On the Festival of the Breaking of Ramadan, the prisoners in the jail of the cadi, who were probably debtors, and those in the jail of the chief of police, who were probably criminals, were set free for the duration of the festival. One must bear in mind that criminal justice in medieval Islam was in the hands of the chief of the police. The Abbasid caliph al-Nasir exceeded al-ʿAziz in his distributions of food, and in 604/1207–8 he opened twenty houses in Baghdad where food was served during Ramadan. He also cared for pilgrims who arrived in Baghdad on their way to Arabia, building them a lodge and giving them money and clothing upon their return from the pilgrimage. Similar patterns of conduct were also common in the Iranian world, and in 421/1030–31 the Ghaznavid sultan Masʿud (1030–40) distributed a million *dirhams* to poor scholars and the poor in general on the occasion of Ramadan in his capital city, Ghazna.[71]

On Ghadir Khumm, a Shiite-Ismaili festival celebrating the designation of ʿAli as Muhammad's heir, the poor from the provinces used to come to Cairo to ask for charity and support for the remarrying of widows. The festival celebrating the Prophet's Birthday was Fatimid invention, which eventually was extended to celebrate the birthdays of the Fatimid rulers themselves. It spread beyond Fatimid domains, to be adopted by the Sunnis, and its Fatimid origin was conveniently obliterated. The festival marking the birthday of the reigning monarch remained uniquely Fatimid, having no parallel in the Sunni world; however, in Fatimid Egypt as well as in Sunni states it became customary to celebrate other events connected with the life of the ruling dynasty. These festivities were politically motivated, and the most noticeable examples were the celebrations of the circumcision of the sons of the ruler in power, which expressed the dynastic aspirations of the rulers and were used to rally support behind the ruling family. The Fatimids turned these festivals into great public events by sponsoring and financing the circumcisions of the sons of members of both the ruling circles and common folk. In the Abbasid caliphate, the birth of the son of the caliph became a festival day marked by the distribution of charity, and the circumcisions of the sons of the vizier served as opportunities to lavish gifts upon the dignitaries of the state. One of the most interesting events took place in 586/1190–91 in Baghdad, when, in a massive event, the circumcisions of boys of families claiming descent from the Prophet were cel-

ebrated. Great quantities of meat and bread were prepared, but who financed these festivities remains unclear, even though the scope of the event suggests state involvement and financing. In 1174, shortly before his death, Nur al-Din circumcised his son together with many orphaned boys to whom he gave clothing and charities. How these festivities were financed also remains unknown. In 1264, however, when Baybars celebrated the circumcision of his son, he paid the expenses. It was a great event in which the sons of emirs and orphaned and poor boys were also circumcised.[72]

The Mamluk sultans of Egypt continued practicing customs that evolved during the Fatimid and Abbasid periods. Baybars, for instance, marked Ramadan with a display of personal piety by setting free his military slaves and magnanimously distributing food and clothes in public to 5,000 *fuqara'* each night during this holy month.[73] Other Mamluk sultans also dispensed charity during Rajab and Shaʿban; for example, sultan Barquq freed debtors from jails after paying their debts during Shaʿban 785/October–November 1383. The historian Maqrizi is very approving of Barquq's Ramadan charities, saying that, as emir and later as sultan, he used to provide meat and bread to both the poor and people associated with institutions such as mosques, shrines, lodges for the mystics, and prisoners in jails. His Ramadan charities also included the *fuqara'* in the cemeteries and the righteous, who received the Ramadan charity in addition to the supply of bread they received on an annual basis. Barquq's Ramadan charities involved the slaughter of twenty-five cattle each day during the Ramadan and the distribution of the sacrificial meat.

Any attempt to assess the impact of Barquq's Ramadan charity is very difficult. Many law colleges and lodges for the mystics who enjoyed large endowments did provide food to the people affiliated with them, and increased the amount and diversity during Ramadan as stipulated in the endowment deeds of these institutions. If Barquq's distributions went to these institutions, then the people in real need would not have benefited, so it might well be that Barquq sent food to the more modest institutions where the demand for food was greater. If this was the case, his distributions would have been most beneficial. In the Mamluk sultanate, as in previous regimes, the distribution of food also served political aims, by fostering bounds of loyalty between the ruler and the ruling circles. This aspect is nicely illustrated by the distribution of food during the Festival of the Sacrifice, whose main festivities took place in the citadel of Cairo and were attended by emirs and state dignitaries. Other food rations were given to law colleges, lodges for the mystics, and the righteous, all of which demonstrated the sultan's patronage of the men of religion, but the urban poor are not mentioned at all as beneficiaries of such distributions.[74] The political nature of the Ramadan charities is reflected in the deeds of the governor Khayrbak, who, although a member of the former ruling elite of Mamluk Egypt himself, tried desperately to practice the newly introduced Ottoman

customs. In 1518, he abolished the long-established practice of distributing the sacrificial meat of the Festival of Sacrifice, claiming that he was following the practice of the Ottoman sultan Selim I (1512–20), the conqueror of Egypt, who refrained from distributing meat during his sojourn in the country. Selim I used charity for political purposes and distributed alms after Friday prayers at the Azhar mosque.[75] The political utility of associating state-sponsored charities with religious festivals prevailed, however, and Khayrbak quickly reverted to the old ways. A more significant threat to state-sponsored charities during the holy months were the financial difficulties faced by the regime. But at the end of Mamluk rule in Egypt and in face of mounting financial problems, the regime adamantly tried to maintain these customs. The emphasis shifted more toward setting debtors free after paying off their debts, and those released were deliberately selected, including women but not criminals and fellahin.[76] The distinction made between debtors and criminals was based on Koranic teaching, which sanctioned the use of *sadaqa* money for bailing out debtors, and this notion became a social norm. For example, the historian Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalani (1372–1449) was critical of the sultan Barsbay (1422–38) for releasing criminals from jail during Shaʿban 827/June–July 1424, wrongly thinking that his deed would bring him closer to God. In contrast to what Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalani considered to be improper conduct by the sultan, he approvingly recorded the deed of a person who, upon recovery from illness, set debtors free.[77] Sultanic charities dispensed in the holy months also went to other needy people, such as the poor, orphans, and those who lived in seclusion, but the choice of those deserving charity was in the hands of the sultans who occasionally dispensed charity to other groups as well. In Ramadan 913/January–February 1508, for example, each eunuch at the shrine of Sayyida Nafisa in Cairo received ten *dinars*, which was a high sum of money and vastly exceeded the usual alms distributed on such occasions. The charities handed out during Ramadan 915/December 1509–January 1510 were more normative and involved 70 North African male and female pilgrims in Cairo who each received one Ashrafi *dinar*.[78]

The provision of food had a long tradition in Islam, going back to the early *amsar*, the towns established in Iraq and Egypt in the wake of the Arab-Muslim conquest of the Middle East. Hospitality to tribesmen and strangers and the distribution of food were issues that lay at the heart of a political struggle between the traditional tribal leadership in these towns and the officials who represented caliphal authority.[79] In the Fatimid and Abbasid period this struggle was resolved and the independent power base of the tribal leadership was crushed by the authority of the emerging state. Food distributions, hospitality to pilgrims, and charities distributed during the months of Ramadan, Rajab, and Shaʿban continued to signify royal authority and power in medieval and Ottoman Islam.[80] The fact that the political dimension of the charities

bestowed during the holy months is being emphasized here should not ignore the beneficial aspects of such largesse, and although most of these charities went to people and groups who did not necessarily need them, some did benefit the needy. A debtor, bailed out of jail, certainly did not mind being used as a symbol of the ruler's political authority and magnanimity—and both aspects were manifested in this act. The cadi nominated by the ruler administered justice by sending the debtor to jail, and the ruler—who was analogous to the state—upheld the religious law, which was the cornerstone of the social system but was also inspired by Koranic teaching. Thus, by bailing out the debtor, he was displaying yet another aspect of political authority: clemency.

Charity and the Virtuous Ruler

The biographical note on Nur al-Din by the contemporary historian, Ibn ʿAsakir, is a very important text for the study of the legitimization of political power in the twelfth century. Ibn ʿAsakir strived to provide a portrait of the ideal ruler and his virtues (*manaqib*), whose legitimacy was derived from his commitment to the Holy War against the Crusaders and the values of Sunni Islam. Nur al-Din was also depicted as the supporter of the Abbasid caliph and as the just ruler. His charities are extensively dealt with and constitute a component in the overall effort to provide legitimization for his rule. Without going into financial details, Ibn ʿAsakir writes that Nur al-Din bestowed charities and presents on the poor, the orphans, and the virtuous, established endowed hospitals for the sick and the mentally ill, and supported those who taught Koran and writing. Nur al-Din's adherence to Sunni Islam is exemplified by his establishment of endowed law colleges in Aleppo. This statement demonstrates how both pious endowments and the institutions of learning financed through them were used as an instrument for the implementation of the state's religious policies in a town known as a bastion of Shiite Islam in Syria. Nur al-Din is also praised by his biographer for the way he treated his military slaves and cared for the families of those who died in the Holy War. These deeds, however, are referred to not as charity but as virtuous traits of Nur al-Din's personality and conduct. It seems that Ibn ʿAsakir created a literary model for the presentation of the virtuous ruler, and this was continued and perfected by other twelfth- and thirteenth-century historians.

An important contribution to the development of this model was made by Ibn al-Athir, the author of the renowned universal history *al-Kamil fi 'l-Ta'rikh* and the *History of the Atabegs of Mosul,* which includes a long and detailed eulogy of Nur al-Din. In his habitual clear style and simple language Ibn al-Athir begins his account of al-Malik al-ʿAdil Nur al-Din (the Just King, Light of Religion) with a personal note: "I have read the histories of the ancient pre-

Islamic and Islamic kings up until today. Not since the Rightly Guided Caliphs (who ruled in Medina, 632–60) and ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAziz (the Umayyad caliph, 717–20), have I seen a king whose biography is better than that of the Just King, Light of Religion." In this way, immediately at the beginning of his exposition, Ibn al-Athir puts his account into a wider political context and equates Nur al-Din with the rulers whom Sunni Islam had come to regard as models of Islamic government. This is followed by evidence to prove his case and an unabashed polemic against Saladin. From the point of view of the present inquiry, the most important section is that devoted to the actions taken by Nur al-Din to benefit the public (*maslaha,* pl. *masalih*). Under this heading Ibn al-Athir lists Nur al-Din's fortification works, the establishment of military outposts on the borders, and the building of caravansaries along the roads. He continues to enumerate Nur al-Din's monuments, and his establishment of many endowed institutions of learning and religion such as law colleges, lodges for mystics, mosques, the House of Prophetic Traditions in Damascus and Koranic schools for orphans. Ibn al-Athir singles out Nur al-Din's hospital in Damascus for special attention, since according to its pious endowment deed it was to be used for the treatment of all patients, poor or rich. None of these details is new, since all appeared in Ibn ʿAsakir's account, but what does appear to be new and significant is a shift in terminology. Ibn al-Athir denotes Nur al-Din's deeds as *masalih*: benefiting the public interest.[81] The Islamic medieval state did not see the care for the welfare of its subjects as its duty. This was left to the benevolence of the individual who might be the ruler himself, a member of the ruling circles, or even a wealthy civilian. Nonetheless some rulers, but by no means all, undertook actions for the benefit and welfare of their subjects, and these deeds signified their personal piety. Thus there was no fundamental difference between *sadaqa* and *maslaha*, especially when works for the benefit of the public were carried out through the pious endowment system. Ibn al-Athir's terminology, however, elevates Nur al-Din's deeds from the level of personal charity to that of policy and is both indicative and misleading. It indicates that Nur al-Din's charities were on such a vast scale that they can be regarded as the beginning of a kind of policy that manifested his piety and concern for the public interest and welfare as well. Ibn al-Athir's use of the term *maslaha*, however, is not limited to the description of Nur al-Din's deeds alone, since he also employs it in reference to the extensive rebuilding projects of ʿAdud al-Dawla. The construction of hospitals and *qanatir*, bridges or aqueducts, are described as laudable deeds that serve the public interest, and ʿAdud al-Dawla's extensive charities are also much praised.[82] The modern reader of Ibn al-Athir can reach the reasonable conclusion that there was no difference between ʿAdud al-Dawla and Nur al-Din, since both were charitable rulers much concerned with the welfare of the people. Although fully borne out by

textual evidence, this would be a distortion of Ibn al-Athir's intentions. From his point of view, there was a huge difference. Ibn al-Athir's view of Nur al-Din is permeated by his personal admiration for him, and the drawing of any comparison between Nur al-Din and others, from his point of view, would be unthinkable. In the medieval world, however, where religion dominated the outlook of people, there was no clear-cut distinction made between godly piety and social awareness, and Nur al-Din was no exception. More than anything else Ibn al-Athir's account reflects the complex entanglement of religion, politics, and social considerations in the deeds of the rulers.

Nur al-Din's personality also fascinated other twelfth- and thirteenth-century historians. For example, Abu Shama (1203–68), at the beginning of *The Book of the Two Gardens: A History of the Dynasties of Nur al-Din and Saladin*, presents a comprehensive picture of Nur al-Din's personality and policies. He is described here as a just ruler and supporter of men of religion and mystics, for whom he established many endowed institutions. He was also very determined in the implementation of Holy Law, instructing his chief cadi in Damascus "to conduct the affairs of the people according to the Sharʿiya." The main feature of this policy was the abolition of taxes not authorized by law, and Abu Shama quotes verbatim two letters from Nur al-Din (one from 569/1173–74) that deal with the abolition of taxes. In both cases Nur al-Din explains his deeds as a quest for approach to God. In one of these letters, in addition to expressions of piety, he also puts forward a practical argument: the regions had been destroyed by the Franks and the population impoverished. Other aspects of Nur al-Din's policies are also much emphasized by Abu Shama: his support and care for the Holy Cities of Arabia, and his charity. Nur al-Din's charity also fascinated Ibn Wasil (1208–98), another renowned historian of the thirteenth century. Every Friday, he writes, Nur al-Din dispensed 100 *dinars* and a further 3,000 *dinars* were distributed every month among the *fuqara'* in Damascus. This was an organized distribution taken from the poll tax paid by the non-Muslims, which was assisted by the city notables who supplied the names of needy people in their quarters.[83] The emphasis on the source of the money was not incidental. Ibn Wasil wished to deliver a message: this was lawfully gained money. In this way Nur al-Din's charity was not invalidated by using unlawfully gained money, and by extension he upheld Muslim law by taxing the non-Muslims and behaved religiously and ethically by distributing charity.

One of the most prominent features of Ibn ʿAsakir's portrait of Nur al-Din is the lack of distinction made between the public and personal aspects of his persona and conduct. This trait is also discernible in depictions made by the historians of other twelfth- and thirteenth-century rulers such as Saladin and Baybars. Baha' al-Din ibn Shaddad, for instance, in his biography of Saladin, dealt extensively with his hero's virtues, stressing Saladin's religious conduct,

his sense of justice, his personal valor, and his commitment to the Holy War. Saladin is depicted as being endowed with *hilm* and *muruwwa*, terms that have a long history and a wide and shifting range of meanings that refer to moderation and political wisdom. More personal and emotional, but essentially similar, is the depiction of Saladin by ʿImad al-Din al-Isfahani, another of his admirers. By the time ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad (1217–80) composed his account of the virtues of sultan Baybars, he had at his disposal literary models perfected by his immediate predecessors. He lists fourteen notable traits of Baybars that offer a mixed bag of policies, public aspects of Baybars's rule, and characteristics of his personality. Baybars's conquests, the territories over which he ruled, and his vast building projects are listed alongside his sense of justice, his love for jurists and mystics, and his military valor. Baybars is depicted as a pious ruler helped by God, and his religious conduct and charity are stressed. The charities that Baybars's biographer chose to single out were his care for the hospital in Medina and his distributions of food in the Holy Cities. In fact, Baybars also distributed food to the poor and those who lived in seclusion in Syria and Egypt, with some of these distributions being financed through a special pious endowment set for that purpose.[84] Other biographers of Baybars supply further details, or perhaps exaggerations, writing that the annual expenditure he made on *fuqara'* was as high as 100,000 *dinars* and 70,000 *dirhams* and that 20,000 *irdabb* of grain were allocated to them.[85]

It is quite clear that charity and the setting up of pious endowments became an essential element in the depiction of what was expected from any virtuous ruler and was a motif that went back at least to the early Abbasid period. It is reported that, in a conversation between Sawwar, the cadi of Basra, and the Abbasid caliph al-Mansur (754–75), the caliph described himself as "the husband of the widows, the father of the orphans, the brother of the old, and the uncle of the weak."[86] On the one hand, the message conveyed by the caliph was clear: he was aware of his duties toward the weak elements in society, and he would carry out his obligations toward them. On the other hand, the social awareness of the caliph was very narrow, limited to the context of relations within the family. Those to whom the caliph committed himself were not the poor and needy but usually those whom the extended family was expected to take care of. Given the medieval realities, the social thinking of the caliph was, not surprisingly, couched in patriarchal and patronizing terms. This attitude, with an occasional expansion of the social obligations of the ruler, is also reflected by the epigraphic evidence. Charitable deeds were singled out not only by the biographers and historians of mighty rulers; the rulers themselves assumed titles expressing their support and concern for certain weak segments of society. For example, in a foundation inscription from Siwas (592/1195–96), the ruler was referred to as "father of the orphans," and in a similar vein, the attribute "father of the orphans and the poor" appears on a funerary in-

scription of the son of the Ayyubid sultan al-Kamil of Egypt.[87] Sultan Barquq, whose charities and the motives behind them were discussed by his contemporary historians, described himself in the foundation inscription of his funerary complex as a ruler devoted to charity. A number of inscriptions were engraved on this complex, which included a lodge for the mystics, a law college, and Barquq's mausoleum. In these inscriptions the founding patron called himself the protector of religion, dispenser of charity, helper of every person wrongly treated, and provider for orphans and the poor.[88] The inclusion of the poor among those for whom the ruler cared indicates a wider social awareness and expansion of the obligations the ruler took upon himself. Nonetheless one must bear in mind the propagandistic intent of royal inscriptions and the fact that the gap between declarations and social realities was wide.

The juxtaposition of royal virtues and an inclination for charity also appears in Ibn Khallikan's depiction of Muzaffar al-Din Kökbüri, the ruler of Irbil. Ibn Khallikan (1211–82), a renowned biographer of Muslim rulers and luminaries, was a native of Irbil, and his biography of Muzaffar al-Din is based on firsthand information. In contrast to the mighty and renowned rulers such as Nur al-Din, Saladin, and Baybars, Muzaffar al-Din was a local ruler of a medium-sized town in the region of Mosul. He was married to the widowed sister of Saladin and took part in his wars against the Crusaders. Ibn Khallikan, however, chose to emphasize not his participation in the Holy War but the extent of his charity, which was outstanding. Ibn Khallikan singles out two aspects of his charity that fall under the requirement to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. Every day food was distributed and clothes were provided in summer and winter to the needy in several places in Irbil. No less impressive was the range of unique charitable institutions that Muzaffar al-Din set up in his town and that were not known in other places. These included houses for the chronically ill, the blind, young orphans, widows, and foundlings, as well as a lodge for visitors to Irbil.[89] He was renowned for his personal involvement in his charities, and like other rulers of his time, Muzaffar al-Din patronized both the jurists and the mystics, using the institution of pious endowment to set up law colleges and lodges for the mystics. His other policies also conformed to the accepted forms of political behavior in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Muzaffar al-Din cared for the pilgrims to Arabia and the Holy Cities by distributing charities and carrying out water-supply works in Arabia, and he devoted resources and efforts for the ransom of Muslim prisoners of war. Everything that Muzaffar al-Din did, he did on a grand scale, and Ibn Khallikan goes into great detail about how the festival of the Prophet's Birthday was celebrated in Irbil. It was a huge and carefully staged event in which the ruler himself participated with hundreds of mystics and other people who arrived in Irbil for the festivities. During the duration of the festival they received meals and money for their journey back. The historian Sibt ibn Jawzi (1185–1256) relates that

when he visited Irbil he was informed that each year Muzaffar al-Din used to spend 300,000 *dinars* on the Prophet's Birthday festival, 200,000 on the lodges for the mystics, 100,000 on the charitable institutions, and 100,000 on redemption of prisoners of war, while 30,000 *dinars* were distributed in the Holy Cities of Arabia.[90]

The depiction of Muzaffar al-Din, a charitable ruler of a provincial town, bears a great resemblance to the way the deeds of Badr ibn Hasanawayh (d. 1014), a ruler who controlled large territories of western Iran, were recorded by his historians. He was described as a ruler who inspired awe combined with political acumen, justice, and many charities. The Holy Cities of Arabia absorbed most the money spent on charities, but he also dispensed broadly targeted charities in Kufa and Baghdad. Among the beneficiaries were people of religion and the weak segments of the society such as orphans, widows, the poor, and people who lived in seclusion (*ahl al-buyut*). His charities were distributed on a weekly basis, and other sums were dedicated to the provision of shrouds for dead indigents. His building activities included mosques, wells, and cisterns as well as the creation of pious endowments for charitable purposes and the public interest (*maslaha*).[91]

Viziers were also judged by the standards applied to the rulers themselves. What is said about Jamal al-Din, the vizier of Mosul (d. 559/1163–64), illustrates the way that virtuous administrators were depicted by the historians of the age. Jamal al-Din devoted many resources to the welfare of the Holy Cities of Arabia, providing them with food and supplies and distributing charities on a grand scale. He built the walls of Medina and a mausoleum for himself in Mecca, and his charities in Mosul were no less extensive. It is said that each day he dispensed 100 *dinars* and, in times of food shortages, made every effort to alleviate the plight of the poor by committing his personal resources. Other beneficiaries of his charities were people of religion and the mystics. Usama ibn Munqidh, a twelfth-century ruler, warrior, and author of a famous autobiography, warned him against his extravagant charities, telling him that rulers do not like to see their riches being handed out, and, indeed, Jamal al-Din's fate was sad: he was imprisoned and executed.[92] Relations between rulers and administrators oscillated between submission, subordination, and interdependence. The career of Nizam al-Mulk epitomizes another facet of these relations. Nizam al-Mulk ruled de facto the state. He wielded great powers, amassed vast riches, and had his own army. Ibn al-ʿAdim (1192–1262), the famous historian of Aleppo, described him as a just administrator, scholar, and statesman. The main point of Ibn al-ʿAdim's account of Nizam al-Mulk is his charity, the massive support of the world of learning, and the establishment of many law colleges supported by pious endowments. He is portrayed as a sage of Prophetic traditions whose personal interest in learning and scholars led him to establish law colleges, while his benevolent attitude toward men of religion,

holders of religious posts, and the mystics is perceived as an extension of his association with them.[93] In Ibn al-ʿAdim's depiction of Nizam al-Mulk, as is the case with Ibn ʿAsakir's description of Nur al-Din, there is no distinction made between the public and personal aspects of Nizam al-Mulk's persona and conduct.

The legitimization of rule in medieval Islam is a complex issue. In Sunni Islam of the high and late Middle Ages the pertinent parameters involved adherents to Islam and its principles, Holy War, justice, and virtues, which in practical terms meant piety and charities. In Ismaili Islam, the Fatimid state of the tenth–twelfth centuries, the legitimization of rule rested on the claims of the Fatimid imams to divine grace and authority. However, as in Sunni Islam, the justice of the Fatimid imams was much emphasized, and in their public appearances, the Fatimid rulers dispensed charity and displayed magnanimity.[94]

3

Charity and Pious Endowments

Motives and Legal Aspects

In order to encompass the whole range of beneficiaries of *sadaqa*, we must widen the scope of the investigation to include the institution of *waqf*, pious endowment or foundation. Any type of *waqf*, charitable (*khayri*) or family (*ahli* or *dhurri*), is *sadaqa* par excellence, and the reason is both legal and intrinsic to both institutions. A property set aside as a pious endowment (which legally means inalienable in perpetuity) was dedicated to the cause of God (*fi sabil 'llah*) and became a property of God (*haqq Allah*). The fact that *waqf* was considered to be the embodiment of *sadaqa* is stated explicitly in the earliest known surviving *waqf* inscriptions and documents.[1] An endowment inscription from 301/913–14, from the town of Ramla in Palestine, equates the act of endowment with *sadaqa,* and in this case the endowed property consisted of an urban commercial property (a *funduq*, which functioned as a place of commerce and an inn). The patron who set up the *waqf*, called Fa'iq, was a white-skinned eunuch and freedman of the Abbasid caliph al-Mu'tamid (870–92). Although the purpose of the endowment remains unknown, the inscription offers a glimpse into the religious world of the founder that was based on reciprocal relations with God. In the inscription Fa'iq states that he has endowed the property as charity, seeking nearness to God and God's forgiveness.

An interesting example is provided by a Christian pious endowment from Fayyum in Egypt that was set up in 948 by a woman in support of a church at a monastery complex in the desert. As has been noted by Nabia Abbott, the endowment deed was formulated according to Islamic law. Although in this case the endowment emanated from a Christian community, charity and pious endowments were concepts shared by the three monotheistic religions, and here a Christian woman had found Islamic law to be a suitable legal framework for expressing her piety and religious faith. Even earlier is the draft of a pious endowment document of the *ahli* type (also from Fayyum) that was created within a local Muslim family of textile merchants, but its final benefi-

ciaries are not known. The equation of pious endowment and charity became standard and is widely attested to in other pious endowment deeds such as the pious endowment set up by al-Hakim in 1010 in support of mosques and a learning institution (*dar al-hikma*) in Cairo. Although very different from the other pious endowments mentioned so far in regard to the extent of the properties endowed and the status of the founder, al-Hakim's endowment deed refers to his foundation as charity. The same is true for the pious endowment created by the Fatimid vizier, Tala'iʿ ibn Ruzzik, in 1159 in support of the *ashraf* living in Fustat-Cairo and Arabia.[2]

Although the creation of a pious endowment was a charitable act of the highest degree, the range of beneficiaries was wide and included not only the poor and needy but also mosques, small communities of relatively well-off scholars affiliated with law colleges, and mystics living in their lodges. Those who benefited from the incomes generated by these pious endowments belonged to diverse groups and included professors of law (some of whom were very well paid), students, preachers, and leaders of prayers as well as the low-paid staff of mosques and law colleges. There were many complex reasons behind the establishment of congregational mosques, law colleges, and lodges for mystics, and they often reflected political aims, religious policies, piety, and the founders' desire for grandeur. One must remember, however, that these were religious institutions, not institutions designated for the relief of social misery—unlike the hospitals, lodges for aged women, widows, and the poor, and Koranic schools for orphans, which were social institutions whose specific goal was to serve the poor and the needy. The *waqf* institution could indeed serve a whole range of purposes, but whatever purposes were served by pious endowments, the deed was seen in religious terms as a quest of approach (*qurba*, nearness) to God. This was done by dedicating a property as *sadaqa* in search of a reward from God (*thawab*, a reward for a good deed, usually meaning in the afterlife), and this type of motivation became deeply embedded in the ethics of Islamic medieval charity. This was not just an abstract concept that appeared in legal documents. It was part and parcel of the lives of people who expressed their feelings, often making use of the terms *qurba* and *thawab*. The epigraphic evidence for this is overwhelming. It spans ethnic, religious, and language differences that characterized and distinguished Islamic medieval societies. The following examples are only a selection, and all illustrate the wide dissemination of this idea. Foundation inscriptions frequently state that this or that institution was set up as a request for *thawab*, or *qurba*. These two terms appear often and unaltered, even though the range of institutions established and explicitly identified as being motivated by the quest for *qurba* and *thawab* was wide and diversified. These included mosques and law colleges, but a waterwheel and an arsenal were also established in search of *thawab* and *qurba*. The concept of reward for a good deed is inscribed on the gates of Cairo

built by the Fatimid vizier Badr al-Jamali (1073–94). It is also expressed by Nur al-Din's inscription marking the abolition of custom duties levied on merchants traveling to Iraq, and many of Nur al-Din's foundation inscriptions engraved on fortifications and law colleges bear this formula as well. The complex built by the sultan Mansur Qalawun, which included his mausoleum, a law college, and a hospital, was erected in a quest for *qurba* to God.[3]

Another idea deeply embedded in the concept of *waqf* and *sadaqa* was that of a perpetual charity (*sadaqa jariya*) that would continue to benefit the donor even after his death. A widely circulated Prophetic saying expressed the notion that the death of a person would terminate his deeds unless these constituted a continuous charity, his learning would benefit others, and his righteous sons would offer prayers for him.[4] This became known as the saying of the three continuous deeds. In 885/1480–81, Qaytbay built an endowed commercial property (*wakala*) in Cairo for the public kitchen he set up in Medina. The inscriptions on the building stated its purpose and expounded on the ideological underpinnings of the whole enterprise. The aim was to establish a continuous charity, and the allusions made to the saying of the three deeds assumed that every educated person capable of reading the inscription would also understand the meaning. Thus the public kitchen and the vast properties endowed for its running were the mechanism set up to ensure that Qaytbay's deeds would continue to serve and speak for him after his death.[5]

Islamic tradition traces the origin of pious endowments to the Prophet and his companions. The properties of the Jews of Medina, who were killed and expelled by the Prophet, were dedicated by Muhammad in favor of the Muslim community. ʿUmar ibn al-Khattab, the second caliph of Islam (634–44), is quoted as saying that he had made a pious endowment of his share of the land in Khaybar, an oasis inhabited by Jews who surrendered to Muhammad in 628, and he had acted on the advice of the Prophet himself. ʿUmar is also credited with the decision to declare most of the agricultural land of Iraq a pious endowment for the benefit of the Muslims, thereby turning the peasants into serfs. He was also the one who finally rejected the claim of Fatima, Muhammad's daughter, against the estate of her father, thus upholding the rejection of his predecessor, Abu Bakr (632–34). This ruling of both caliphs against Fatima was based on a saying of ʿAisha, Muhammad's wife, who repeated what the Prophet had said to the effect that no one could inherit from him and that what he left would be *sadaqa* (charity, pious endowment) for the Muslim community. It should be pointed out that Islamic traditions ascribes a wide range of sayings and directives to ʿUmar that must be seen in the context of the various topoi that were common in early Muslim historiography.[6] The beneficiaries of the early pious endowments referred to in the sources were the wives of the Prophet, the poor, the orphans, and especially the warriors of the Holy War for whom many endowments were set up. These endowments were

inspired by the Koranic teachings about the necessity to show benevolence to the poor, the widows, the orphans, and the wayfarers. The believers were urged to give for the cause of God, and the Koran equates belief with good deeds.[7] Charity toward family was part of Islamic ethics, being rooted in the Koranic revelation, and it was also a widely spread concept shared by Judaism and Christianity and epitomized by the Hebrew saying "Charity begins at home." Pious endowments of the *ahli* type reflect this outlook, but in these endowments the charitable causes were only designated as the ultimate beneficiaries, whereas family members were the primary ones.

The founders of the legal schools such as Malik ibn Anas (d. 795) and Abu Hanifa (d. 767) discussed the laws of pious endowments, and Malik permitted the establishment of a temporary or reversible pious endowment, whereas Abu Hanifa strongly objected to this type of foundation. Abu Yusuf (d. 798) and Abu Bakr al-Khassaf (d. 798) shaped the Hanafi law on pious endowments. Abu Yusuf diverged on many occasions from the teachings of his mentor, and to what extent he was influenced by the Byzantine institution of pious endowments (*pie cause*) and its laws remains an intriguing question.[8] It should be pointed out that the notion and practice of pious endowment were also known in Sasanian Iran. The belief in an afterlife with a heaven and hell was part of Zoroaster's teaching, and rites for the departed became central to the religious life of the Zoroastrians as a form expressing their piety. Pious endowments, through bequests, as commemorative services for the dead soon became widespread, and other pious endowments were set up for the maintenance of the Sacred Fires. Pious endowments were also created for good and charitable causes to commemorate the souls of the founders, who sought gratitude and acknowledgment of their deeds from the beneficiaries of their endowments.[9]

If we leave aside the question of possible foreign influences on Islamic law, we find that al-Khassaf was the author of the most detailed Hanafi exposition on the laws of pious endowments. He discussed the validity of the endowment deed, the type of properties endowed, the choosing of the endowment's supervisor, and the management of the foundation, including the question of *istibdal* (under which conditions it was permissible to exchange the endowed properties for others).[10] The exchange of *waqf* properties must have been practiced widely, since many references to such cases appear in the literary sources. It was an important legal mechanism to ensure the economic viability of *waqf* properties by adjusting the composition and location of these properties to the changes in urban and rural economies. Like any other legal-economic device, however, it was open to misuse, and some cadis refused to approve requests for exchanges.[11] In Mamluk Egypt and Ottoman Damascus and Algiers, this was a topic high on the public agenda, and contemporary sources referred to it frequently. In 786/1384–85, Barquq carried out an exchange of *waqf* properties, and in 826/1422–23, sultan Barsbay (1422–38) took over, under the terms

of an *istibdal* transaction, the shops and commercial properties (*fanadiq*) that had been endowed for a law college. A year later, following another exchange transaction, he took over properties endowed for the ransom of prisoners of war and the Holy Cities of Arabia.[12] It is said that these properties lost their economic value, whereas the new properties given in exchange sustained the charitable causes stipulated in the original endowment deed better. In that year Barsbay seized yet another property in the same way. The actions of the sultan are open to two interpretations. It is quite possible that many pious endowments became depleted following the deterioration of their properties; the sultan gave these foundations new properties, taking their ruined ones in exchange. In contrast to the directors of the depleted endowments, the sultan had the economic means to revive the ruined properties, and thus both sides profited. On the other hand, *istibdal* may have been used here as a pretext to seize desirable properties while offering little, if anything, in exchange. Sylvie Denoix has shown that fourteenth-century cadis strongly objected to the demands of Mamluk sultans and emirs to acquire properties through *istibdal* for their own *waqf* foundations. During the fifteenth century they adopted more flexible practices, yielding to the pressure of the Mamluk ruling elite. However, because of the limited literature dealing with *istibdal* within the wider context of the pious endowment institution, hasty conclusions should be avoided. Miriam Hoexter, for example, has pointed out that *istibdal* made a positive contribution for the management of the Pious Endowment for the Holy Cities of Arabia in Ottoman Algiers.[13]

Given the sacrosanct essence of pious endowments, the cadis and jurists were faced with difficult religious, legal, and professional problems when asked to nullify pious endowments or authorize questionable *istibdal* transactions. When examined over a long period it can be said that the cadis almost always yielded to or supported the regime when the nullification of pious endowments was required for the needs of the Holy War or was presented as such. For example, Saladin's request to nullify the pious endowments of Badr al-Jamali was promptly fulfilled, and the same was true of his transfer of money from the Office of Zakat to the Office of the Navy to finance the war for Acre. In 789/1387–88, when the Mamluk regime was faced with the Mongol menace in Syria, the cadis sanctioned the transfer of *zakat* money for military purposes and authorized the seizure of one year's income of pious endowments from the legal beneficiaries.[14] In other cases cadis and jurists yielded to, or cooperated with, powerful Mamluk emirs and approved the nullification of pious endowments established by other emirs. One of the legal tools for the nullification of a pious endowment was to cast doubts on the origin of the endowed property. This was done by raising the question of whether the endowed property was really a fully private property (*mulk*), meaning legally bought, or whether it was a property of the state transferred in some doubtful

manner into the possession of the person who had set up the endowment. As has been shown by Maya Shatzmiller, doubts about the status of the endowed properties compromised the legality of many pious endowments set up by the fourteenth-century Marinid rulers of Morocco, and in some cases Marinid sultanic *waqfs* were declared null by the jurists.[15] Wiser rulers, including most mighty ones, made every effort to fulfill this legal requirement when setting up their pious endowments, and statements testifying to the fact that the endowed property was *mulk* are part of the legal formula and vocabulary of the endowment deed itself. Nonetheless, for a skillful jurist, the issue of *mulk* offered many possibilities to undermine the legal basis of a pious endowment.

In many other cases the cadis vigorously defended pious endowments against seizure. In these cases their own class interests were usually at stake, and attempts to exploit pious endowments that supported urban religious institutions with which jurists and people of religion were affiliated were met with strong opposition.[16] Such a conflict erupted in 780/1378–79, when Barquq, before becoming sultan, assembled cadis and the people of the religious establishment to complain about the extent of the pious endowment lands and to seek a way to nullify these endowments. He claimed that the lands endowed for mosques, law colleges, lodges for the mystics, the sons of sultans and emirs, and *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* (lands in the provinces endowed in support of mosques in the rural areas, lodges for mystics in the villages, and other charitable purposes) had reached such proportions that the army was adversely affected. A heated debate followed Barquq's speech, and although the people of the religious class were well aware of their dependence on their political masters, they were capable of holding their ground against their demands. Eventually some pious endowments were dissolved, and their lands were granted as fiefs to the soldiers. This was only one incident in the long conflict between the state's interests and the expansion of the pious endowment system. In 838/1434–35, the sultan appointed the Shafi'i chief cadi to inspect the pious endowments of law colleges and lodges for mystics, but it immediately became apparent that the cadi had no intention of pleasing the sultan. The whole attempt ultimately ended in a fiasco, to the great relief of the people who might have been affected by the outcome of the inspection.[17]

The Management of Pious Endowments

In early Islamic Egypt the cadi was responsible for the management of pious endowments, and the first cadi who gained control over the pious endowments was Tawba ibn Nimr in 118/736–37. He was motivated by the need to ensure the transfer "of these charities" to the poor and honest administration of the pious endowments, whose extent was considerable. How the cadi was able to

impose his will upon those in charge of these endowments is not reported, and whether he cooperated with other officials, such as the governor or the fiscal administrator, also remains unclear.[18] In any case he created a new administrative reality by placing the cadi in a position of supervision over a large number of pious endowments. The notion that various types of money, such as the incomes from pious endowments, the orphans fund, and the money and property of people absent from the country, were under the management of the cadi and constituted a separate category became firmly entrenched in the public mind. Cadis who were suspected of using these funds for other purposes came under severe public criticism.[19]

Some of the cases reported by Kindi (897–961), in his *History of the Egyptian Cadis*, provide us with information about the involvement of cadis in questions concerning pious endowments in eighth-century Muslim Egypt. The cadi's responsibility for managing pious endowments led him to deal with questions involving the maintenance of the properties dedicated as endowments.[20] Occasionally the cadi could play a role in interpreting the stipulations laid down by the founders of pious endowments, and this point is well illustrated by the following example. In Egypt the poor among the military (*ahl al-diwan*) and volunteer fighters, who cultivated lands on the outskirts of Fustat, were also entitled to receive incomes generated by pious endowments for which the cadi was responsible, but the payments to the volunteers ceased due to internal unrest during the late 810s and early 820s. When order was restored, the cadi reaffirmed that the volunteers were entitled to such payments, and this made the original stipulation a binding custom.[21] The powers of the cadi were extensive, and he could order the setting up of a new pious endowment for the benefit of the public. In one such case people from a certain neighborhood in Fustat came to the cadi complaining that a mosque that served them had crumbled. The cadi investigated their complaint and ordered the transfer of 1,000 *dinars* from the inheritance of a certain person for the rebuilding of the mosque. The cadi consequently drew up a legal document concerning the whole matter that contained the full ramification of the events leading to his decision. He also ordered that shops that were part of the mosque complex must be dedicated as a pious endowment for the mosque. This was done following verification that the shops were a free property, and the incomes generated by these shops went to pay the salary of the mosque's muezzin and to maintain the building, whereas any surplus income was to be divided as a charity. The cadi appointed a trustee for the pious endowment he created, and copies of this document were distributed among the witnesses of his court who testified to the validity of the whole procedure.[22]

This creation of a public pious endowment by a cadi was unusual, and in most cases the cadi's role was limited to supervising endowed properties to ensure their economic viability. The cadi had powers to punish a supervisor of

a pious endowment for neglect of his duties, and cases involving disputes relating to pious endowments were brought before him for judgment.[23] For instance, in 93/711–12, an unnamed non-Arab client of an Arab named Musalama ibn Mukhlid turned his house into a pious endowment in favor of the male descendants of his non-Arab clients for as long as their family lines continued. In the event that the line came to an end, the incomes would be divided between the poor and other non-Arab clients of Musalama who were registered as military personal and volunteers. In legal terms this was a family pious endowment that belonged to a common type of *waqf* set up for the benefit of clients and freedmen. The pious endowment established by the chief of the Abbasid postal service in Egypt of the late ninth or early tenth century also belonged to this category, and in it he endowed a tenement block in Fustat for his former slave, whom he had raised and educated.[24] The sacrosanct nature of pious endowments is revealed by two contrasting cases that took place in Egypt during the rule of Ahmad ibn Tulun. A tax-farmer who had an unsettled debt died, leaving young children and a house. The debt had come about as the result of a tax-farming contract that he had undertaken, and the chief tax collector requested the sale of the house to cover the debt. The matter was brought to the cadi, who dealt with it in a very orderly way, first by asking for proof that the debt really existed and then by demanding proof that the debt was indeed outstanding. Ahmad ibn Tulun himself swore that this was the case, and the cadi reluctantly ordered that the house be sold. Later a similar event involving another tax-farmer occurred in which his house had been turned into a pious endowment—apparently of the family type. The cadi reminded Ahmad ibn Tulun that he himself had created vast pious endowments, and this reminder was enough to forestall any attempt to nullify the pious endowment.[25]

Although the responsibility for pious endowments was with the cadi, this did not mean that he himself exercised it. Quite frequently he or the governor appointed other people to carry out this duty. The post of the cadi provided a salary that was often substantial, as did the post of the official who was responsible for pious endowments. For example, the cadi's deputy, who was also in charge of the pious endowments of the Tulunid hospital, received a salary of 30 *dinars* per month. Notwithstanding the difficulties of correlating prices and salaries in tenth-century Egypt, this salary certainly put the recipient into the upper middle class, if not higher on the social ladder. Another man in charge of pious endowments took a remuneration of 500 *dinars* for a transaction of 5,000 *dinars* involving pious endowments, but the cadi reduced it to the more standard pay of 30 *dinars*. For the cadis, the supervision of pious endowments was a lucrative source of income, but occasionally they were divested of this function.[26]

The way pious endowments were managed changed with the establishment of the Fatimid rule in Egypt in 969. For instance, none of the cadis of the

Nuʿman family, who monopolized the post of chief cadi in the Fatimid state of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, were given responsibility for pious endowments. In 363/973–74, the revenues of pious endowments were farmed out for 1.5 million *dirhams* per year, and this is the first known case of applying the tax-farming system to deal with this type of property. The tax-farmer became responsible for paying the claimants their dues, after which he transferred any surplus money to the treasury. Needless to say, he himself must have profited in some way from the whole transaction as well. Furthermore, the Fatimids claimed that they were the legal benefactors of certain pious endowments, and such revenues were thus diverted to them. It seems that many were adversely affected by the Fatimid policy, and in 365/975–76 the emir of Mecca intervened for the return of pious endowments to certain families in Egypt. His request was only partially granted, but it was reconsidered in 405/1014–15 when pious endowments that yielded 200 *dinars* per month were returned to their beneficiaries: the family of ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAs, the Muslim conqueror of Egypt. These pious endowments must have been of the family type, and the high income of 200 *dinars* indicates how valuable the properties must have been.[27] The first cadi in Fatimid Egypt to be entrusted with responsibility over certain types of pious endowments was Ibn Abi ʾl-ʿAwwam (appointed as chief cadi in 1015), and his supervision encompassed pious endowments of mosques, including congregational mosques, and other charitable payments. From documentary sources we learn that the ratification of pious endowment deeds was in the hands of the cadis, but this should not come as a surprise, since the questions of legal ratification and actual supervision were separate matters.[28]

At some time in the history of the Fatimid rule in Egypt, the Office of Pious Endowments was created. The way it functioned is described by Ibn al-Tuwayr (1130–1220), whose writings deal with the administrative practices of the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods, but they often blur the differences between the two regimes. He perceived service in this particular office as a religious function, and therefore the scribes employed there ought to be Muslims. The Office of Pious Endowments was responsible for the provision of water in cemeteries and shrines visited by the public and was also charged with paying those who sold a barley dish in the cemeteries. It seems that this was some kind of charitable food distribution, but exactly how it was carried out remains unclear.[29] Medieval administrative practices were notorious for overlapping, and during the Fatimid period it was the Office of Mosques and Congregational Mosques that was responsible for the pious endowments of mosques and the leasing of other governmental properties.[30] Prior to the establishment of this office, cadis were occasionally given responsibility for the pious endowments of the mosques and, it seems, had a role in the running of mosques and shrines throughout the Fatimid period.[31] It is possible that the responsibilities were

divided between the direct management of the *waqf* properties of the mosques, which were in the hands of the office dealing with this type of assets, and other aspects pertinent to the orderly functioning of the mosques. In Ayyubid Egypt an office known as the Office of Ribaʿ, a term indicating urban properties, especially tenement blocks, dealt with endowed properties dedicated for charitable purposes and registered properties confiscated from the former Fatimid regime, Ismailis, and Christians. The properties managed by this office included pious endowments set up for the maintenance of walls, lodges, hospitals, churches, and lands of monasteries. How the pious endowments of mosques were administrated in Ayyubid Egypt remains unclear.

We must bear in mind that there were several types of endowed properties that served a wide range of causes and were directed by different supervisors. Posts of supervision of pious endowments were lucrative, and many competed for them. While cadis played a role in the management of pious endowments, so did other people and government offices, and this multiple division of responsibilities is clearly attested to by the sources. For instance, in Baghdad of the early thirteenth century, the chief cadi was only responsible for the endowments of the Hanafi and Shafiʿi law colleges, while in Damascus the chief cadi supervised a wider range of pious endowments, including those of the mosques, law colleges, hospitals, and endowments for public causes (*masalih*).[32] In Damascus in the 1280s, a jurist who earned the confidence of Mansur Qalawun for a short time was entrusted with the supervision of the pious endowments of the Umayyad mosque, the hospitals, and lodges for the mystics, and he also held responsibility for orphans, the ransom of Muslim prisoners of war, and the maintenance of the city's walls—the last two functions usually being financed by special pious endowments.[33] The question of the honest management of pious endowments is frequently mentioned by the sources and overshadows the issue of who was actually in charge of such properties. Nur al-Din's chief cadi and administrator was quoted as saying that the first duty of a supervisor of pious endowments is to fulfill the stipulations of the founder, and if any surplus income was generated, it could be used for the maintenance of the city's walls and the protection of the border towns. The historian Ibn al-Furat (1334–1405) praised a Damascene scholar who died in 676/1277–78 for not drawing a salary, to which he was entitled, from the incomes of the pious endowment of the Dar al-Hadith where he taught and for using the money that was saved for the creation of new pious endowments for the institution. In other cases cadis and officials are praised for their honest and proper handling of pious endowments, meaning paying the beneficiaries and keeping the endowed properties economically viable.[34]

In his discussion of the Mamluk period, Maqrizi divides the *waqfs* into three categories. The first category is designated by the term *ahbas*. This was managed by the *dawadar* (one of the highest-ranking Mamluk emirs responsible for

the chancery and the royal post) and a high-ranking civilian supervisor, the *nazir*, who was recruited from among the civilian notables. They ran an office that dealt mostly with pious endowments created in the provinces for the support of institutions and groups in the rural world, the so-called *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya*, whose supervision was in the hands of the "rural jurists." Maqrizi cites the words of al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun, who, during deliberations about what should be done with these lands, coined the above expression, and his contempt toward them was undisguised.[35] This disparagement of the rural world and its inhabitants by the urban elite is one of the reasons for our lack of information about how these rural pious endowments evolved. By the time of the Mamluks, the extent of these lands was considerable and the regime coveted them. According to the cadastral survey of 697/1297–98, known as the *rawk al-Husami*, *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* supported a range of religious institutions and groups in the rural areas that included mosques, congregational mosques, and lodges for the mystics and preachers. Those lands were recorded during the survey by relying on documents of verification issued by the Office of Pious Endowments, but no attempt was made to seize *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya*.[36] In 740/1339–40, al-Nashw, the finance minister, suggested a whole range of economic policies to al-Nasir Muhammad that were aimed at maximizing the revenues drawn from rural areas and included the seizure of *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya*. The extent of these lands was considerable (130,000 *faddan*), and the sultan and his minister saw no reason to keep them intact. In their view the rural people were an ignorant lot who had no knowledge of law and religious learning, and many of the institutions supported by *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* were in ruins in any case. It is clear that they intended to seize endowed lands from depleted institutions, but how much land, if any, they actually expropriated remains unclear.[37] The Mamluk regime could not simply nullify *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya,* since this would have been an illegal act and, more significantly, might have led to grave consequences for certain segments of the rural society. With all the disregard that urban rulers had for their rural subjects, keeping agricultural production undisturbed was a primary goal of the regime, and the taxation of these lands was a better solution than their indiscriminate seizure. Such taxation benefited the regime by opening a new untapped source of revenue without totally alienating the rural religious class and society.[38]

The second category of pious endowments in Mamluk Egypt described by Maqrizi is referred to as *al-awqaf al-hukmiyya*. These were under the supervision of the chief Shafiʿi cadi and included properties in Fustat and Cairo. Maqrizi is rather vague about the type of endowed properties involved, and he only writes that these were tenement blocks. He is more forthcoming regarding the range of purposes served by these endowments, which included funds for Mecca and Medina, charitable causes, and the ransom of Muslim prisoners of

war. Perhaps it can be understood from Maqrizi's allusion to the motives behind the establishment of these endowments (nearness to God) that these were *khayri* pious endowments, dedicated exclusively to charities and public causes. These endowments were supervised by two offices, one responsible for the properties in Fustat and another for those in Cairo. Sometimes the supervision of both offices was in the hands of one of the deputies of the chief Shafiʿi cadi, and at other times each office had its own supervisor. Revenues derived from these endowments were sent to Arabia and also spent locally in Fustat-Cairo on students, *ahl al-satr*, and *fuqara'*. Maqrizi writes that, in his time, these endowments were largely depleted due to the unlawful practice of exchanging endowed properties. He indicates that at the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth these endowments deteriorated because of unlawful deals made between a cadi and a Mamluk emir with the complicity of the sultan Faraj (1390–99, 1405–12). Maqrizi makes the bitter observation that "people follow the conduct of their rulers," and he explains how these practices spread and how the process of the illegal nullification of pious endowments gathered momentum.[39]

The third category he discusses involves the *ahli* endowments. The supervision over these properties varied between specially appointed supervisors, the sons of the founders of these endowments, the cadis, and supervisors appointed by the sultans. Maqrizi makes what seems to be a significant observation when he writes that many pious endowments for religious and educational institutions were created as *waqf ahli*. The fact that these were not *khayri* endowments must lead one to the conclusion that in these cases, the endowed institutions a priori received a small, or even a minimal, share of the revenues generated by the endowed properties. Maqrizi also observes that in the Mamluk period there was a great expansion of this type of endowment and the regime coveted these properties. Maqrizi blames Barquq for the unlawful seizure of these endowments, but this practice continued under the subsequent sultans.[40] What clearly emerges from Maqrizi's account is how widespread tampering with pious endowments really was in the Mamluk period. His remarks are fully corroborated by other sources.

The endowed lands and properties, regardless of their subdivisions into types and patterns of management, constituted a constant source of temptation for the Mamluk sultans who coveted those pious endowment earlier established while constantly creating new ones. The question of how to utilize the existing pious endowments for the benefit of the regime in power arose most acutely in times of crisis and either reflected real pressing needs or served merely as a pretext for the realization of long-standing policies. In 894/1488–89, Qaytbay assembled the four chief cadis of the state and informed them that he was unable to pay the army. The meeting ended in an agreement that the cadis would impose a payment equal to the revenues of two months upon

owners of properties and beneficiaries of pious endowments, which would be transferred to the sultan. The same happened in 896/1490–91 when the army was mobilized against the Ottomans and the regime demanded the surrender of an entire year's income from many types of businesses in the capital and from beneficiaries of pious endowments. Eventually, according to a compromise worked out with the chief cadi, the demand was reduced to a payment equal to the revenues of five months, and this policy was implemented not only in the capital but in Damietta, Alexandria, and Damascus as well. As a result many institutions were affected, including the Mansuri hospital in Cairo, the congregational mosques, law colleges, and mausolea. Mystics were deprived of their salaries, and continuous charities came to halt. In 901/1495–96, in the face of a new round of hostilities with the Ottomans, the same edicts were reenacted and expanded to include foreign merchants and minorities. The military confrontation was eventually avoided, but the regime kept the collected money anyway. The historian Ibn Ayas (1448–1524) criticized Qaytbay for this course of action and compared him unfavorably with sultan Barsbay, who imposed forced payments on Mamluk auxiliary troops (*halqa*) at a time of military emergency but reimbursed them later.[41]

In the first decade of the sixteenth century, the attempts to nullify all kinds of pious endowments, including *al-rizaq jayshiyya* and *ahbasiyya,* intensified. In 906/1500–1501, rumors spread that the regime was intending to appropriate the pious endowments dedicated to mosques and law colleges and leave only the bare minimum necessary for the running of these institutions. According to these rumors, the lands and properties tied up in the endowments were supposed to be divided among the Mamluk troops as fiefs, but this threat did not materialize, and a year later a more familiar and less radical solution for the financial difficulties of the state was tried. Following a meeting of the sultan with the chief cadis, a decision was made to take a year's income from the beneficiaries of pious endowments and ten months' income from those who received rents from properties and businesses and to impose a levy of 30,000 *dinars* on the Christians and Jews. Muslims affected by this policy protested, and riots broke out, which eventually led the regime to demand only a payment of seven months' income from landlords. This policy was impractical, since neither the landlords nor those who paid the rents were capable of meeting the demands made by the regime because there were no cash surpluses in the urban economy. As a result, the regime reversed to the policy of nullifying *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* in 914/1508–9 and transferred fiefs from the sons of the Mamluks to Mamluk troops, which proved to be a more successful policy that created 400 new fiefs for distribution among Mamluk troops. Together with these attempts of the regime to enlarge the economic base for the upkeep of the army, the sultan was also involved in private attempts to seize pious endowments through *istibdal* deals to finance his ongoing building activities. Other emirs

were more brutal, however, and they took pious endowments from the beneficiaries by force.[42]

Jewish and Christian Pious Endowments

Islamic law permitted the existence of non-Muslim pious endowments administrated by Jews and Christians, which provided income and benefited Jewish and Christian communities as well as religious institutions such as synagogues, churches, and monasteries. The development and functioning of the Fustat Jewish community's pious endowment have been studied by Goitein and Moshe Gil, who show that, by the 1180s, this endowment included houses, shops, and commercial buildings. When the designations of the pious endowments created within the Jewish community in Fustat are examined, one can clearly see their social orientation. Few of the pious endowments were of the family type, whose first beneficiaries were the descendants of the founder. The Hebrew words for poor (*'aniyim*) and pious endowment (*qodesh*) were used synonymously, although the Arabic word designating the poor (*du'afa'*) was also much in use. Other ends served by the pious endowment included the support of community officials, scholars, teachers, the sick, the provision of shrouds for the dead, the ransom of prisoners of war, and the provision of aid for Jews from foreign countries. The community maintained a weekly distribution of bread, wheat, and clothing, and the needy were aided with the payment of their poll tax.[43] The Jewish community of Fustat was by no means unique, since other Jewish communities in the Islamic medieval world also had pious endowments that served similar ends. For example, the Jewish community of Qayrawan in Tunisia, which has been studied by Menahem Ben-Sasson, used its pious endowments to support learning and the poor.[44]

Mostly due to a lack of documentation, the Christian pious endowments have not been studied in the same detailed and comprehensive way that the Jewish endowments have. There is scattered information from Arabic sources, especially in conjunction with accounts of the maltreatment of Christians and the seizure of their churches and monasteries. For example, such data is recorded about al-Hakim's persecutions of the Christians and Jews in the Fatimid territories in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, but toward the end of his rule (1021) he revoked some of his policies and authorized the return of the pious endowments that had been seized earlier. The most remarkable case of such endowments was that of the Qusayr monastery, on the outskirts of Fustat, whose pious endowment was vast and included agricultural land, an orchard, a date palm grove, a forest, and urban properties such as houses, shops, a covered market, a bathhouse, and two production facilities (one for pottery and another for cheese). Some of the properties were in Fustat itself, but many

were scattered all over Egypt and must have been accumulated over a long period. Other churches and monasteries also had pious endowments, and some of these were granted by al-Hakim as military fiefs to his troops. Such was the case in Damietta, where a church was destroyed, its pious endowments were seized, and a mosque was built on the site.[45] When lands endowed for churches and monasteries were distributed to the military or when Christian and Jewish religious institutions were converted to mosques, it meant irrevocable losses for these minorities. But it should be noted that religious persecution was not the habitual policy of the Fatimid rulers, who were known for their tolerance toward Christians and Jews. In fact, some of the Fatimid rulers of Egypt actually granted agricultural land to monasteries, but these were subsequently confiscated by the Ayyubids.

In the 1170s, at the beginning of the Ayyubid rule in Egypt, Christians were persecuted and monasteries in Upper Egypt and Fayyum were seized. Some of these monasteries were rich in land, with production installations such as oil presses, mills, and ovens on their premises. In many cases these lands were divided as military fiefs among the army personnel, and when this happened, it represented a permanent loss for the Christian communities. In other cases, the Christians were later able to retrieve some of the destroyed churches and properties.[46] In other incidents, churches in Palestine that had rich endowments were destroyed by Saladin during his wars against the Crusaders, but this seems to be due to military considerations, not religious persecutions. From the point of view of the Christian communities, however, the outcome was identical regardless of the motivation.[47] One of the most interesting features of the Christian pious endowments in medieval Egypt was the existence of Christian rural *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya*. Like their Muslim counterparts, these probably were created to support rural churches, clerics, and perhaps charitable ends and served the needs of the Coptic rural communities. The extent of these lands was considerable, and in the cadastral survey of 1354, 25,000 *faddan* were registered, but the emirs whose fiefs included this type of land were allowed to seize it. Other Christian *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* were also confiscated and redesignated to provide income for Muslim jurists.[48] Nonetheless, the practice of creating pious endowments for religious and social aims and for the support of churches, monks, and feeding the poor continued in the Christian communities of the Middle East well into the modern period.[49]

4

Pious Endowments and the Urban Society

Diffusion and Uses of Pious Endowments

The greatest impact of the *waqf* institution was on the urban society. Any attempt to assess the impact of *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* on rural society is marked by many difficulties. The question of whether these pious endowments had a real impact on the availability of education and social services in the villages remains unanswered, but we are in a far better position to assess the impact of pious endowments on the urban society. Two aspects were involved: A great many urban commercial properties were endowed for various purposes, and these properties supported various facets of the urban infrastructure and a variety of urban institutions.

As earlier noted, one of the earliest uses made of pious endowments was for the support of the Holy War, and these endowments had an urban context. Tarsus, on the Muslim-Byzantine frontier, was one town that benefited from such endowments set up by private people and women of the ruling Abbasid family. Ibn al-ʿAdim writes, for example, that he saw the endowment document of a land property in Aleppo, which had been dedicated by one of his family members, for the purchase and maintenance of a mare in the house of Zuhayr ibn al-Harith in Tarsus, and this family's tradition is corroborated by historical sources.[1] In a tenth-century work by Abu ʿAmr ʿUthman al-Tarsusi that deals with Tarsus and the Muslim-Byzantine frontier, there is a reference to this very house, whose lower level included a stable, shops, and storage space, whereas its upper level had rooms probably for residential purposes. In the stable were seven horses, apparently including the one endowed by Ibn al-ʿAdim's family member, which were designated for the use of seven officers in Tarsus when they led their troops in the Holy War. The commercial properties on the lower level of this house were endowed for the maintenance of the stable and the other six horses. What private people did modestly, the women of the Abbasid royal family did on a grand scale. Two houses in Tarsus were pious endowments, one set up by a slave girl of the caliph Mutawakkil (847–61) and

one by the mother of the caliph Muqtadir (908–32). Each housed 150 military slaves and contained an armory and a team of armorers recruited from among the craftsmen of the Market of Arms in the town.[2] Tarsus and the Muslim-Byzantine frontier attracted volunteers from many parts of the Muslim world who came there to fight the Holy War, and these fighters were supported by pious endowments set up in their homelands. The pious endowment system, however, was not the only fiscal-administrative tool used to finance Tarsus, and selected groups, such as the descendants of the first generation of Muslims as well as *suyukh al-masjidiyya* (people, or staff, of the mosques), received allocations of grain from the tithes levied from agricultural lands in the region of Tarsus. Other groups entitled to receive this type of grain allocation included the Greek and Armenian guides employed by the military in Tarsus as well as prisoners of war held in the town. Al-Ma'mun ordered the creation of a register with the names of those entitled to receive grain benefits. In fact, it seems that the whole income of the tithe tax of the Tarsus region was dedicated for use in the town, but the government found it difficult to collect the full amount of the tithe.[3] These accounts seem to indicate that the pious endowment system often functioned better than financial allocations made by the central government, which designated specific sources of revenues to finance particular expenditures. This does not, however, mean that pious endowments were any less prone to corruption than financial arrangements set up by the authorities.

The use of pious endowments for the purpose of the Holy War continued through the ages, and one of the most telling examples illustrating the reliance on the pious endowment system rather than on direct governmental funding is from 884/1479–80, when Qaytbay built a large citadel to protect the seaside and the port in Alexandria. The building costs ran to 100,000 *dinars,* and a garrison and canons were installed at the citadel. These expenditures were covered in the budget, but maintenance and troops were financed through the pious endowments established for the citadel. The protection of Alexandria and its port were a vital state interest, and the sultan concluded that, in the long run, pious endowments would serve this purpose better than direct state financing. Pious endowments for the upkeep of walls are occasionally mentioned in the sources, and although not directly related to the Holy War, such pious endowments served to maintain an essential defensive urban infrastructure.[4]

Although pious endowments for the support of the Holy War were consistent with the spirit of Koran 9:60, the uses made of the pious endowment institution went far beyond just this end. Two accounts of travel from the eleventh and twelfth centuries provide a fascinating panoramic view of the lands of the Middle East, its people, the regimes, and the institutions. Pious

endowments and the institutions supported by these foundations figure prominently in both accounts. When Nasir Khusraw toured the Middle East in the mid-eleventh century, he noted that a hospital in Jerusalem was being maintained through a pious endowment and that a pious endowment supported the distribution of food to the pilgrims and visitors to a shrine of the Patriarchs in Hebron. He also noted that public water cisterns were built and maintained through a pious endowment in the Egyptian town of Tinnis, on a tiny island off the Mediterranean coast. In the early 1180s, Ibn Jubayr visited the Middle East and was particularly attentive to the treatment of North African pilgrims. In Alexandria and Cairo, for example, he notes that they were treated well and provided daily with portions of bread financed by pious endowments and incomes derived from the payment of *zakat*. In addition, a whole range of religious and learning institutions in both towns were either directly supported by the state or maintained from revenues of pious endowments, and the same applies to a diverse population of ascetics and destitute people. Hospitals also attracted Ibn Jubayr's attention, and he describes those of Fustat, Cairo, Damascus, and Baghdad and refers to others in Mosul and Homs. He was much impressed with Damascus, where North African pilgrims in the town were sustained through a rich pious endowment created for them by Nur al-Din. In Damascus, as in Fustat-Cairo, religious and learning institutions were supported by pious endowments, and pilgrims visiting local holy places and shrines were provided with sleeping facilities and food.[5] In fact, Ibn Jubayr's account reflects the cumulative effect of some of the policies of both Nur al-Din and Saladin and their use of pious endowments as a financial tool to implement them.

What Nasir Khusraw and Ibn Jubayr observed and recorded we also know from historical accounts that provide ample data on the extent and spread of pious endowments. For example, in 405/1014–15, al-Hakim created a pious endowment to serve various religious and social aims. The properties endowed were a mixture of urban commercial properties and rural estates, and the incomes were used to support Koran reciters and muezzins at the congregational mosques of Fustat-Cairo, the filling in of cisterns, the upkeep of a hospital, and the provision of shrouds for the dead.[6] This was one of the earliest pious endowments that combined urban and rural properties, and the aim was to ensure the longevity of the foundation by diversification and spread of the properties. It also provided a steady flow of revenues, since urban commercial properties generated income all year whereas rural lands only generated income after the harvest. We can get a good idea of the extent of pious endowments and the range of the institutions supported by them from the reign of Nur al-Din. It is said that properties worth 200,000 *dinars* were dedicated by him as pious endowments, and these yielded a yearly income in the range of 30,000 *dinars*. The beneficiaries of these revenues were law colleges, institu-

tions for the mystics, mosques, the walls of towns, bridges, and hospitals and hospices (*maqarr*) for the poor and foreigners. Money generated by these endowments was also spent on the teaching of orphans, ransom of prisoners of war, notables of the Shiite and Abbasid lines, and fighters of the Holy War.[7] The twelfth century was a period of intense fighting between the Muslims and the Crusaders, the ransom of prisoners of war became an acute problem, and special pious endowments were set up for this purpose in Cairo and Damascus.[8] The spread of pious endowments and the range of institutions and causes financed through them only increased in the late Middle Ages, and the geographical work of Ibn Fadl Allah al-ʿUmari (d. 1349) confirms what earlier travelers had noted and provides further information on the role of pious endowments in the social life of the fourteenth-century Muslim Middle East. His testimony, for instance, vividly illustrates the dependence of people of the religious class on incomes derived from pious endowments. ʿUmari notes that the cadis in the Mamluk sultanate received monthly salaries of 50 *dinars*, but supplemented their incomes from pious endowments. By this he probably meant their salaries from the teaching posts they held at endowed law colleges or their posts as supervisors of pious endowments. The dependence on pious endowments of people of the religious class who were not cadis was even greater. Some had teaching posts at endowed law colleges, while others served in various capacities at endowed mosques and other institutions. ʿUmari's description of Aleppo and Jerusalem supports what is also borne out by other sources, namely, that religious, educational, and charitable institutions were financed through pious endowments as were some other key aspects of the urban infrastructure, including water supply facilities. ʿUmari's geography also throws some light on the realities of the more neglected rural society. He writes that the state financed mosques and preachers in the villages as a matter of policy, apparently alluding to *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya*.[9]

In contrast to the rural areas, provincial towns, being the great urban centers, attracted patrons among the people of the ruling class, and the sponsorship of endowed educational and religious institutions in such towns is mentioned in the obituaries of emirs and ministers as one aspect of their pious works. For instance, the emir ʿIzz al-Din al-Afram (d. 695/1295–96) is described as being kind and a great patron of endowed institutions. His main building activities involved mosques in Cairo and Qus, in Upper Egypt, where he built a law college and a mosque that, during Ramadan, served as a gathering place for Persian mystics to whom he supplied meals, but he also built many minarets in the villages of Upper Egypt. In Isna, in Upper Egypt, a Shafiʿi jurist established an endowed law college for the education of jurists belonging to the Shafiʿi school of law, and Safad and Gaza attracted a great deal of attention from local governors during the Mamluk period. Tankiz built an endowed hospital in Safad, and educational-religious activities were supported by a local

jurist in a village of the Safad region.[10] Hospitals were a typical urban institution found both in the great capital cities and in provincial towns in the medieval Middle East but not in the rural areas, and this urban context of the Islamic medieval hospital was also typical of the Ottoman period. In institutional terms, the hospital in the medieval Middle East can be seen as a line of demarcation between the urban and rural worlds. If we turn our attention to the Iranian world of the twelfth–fourteenth centuries, we see that the pious endowment system fulfilled a role there similar to that in the Middle East. *Waqfs* were established for both religious and educational institutions and to build infrastructures related to travel and commerce. As a result, lodges along the roads and bridges were financed through *waqfs*, as were the teaching of orphans and the provision of clothing for poor widows.[11]

The best and the most comprehensive overview of the extent and spread of pious endowments is offered by documentary sources such as the sixteenth-century Ottoman land register of the provinces of Gaza, Jerusalem, Safad, Nablus, and ʿAjlun. This is a large document that mostly reflects the realities of Palestine in the late Mamluk period. The pious endowments in these provinces were of two familiar types, *waqf khayri* and *ahli,* and the wide range of the beneficiaries included the Holy Cities of Arabia, Jerusalem, and Hebron, law colleges and Koranic schools for children, the mystics and their institutions, hospitals, and the poor. For instance, the Nasiri hospital in Gaza enjoyed a rich pious endowment, and the existence of another hospital in Ramla is also alluded to.[12] Most of the pious endowments that were registered by the Ottomans in Palestine were of the family type and took the standard form of naming a religious or charitable institution or cause as the ultimate beneficiaries of the endowment. This designation would materialize upon the extinction of the family line for whose members that endowment had been established in the first place.

Examination of the ultimate beneficiaries reveals the values of the society and which institutions and causes were regarded as virtuous and worthy. Dedications for *haram al-Sharif* (the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock) and *haram al-Khalil* (the Tomb of the Patriarchs) as well as for the poor of Mecca and Medina were very common. To what extent the poor in the Holy Cities of Arabia eventually received any income from these family foundations is difficult to tell, but we should not jump to any hasty conclusion that such provisions only reflected the legal requirements of the *waqf* institution and outward piety. Attention should be paid to Hoexter's comments about the pious endowments for the poor of Mecca and Medina in Ottoman Algiers. In Algiers, as in Palestine, the poor of the Holy Cities were named as the ultimate beneficiaries of *waqfs* of the family type, and Hoexter has observed that "contrary to what one might have thought, many of these assets did eventually find their way to their ultimate beneficiary."[13] Given the short life expectancy and the vicissi-

tudes of life that threatened the longevity of family lines in the medieval and premodern world, the naming of an ultimate beneficiary of a family pious endowment, in many cases, became a social reality. What the realities in Palestine were is a matter of conjecture only, but judging from the Ottoman register, it seems that in some cases there were good chances that the ultimate beneficiaries would receive some income from pious endowments of the family type. As an example we can take the pious endowment set up in 916/1510–11 in Jerusalem by Burhan al-Din for himself. There were many ultimate beneficiaries of this particular *waqf*, including reciters of Koran and Prophetic traditions in various places and widows living in seclusion at a lodge in Jerusalem, for whom a supply of wheat was stipulated. It seems that the same Burhan al-Din also established a family type pious endowment in Safad, whose ultimate designation was for the public kitchen (*dashisha*) in Damascus that supplied food for prison inmates.[14] Although it is clear that charitable deeds, especially the provision of food for the less fortunate, were highly valued by Burhan al-Din, the pious endowments that he set up aimed to provide him with economic security during his own lifetime. There was at least some chance, however, that upon his death the ultimate charitable goals named by him would be served by his endowment.

The desire to ensure the well-being of one's family while manifesting piety by supporting virtuous causes was widespread in the Muslim society and could be accommodated under different arrangements within the legal parameters of the *waqf* institution. The following case illustrates a typical approach to this problem. In 1430, an Ottoman scholar, Muhammad al-Fanari, who traveled extensively in Egypt and the Middle East, established two pious endowments: one in support of a law college in Jerusalem and another for several institutions in Bursa. As the supervisor of these endowments he took salary for himself and stipulated that his sons would inherit this post.[15] Thus a certain level of economic stability was secured for the family while serving pious causes as well. In this case, as in many other cases of *ahli* pious endowments, the chances that the pious causes named as the ultimate beneficiaries of such endowments would receive any incomes were rather remote. We must take into account that the same factors that threatened the longevity of family lines also worked against the longevity of pious endowments. Chances were slim that a small or modest *ahli waqf* would survive the extinction of a family-line intact and subsequently fulfill the charitable stipulations. This observation does not contradict Hoexter's findings. Large *ahli waqfs* and the great proliferation of family pious endowments for specific causes could eventually serve their ultimate beneficiaries. But one should not conclude that this happened with every, or even many, *ahli waqfs* whose foremost aim was to secure family well-being. One should always remember that this goal was squarely within the framework of the concept of *sadaqa*. Notwithstanding the problem to what extent *ahli waqfs*

eventually did serve charitable causes, it is impossible to overestimate the impact of pious endowments on Muslim towns, including aspects pertaining to their Islamic and physical makeup. For instance, both mosques and water installations were maintained to a large degree through *waqfs*.

The City, Mosques, and Water

Muslim jurists who discussed the legal criteria for defining a city regarded the existence of a congregational mosque as an essential element in any definition of this type. Mosques were ubiquitous in Muslim medieval towns, and Ibn ʿAsakir, in his topographical description of Damascus and its immediate environs, writes that 242 mosques were located in the city proper and another 187 were outside the city's wall. Eighty-eight of the 242 mosques in Damascus were supported by pious endowments, which financed the salaries of the imams and muezzins employed in them. The staffs of twenty-five mosques were not supported by any pious endowments, and we must assume that their salaries were paid in some other way. Only five mosques mentioned by Ibn ʿAsakir had neither staff nor pious endowments. Outside the city's wall, however, the situation was much different: only ten mosques were endowed and had basic staff. Three mosques had basic staffs but no pious endowments, and six had neither pious endowments nor staffs. No information is available for other mosques.[16] The problem of mosques with neither pious endowments nor staff was not unique to Damascus and its environs and was even more widespread in Cairo, where in the early eleventh century 800 mosques had no source of income. Al-Hakim assigned 9,220 *dirhams* per month for the upkeep of such mosques. The same concern for mosques is revealed by the deeds of Nur al-Din and other rulers who provided a continuous stream of endowments for the maintenance and activity of mosques in Damascus.[17] It seems that no matter how many mosques existed, there were never enough of them. Mosques symbolized Islam and the presence of a Muslim population, but the Egyptian countryside during the high Middle Ages was far from being fully Islamized. During his short term of office, the vizier Maʾmun al-Bataʾihi (1122–25) established and renovated forty-one mosques in the provinces of Egypt, which demonstrated his desire to establish and spread Islam. But how this project was financed and maintained remains vague.[18]

Ibn ʿAsakir's list of the mosques of Damascus was reproduced with only a few additions by ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad (d. 1285), and comparison between the two reveals that only nine mosques on Ibn ʿAsakir's list lost their pious endowments, whereas two unendowed mosques became endowed.[19] On the other hand, there are many differences between Ibn ʿAsakir's list of mosques outside the walls of Damascus and that of ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad. Four

mosques that appear on both lists are listed as endowed, indicating that they kept their original pious endowments.[20] If we assume that the differences in these two lists are the result of updating, and not just errors in transmission, then the pious endowment system is shown to be an institution that has endured at least a century while serving its purpose.

Water has always been a precious resource in the Middle East, and the intense rain that falls in short spells during the winter season needs to be stored for the long and dry summer; as a result, water installations were a conspicuous feature of the urban landscape. A Prophetic tradition quoted by Ibn ʿAsakir says that "offering water is a charity that brings the greatest reward," and this saying nicely encapsulates the reciprocal concept lying behind the notion of medieval charity and the importance of water.

We know about the water supply system of Damascus and Mecca from literary sources and about that of Cairo from archeological excavations. Many water installations such as water canals, wells, and water wheels were built and maintained through pious endowments. In numerous endowed and unendowed mosques in Damascus itself and outside the city walls, there were various water installations that served the purpose of ritual ablution and drinking. Nonetheless, revenues from pious endowments were insufficient for the upkeep of the entire water supply system, and direct injections of funds were needed frequently. For instance, in 729–30/1328–29, 300,000 *dirham* were spent in Damascus on cleaning and rebuilding the water canals, but care for the supply of water and the use of pious endowments for this purpose were not unique to Damascus.[21] One of the oldest water supply projects established by, and then maintained by, a pious endowment was built in Fustat by the vizier Jaʿfar ibn Fadl midway through the tenth century. The entire project, which involved a well and seven cisterns, was endowed for public use and is known from an inscription cited in later literary sources.[22] The combination of governmental concern for the water supply and private charitable contributions for that purpose is exemplified by the case of Ramla where, in 789, Harun al-Rashid built a large water reservoir and, at the beginning of the tenth century, Abu Bakr al-Madhara'i built a modest but useful drinking installation. In tenth–eleventh century Mayyafariqin, the Hamdanid and Marwanid rulers built canals to supply the town with water from springs outside the city's walls, and in one case such works were undertaken by a rich merchant and, in another, by the official who was in charge of the pious endowments in the town. He used for that purpose the revenues that were under his control.[23] The water supply system of twelfth-century Basra was also maintained by pious endowments, which financed the operation of water wheels that fed the pipes through which water was distributed in the town.[24] Drinking fountains (*sabils*) became a common urban landmark in medieval and Ottoman towns, and most of these

facilities were built for the use of people, but some were also designed for the use of animals. The costs of building and maintaining drinking fountains were not prohibitive, and a modest pious endowment was usually enough for the constructing and running of these facilities. Many of these were also established in conjunction with the building of larger endowed or unendowed projects.[25]

The Holy Cities of Arabia

If pious endowments were important in the life of any Muslim medieval or Ottoman town, they were absolutely crucial for the Holy Cities of Islam, since they were the mainstay of their economic, religious, and social lives. Egyptian vizier Abu Bakr al-Madhara'i, the "provider" of Mecca and Medina, was not exceptional in his concern for the welfare of the Holy Cities of Arabia. Muslim medieval and Ottoman rulers and other people of the ruling circles saw the provision of both towns as their duty, and they invested efforts and resources into both the protection of the pilgrims and maintenance of facilities along the roads to Arabia. Since the economic base of Medina and especially Mecca was insufficient and fragile, the annual pilgrimage was vital for their economic well-being. The barren local environment could supply very little. Water was a serious problem, and the well water in Mecca was hardly drinkable. To solve this problem, large cisterns and reservoirs were built to catch the rainwater from the mountains around the town, which is situated in a deep valley. Nonetheless, the agriculture of the oasis was limited to the growing of date palms, which was the staple food, and much food had to be imported. Ibn Jubayr, who visited Arabia in the early 1180s, says that Yemen tribesmen were the food suppliers of Mecca. More enthusiastic was Nasir Khusraw, who stayed in Mecca and Medina in 1050–51 and wrote about the ample availability of fruits in Mecca during the winter months.[26] The supply of victuals, especially grain, is always emphasized in the accounts dealing with the charities showered on the Holy Cities of Arabia.

The Holy Cities benefited immensely from the pilgrimage made by rulers and other high-ranking people, and we can take the pilgrimage performed in 574/1178–79 by Qadi al-Fadil as an example. To make his pilgrimage, Qadi al-Fadil had to ask Saladin's permission, and it was given provided three conditions were fulfilled: that he would take the land route to Arabia, he would not sail from the Egyptian port town of ʿAdhyab across the Red Sea to Jidda, and he would not stay in Mecca as a devotee (*mujawir*). (Many devotees stayed in the Holy Cities on a temporary or permanent basis in quest of the holiness and blessing that emanated from these sacred places.) On the positive side, Saladin gave Qadi al-Fadil 3,000 *dinars*, taken from the revenues of the poll tax paid

by the non-Muslims, to be distributed in Saladin's name among the inhabitants and devotees in Mecca and Medina. Earlier, in 556/1160–61, the pilgrimage was made by three eminent emirs: Saladin's uncle, Asad al-Din Shirkuh, the future conqueror of Egypt, Küçük Zayn al-Din of Iraq, and Mulhim, brother of the Fatimid vizier, Dirgham. Shirkuh paid the expenses of the 1,000 pilgrims who went with him, and all three distributed extensive largesse in Mecca and Medina.[27] The emirs who commanded the annual pilgrim caravans that went to Arabia performed many charities in the Holy Cities. Although most of the data concerns the emirs of the Egyptian pilgrimages, the same applies to the commanders of the Syrian and Iraqi pilgrimages as well.[28]

The rationale behind the wish to be buried in a Holy City and distribution of charities in one of them is explained by Mujir al-Din (d.1521), the historian and topographer of Jerusalem. He writes that charities dispensed in Jerusalem can, for instance, save one from Hell and that bread distributed in Jerusalem is worth its weight in gold. What was true for Jerusalem applied, even more so, to Mecca and Medina and the sources from the high and late Middle Ages provide ample data concerning the charitable deeds performed by people of the administrative and military classes in Arabia. Tenth-century Egyptian vizier Jaʿfar ibn al-Furat was a generous supporter of Mecca and Medina and their rulers, in exchange for which he received permission to bury his mother in a house close to the Prophet's tomb. Upon his own death and in accordance with his last will, he himself was buried there.[29] One of the greatest patrons of Mecca and Medina in the twelfth century was the vizier Jamal al-Din of Mosul, whose building activities included a structure close to the Kaaba sanctuary and the embellishment of the Kaaba shrine itself with gold and silver decorations. In addition he built mosques at Mina and the ʿArafat Hill and water cisterns at ʿArafat, while his most ambitious project involved the construction of walls around Medina.

Even a patron of Jamal al-Din's rank and contribution needed the political consent of both the Abbasid caliph and the emir of Mecca for his building projects. Most sensitive were the works done at the Kaaba, for which the goodwill of both rulers had to be secured, usually after the payment of large sums of money and the presentation of handsome gifts. Jamal al-Din, like many others, wished to be buried in Medina, and to ensure this, he made an agreement with Shirkuh that each of them would take care of the burial of the other in Medina. In 559/1163–64, Shirkuh commissioned the services of a sheikh for Jamal al-Din's burial at a lodge for mystics he had earlier constructed very close to the tomb of the Prophet.[30] Charity donated for the inhabitants of Mecca and Medina and the distribution of wheat and foodstuffs were also typical of many Mamluk emirs, some of whom also sent vast sums of money there.[31] The wish to be buried in the Holy Cities of Arabia and Jerusa-

lem was persistent, and Saladin's father and uncle, for instance, were buried in their law college in Medina, which was situated close to the Prophet's tomb. Other rulers, however, who failed to secure such a highly desirable site for themselves were forced to locate their funerary monuments at the foot of the ʿArafat Hill.[32] The rulers of the Holy Cities granted permission for burial and building in both towns, but this depended on the status of the patron and his contribution to the welfare of the Holy Cities and their pockets. The issue of gaining permission to build in Mecca and Medina is, however, an elusive one, since it seems that, with the exception of Kaaba and its close vicinity, there were no serious restrictions placed on building, and special permission was not always necessary. For instance, the Ayyubid governor of Aden, ʿIzz al-Din ʿUthman ibn Zanjili, established a lodge and a law college in Mecca with no apparent difficulty. He used his wealth for charity and endowments and made generous dispensations in Mecca, Yaman, and Damascus, where he built another law college.[33]

Although the patronage extended by people of the ruling circles to the Holy Cities was of great importance, the Muslim rulers of the Middle Ages and the Ottoman period were the supreme benefactors of Mecca and Medina. Their patronage always had political implications, and what they could do in the Holy Cities was beyond the means of others. The Fatimid rulers of Egypt provided Mecca and Medina with grain and huge fabrics embroidered with gold and silver (*kiswa*) for the external coverage of the Kaaba sanctuary and for internal use. The names of the rulers were inscribed on the *kiswa,* which symbolized Fatimid political predominance in Arabia. The production of these fabrics was very expensive and involved the work of a great number of highly specialized craftsmen and the use of costly materials. The *kiswa* fabrics were political symbols of the highest public significance. A fine description of the Abbasid *kiswa* sent to Mecca in 622/1225 is preserved in the sources. It was a black fabric (black being the Abbasid emblem) with a white badge at the top carrying an inscription (*tiraz*) bearing the names of the reigning Abbasid caliph and his predecessor, who had died in the same year. The used *kiswa* fabrics acquired the status of holy relics and were in great demand. They were torn into pieces to be bestowed on distinguished people, although sometimes they were sent intact to distant Muslim rulers.[34]

The Abbasid support for Mecca and Medina, like that of the Fatimids in their time, was extensive and manifold and included money, materials, and craftsmen that were annually sent to Arabia, as well as charity and clothes that were widely distributed among the various groups that made up the population of both cities. This support was financed by the treasury and by members of the Abbasid family, including royal women. Women of the Seljukid sultanic family also assumed the role of patrons of Mecca and Medina.[35] The same is true for the Mamluk sultans and emirs, and between 663/1264 and 667/1268, works in

Mecca were organized and financed by sultan Baybars that involved sending materials and craftsmen from Egypt and a physician for the hospital in Medina.[36] Baybars himself performed the pilgrimage in 667/1268–69 and earned a name for himself because of his humble and pietistic conduct and distribution of charity.

In economic terms, the involvement of the Muslim rulers in Arabia was a burden that also necessitated considerable administrative resources. The rulers were willing to sustain these costs and invest the required efforts, since the protection of pilgrims and support of the Holy Cities became political symbols and an essential element in the overall legitimization of political power. Rulers such as Nur al-Din and Saladin, in addition to the money and charities they bestowed on the Holy Cities, used the system of granting incomes from land (*iqtaʿ*) to impose their political influence on the rulers of Arabia. Their main concern was to cause the emir of Mecca to cease collecting taxes from the pilgrims, for which he had to be compensated with other forms of income. So both rulers granted him the right to collect revenues from rural properties assigned to him in the territories under their rule.[37] The policies of both Nur al-Din and Saladin toward Mecca and Medina set the precedent for other rulers who used the pious endowment system to implement their own policies in the region. The creation of pious endowments for the Holy Cities demonstrated a deep commitment that went beyond grants of *iqtaʿ*, which were dependent on the goodwill of the ruler who had bestowed them and were thus revocable.

One of the most interesting attempts to influence the economic policies, or more precisely the taxation practices, of the emir of Mecca was undertaken by the Mamluk sultan al-Ashraf Shaʿban (1363–77), who in 777/1375–76 created a vast pious endowment that supported a range of activities and charities in the Holy Cities, especially learning and performance of religious rites (see chapter 5). The ruler of Mecca was allocated a yearly income of 160,000 *dirhams* in exchange for the cessation of custom duties levied on the pilgrims and in the city's market. The list of these levies is detailed and allows a glimpse into the economic life of the town. Duties were levied on basic foodstuffs such as hard grain, rice, lentils, barley, and chickpeas, which were sold either by measure or weight. In fact, all foodstuffs offered for sale such as fruit, vegetables, and meat were taxed, as were cooked dishes sold in the markets. In addition, al-Ashraf Shaʿban demanded a full tax exemption for all supplies that came to Mecca from the port of Jidda and Hijaz, stipulating that neither officials nor members of the court or the ruling family could be engaged in tax collection. Merchants arriving from Yemen and Iraq are explicitly named as those entitled to immunity from taxation. This should not be interpreted as permission to tax other traders. These were apparently the most important suppliers of Mecca. The emir was also required to relinquish the tithe levied on date palms grown in the territory under his rule.[38] The scope of taxation allowed by Islamic law is

narrow, and Mecca and Medina were in an especially disadvantaged position. Law permits—in fact, requires—the collection of a poll tax from Jews and Christians, but these were not permitted in Arabia, and the collection of certain types of land taxes allowed by law was impracticable in the barren Mecca. Most of the Muslims living in Medina and Mecca were poor and relied on outside support, making the collection of *zakat* highly unrealistic. What Ashraf Sha'ban tried to do was to transform the tax system in Mecca into a system that was in accordance with the law, compensating the emir for any losses he incurred in the process.

Ashraf Sha'ban's vast pious endowment resembles the first known extensive pious endowments set up in tenth-century Egypt for Mecca and Medina by Abu Bakr al-Madhara'i, who was the owner of immense rural properties. It is said with a certain amount of exaggeration that these properties brought him an annual income of 400,000 *dinars* and that he turned some of them into a pious endowment for the Holy Cities of Arabia, which yielded an annual income of 100,000 *dinars*—apparently also an exaggeration.[39] Abu Bakr Muhammad al-Madhara'i's endowment can be regarded as the forerunner of the *waqf al-Haramayn*, that is, pious endowments for Mecca and Medina. In the literary sources of the Mamluk period this term appears alongside references to other Egyptian pious endowments that financed special expenditures in the Holy Cities, among which we find endowments for the eunuch corps that served at the tomb of the Prophet in Medina. On the whole, the management of the *waqf al-Haramayn* was not without problems, however, and in 794/1391–92, for example, when the beneficiaries of these endowments in the Holy Cities did not receive the expected incomes, they pressed the Mamluk regime to alleviate their plight. As a result the accounts of the *waqf al-Haramayn* were examined for ten years back, but apparently no tangible results were achieved. Later on, in the 1410s, the chief cadi who supervised this *waqf* supported the beneficiaries by making substantial private donations, something that was not exceptional, since the incomes of the *waqf al-Haramayn* were always supplemented by private charities of the Mamluk emirs.[40] Like any other beneficiaries of charity, the poor of the Holy Cities were dependent on the ability and honesty of the supervisors of the *waqf al-Haramayn* and their managerial decisions. For example, the money sent by the supervisors of the *waqf al-Haramayn* from Ottoman Algiers was also distributed among the ruling class in Medina, including the emir.[41]

The impressive extent of the *waqf al-Haramayn* becomes evident from studying documentary sources, especially the Ottoman land register of the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Middle East. The pious endowments for Mecca and Medina in Gaza were vast and included villages, land tracts, or-

chards, and vineyards, while the Ottoman register of Egypt reveals the immense extent of the resources devoted to direct support of Mecca and Medina and the annual pilgrimage. Certain sources of income in Egypt were devoted to the financing of the pilgrimage, and these were supplemented by revenues derived from pious endowments that were dedicated to the use of the Commander of the Pilgrimage.[42] The Chief Black Eunuch of the Ottoman Empire was the supervisor of the complex network of imperial pious endowments for Mecca and Medina, many of which derived from properties located in Egypt. The direct support that came from Egypt to the Holy Cities was diversified and included a number of major expenditures. For example, the *ashraf* in Mecca and Medina were recipients of cash contributions and food allowances, and foodstuffs were dispatched to both cities on a regular basis—not only during the annual pilgrimage. The Ottomans continued the tradition of sending the *kiswa* and other exquisite fabrics to the Holy Cities, and the production costs of these expensive textiles were covered by pious endowments created in the Mamluk period and expanded by the Ottomans.[43] The most crucial issue, however, was the supply of grain to Mecca and Medina. The Ottomans inherited and maintained Mamluk pious endowments established for this purpose and created new ones, the most important being the Pious Endowment of the Great Dashisha, which combined Mamluk and Ottoman endowments. At the height of its operation, on the eve of the French expedition to Egypt in 1798, the endowment provided for the shipment of 33,330 *irdabbs* of grain and the transfer of almost 2 million *paras* in cash. The term *dashisha* had a double meaning and was used to denote a kind of porridge made of wheat and fat and, more importantly here, a public kitchen that dispensed this type of dish. A *dashisha* was established in Medina by Qaytbay, following his pilgrimage in 884/1479–80 to Arabia, who created an extensive pious endowment for its operation. The sultan, who handed out 10,000 *dinars* as charity in both towns, was struck by the poverty he witnessed in Medina, and the *dashisha*, modeled on the public kitchen in Hebron, was intended to alleviate the plight of the poor in the town.[44] Other vast pious endowments for similar purposes were created in Egypt during the Ottoman period. In 1678, for instance, the wife of the Ottoman sultan Mehmed IV (1648–87) created a pious endowment in Egypt that consisted of rural and urban properties for the support of a hospital and soup kitchen in Mecca.[45] Each of the special pious endowments created in Ottoman Egypt for the provision of Arabia maintained its own fleet of transport ships on the Red Sea, and these fleets, as well as the port facilities on the Red Sea, were paid for by the endowments, something that added a new dimension to the traditional uses made of the institution of pious endowment.[46]

Jerusalem and Hebron

Being the third most holy city in Islam, Jerusalem attracted its share of public attention and material support in medieval and Ottoman times. Although Jerusalem received significantly less than the Holy Cities of Arabia, the forms of support were identical. For example, Muslim rulers in distant regions set up endowed houses in Jerusalem for visitors and pilgrims from the territories under their rule.[47] Christian monarchs also did this and built lodges for Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem, which provided food and, occasionally, medical care in the town before and after the Crusades. Some of these were specifically designated for people arriving in Jerusalem from certain regions in Europe. The efforts to provide lodging and some basic services for the Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem, which continued throughout the Ayyubid-Mamluk period, were successful.[48]

Many Muslim rulers contributed toward the maintenance of the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock and financed waterworks in the town. Jerusalem, in contrast to the Holy Cities of Arabia, could feed itself and needed neither a massive supply of grain nor other foodstuffs. In 1047, when Nasir Khusraw visited Jerusalem, he was much impressed with the rainwater collection system in the town and the population of ascetics and devotees. The Fatimid rulers were not indifferent to Jerusalem and its holy places. They sent many gifts, including silver lamps and candles to the Dome of the Rock, but most important between 1030 and 1033, they rebuilt the city's wall following an earthquake and renovated the Aqsa Mosque and its mosaics. Other rulers undertook similar projects. For example, in 671/1272–73, the Dome of the Rock was repaired.[49] During his long years as governor of Syria, Tankiz undertook extensive waterworks in Jerusalem as well as the building of a bathhouse and religious and commercial complexes. The water supply system needed constant maintenance and expansion, and further works were carried out in 785/1383–84. The Mamluk sultan Khushqadam (1461–67) undertook waterworks that involved installing pipes and public drinking fountains.[50]

The Ayyubid and Mamluk rulers left a significant imprint on the physical and social landscape of Jerusalem. Saladin, for example, established many endowed religious-educational institutions in Jerusalem following the conquest of the town from the Crusaders and used the pious endowment system to establish a visual and social presence for Sunni Islam in the town. His efforts, in general, were geared toward the establishment of institutions and communities of scholars and mystics.[51] Some of the endowments created by Saladin and his brother al-ʿAdil were dedicated, however, to specific people who were assigned posts essential for the revival of Islamic life in the town. For example, the imam who was installed at the Dome of the Rock received endowments to provide for his housing and salary, and two members of the Kurdish Hakiri

family who settled in Jerusalem were beneficiaries of this kind of endowments. Following the conquest of the town, Saladin had the problem of providing for the many thousands of Muslim prisoners he had liberated in Jerusalem. They were supplied with the basic necessities and sent to their homelands. Additional endowments were made for Jerusalem following the truce that ended the Third Crusade. Saladin wished to fortify the town and to strengthen the institutions he had established earlier.[52]

Ayyubid policy toward Jerusalem was complex, oscillating between care for the city and its Islamic character and indifference and a readiness to use it as a political coin in the continuous struggle against the Crusaders. Ayyubid emirs, less concerned with the intricacies of high politics, built many monuments in Jerusalem. The Kurdish emir Muhammad al-Hakiri, who died in 615/1218–19 fighting the Crusaders, for example, established a law college, a lodge for mystics (where he himself was buried), and a mosque in the vicinity of Hebron. He was also known for his many charities.[53] Although Jerusalem had less need of support than Mecca and Medina, the pious endowment for it and Hebron (referred to as the two pious endowments, *waqf/awqaf al-Haramayn al-Sharifayn*) played an important role in the economy of the city. The endowment deteriorated, due to poor management, requiring direct support from the Mamluk sultans. Qaytbay, the great benefactor of Medina, also created a number of pious endowments in Palestine, some of which were truly vast. These endowments financed institutions in Gaza, Jerusalem, and Arabia. In Jerusalem he completed waterworks begun earlier by sultan Khushqadam and built a famous law college, al-Ashrafiyya, originally also a foundation of Khushqadam.[54] Other Mamluk sultans of the fifteenth century such as Jaqmaq (1438–53) and Aynal (1453–61) made their own generous contributions for Jerusalem by providing grain and the cash and building materials needed for the constant maintenance of mosques and buildings in Jerusalem. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the pious endowment for Jerusalem and Hebron declined further. It was a known weakness of the *waqf* system and something against which little could be done to reverse.[55] The evidence gleaned from the Ottoman land registers enhances what is known from the literary sources. A number of law colleges in Jerusalem were maintained through pious endowments dedicated specifically to them, and in five cases, provisions were also made for Koranic schools for orphaned children. Other pious endowments were set up for education above the level of a Koranic school and for charitable purposes. For example, such was the pious endowment of Muhammad ibn Maqil al-Rumi, who divided the incomes of his foundation in equal shares among the following beneficiaries: the eunuchs of the tomb of the Prophet in Medina, students at the Azhar mosque in Cairo, and students in Gaza. Other pious endowments in Jerusalem were dedicated for specific mystical orders and their lodges.

In 1047, Nasir Khusraw visited Hebron. His journey from Jerusalem to Hebron brought him to Bethlehem, which he says was visited by many Christian pilgrims, including from Byzantium. Nasir Khusraw described the Shrine of the Patriarchs in Hebron, which was the beneficiary of many rural endowments. At the shrine meals were offered to the pilgrims, and the public kitchen that dispensed these meals (*simat*) enjoyed rich endowments of agricultural land and properties in Jerusalem. It is instructive that Nasir Khusraw, in addition to the record of his visual impressions of Hebron, also noted the existence of special endowments for the shrine and the meals. For such things to be entered into the diary of a foreign visitor they must have been widely known and much spoken of. Literary sources and the epigraphic evidence supply much information on these endowments as well. For instance, in 1215, the Ayyubid sultan Muʿazzam ʿIsa (1198–1227) created a pious endowment to finance the renovations of the Shrine of the Patriarchs, to pay the maids employed in the public kitchen, to buy fabrics for the external cover of the shrine, and to light the interior, while other revenues derived from this endowment were dedicated for the meals offered to the pilgrims.[56]

5

Pious Endowments, Learning, and Mysticism

Elementary Learning

The Koranic Schools for Orphans: Dispersal and Patrons

Being rooted in the Koranic teachings, the care for orphans became deeply embedded in the religious thought and ethics of medieval Islam. Orphans are mentioned in many Koranic verses, including references to the fact that the Prophet himself was an orphan. The most important verse is 2:172: "True piety (*birr*) is to believe in God, the Last Day, the angels, the book, the prophets, and to give money willingly to relatives, orphans, the needy (*masakin*), wayfarers, beggars, to ransom the enslaved, to perform prayers, and to give *zakat*." Other verses (4:1, 5, 9 and 17:33) are concerned with the proper management of orphans' money (*mal*) by their guardians, and those who misuse *mal* are threatened with Hell. Koranic injunctions command the believer to show kindness toward parents, kinsmen, orphans, the poor, neighbors, and travelers (4:35), who are all entitled to a share of the spoils designated for God and the Prophet (8:40). The Koran also commands followers to provide them with food (76:7).

In medieval Islam the term *orphan* meant a child bereaved of a father, and from an institutional point of view the cadi acted as the guardian of the orphans. The cadi's involvement in the affairs of orphans began early, at the beginning of the eighth century, and involved the supervision and management of money belonging to the orphans—an issue that much troubled the jurists, the cadis themselves, the rulers to whom the cadis were answerable, and society as a whole. The cadi's role as the guardian of the orphans was essentially a passive one, since he was only expected to handle their money honestly and profitably, and he was not expected to take any other actions for their welfare. In Jewish society, the court fulfilled the role of "the father of the orphans" and was responsible both for the management of the estates of orphans and for providing aid to widows and their orphaned children.[1]

When the question is posed of how Muslim medieval society actually cared for orphans, the answer is clear and consistent: a great deal of attention was devoted to securing a basic education for them. The same is true for Jewish communities in the medieval Islamic world where the leaders of the community and the court made arrangements for financing the education of orphans. One of the most notable deeds was undertaken by al-Hakam II (961–76), the Umayyad caliph of Cordova, who set up twenty-seven Koranic schools. Three of these schools were built around the central mosque of the town, while the others were dispersed in such a way that every urban district of Cordova had a local school. The caliph is depicted not only as a person with an aptitude for learning and a passion for books but also as a famous and generous patron of sciences and learned men. He also set up the *dar al-sadaqa*, a building adjacent to the central mosque in which the distribution of charities dispensed by him took place. As has been pointed out by Muhammad Muhammad Amin, the very need to establish Koranic schools was due to the prohibition to teach young boys in mosques because of their lack of attention to the requirements of ritual purity. The question of whether teaching boys in a mosque was permitted was debated in fifteenth-century Fez, and the tendency was to prohibit it. On other occasions, however, mosques were used for learning, including for the education of young boys. For example, in 626/1228–29 in Baghdad, a mosque was renovated and a large group of young boys was taught Koran there. The mosque was equipped with a library and also served as a place for the study of Prophetic traditions.[2]

A policy of establishing Koranic schools is also attributed to Nur al-Din, who set up endowed Koranic schools for orphans in many towns under his rule. Saladin followed his example and established Koranic schools for orphans in Cairo, Damascus, and Jerusalem. The school in Damascus, for example, was maintained by a pious endowment, and the needs of the orphans, such as clothing, were also cared for.[3] The establishment of Koranic schools, particularly those for orphans, persisted throughout the Mamluk period, although from the eleventh century onwards, following the emergence and spread of the law college (*madrasa*) as the main form of educational institution in the Middle East, royal and high-ranking patrons preferred it to any other type of educational foundation. In many cases, however, law colleges were part of larger complexes that also included a Koranic school, and the addition of a Koranic school for orphans only enhanced the pious intentions of the founding patron. In economic terms, the cost was insignificant, since Koranic schools were cheap to establish and maintain, while law colleges demanded the investment of considerable resources. A notable example is provided by the Mustansiriyya law college inaugurated in 631/1233–34 in Baghdad. It was a most impressive institution that provided for 248 students of law and included a school for the study of the Prophetic traditions that consisted of ten students

and their teachers. A large Koranic school for orphans, which provided education for thirty pupils, was housed in an adjacent building, and the orphans, like the students of the Prophetic traditions, were supported through the pious endowment of the Mustansiriyya college. A Muslim physician was a member of the staff of the college, and in 636/1238–39, a physician and ten students of medicine were also lodged in a new building close to the college.[4]

In Syria and Egypt, the patrons of Koranic schools were sultans and members of the military class—a type of patronage typical of the Zankid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk periods. For instance, an Ayyubid emir, Fakhr al-Din ʿUthman ibn Qizzil, was known for his many publicized and secret charities. He built a number of endowed law colleges and a Koranic school for orphans in Fayyum, an agricultural depression in Egypt.[5] Other examples come from the Mamluk period. In 748/1347–48, a Mamluk officer of the highest rank (*amir mi'a wa-muqaddam alf*) was appointed as the supervisor of the Mansuri hospital in Cairo, and adjacent to the hospital, he built a drinking fountain (*sabil*) and a Koranic school (*kuttab sabil*), both of which he provided with pious endowments. He was also known for his charities and the establishment of a lodge for the mystics at the Qarafa. Another top-ranking Mamluk dignitary, *na'ib al-sultana*, set up a number of institutions both in Cairo and Safad, where he lived for many years. In Safad be built his mausoleum, a law college, and a Koranic school, while in Cairo he built a drinking fountain and a Koranic school.[6] A further example is the funerary complex of the wife of the governor Tankiz in Damascus, which consisted of her mausoleum as well as a number of other institutions including a mosque, a lodge for women, and a Koranic school for orphans.[7]

Whatever the emirs did, the sultans did on a grander scale. The inclusion of Koranic schools for orphans as part of larger sultanic foundations became very common in Mamluk Egypt and Syria. These Koranic schools also provided a daily portion of bread, summer and winter clothing, and pocket money—provisions that are frequently mentioned and well documented. For example, Baybars established both a law college and a school for orphans in Cairo, and although the school was adjacent to the law college, it was supported by a separate pious endowment. In 682/1283–84, the sultan Mansur Qalawun established a complex that included his mausoleum, a law college, a hospital, and a Koranic school for orphans that was supported by a separated pious endowment created for that purpose in Syria. Two jurists held teaching positions in this school, and the sixty orphans were provided with a kilogram of bread (two *ritals*) per day and two sets of clothes per year, one for the winter and the other for summer. Similar schools for orphans that offered the same type of support were also established by other Mamluk sultans. Sultan Baybars, for example, attached Koranic schools to three of his foundations—a law college, a mosque, and a congregational mosque—and these schools admitted

between ten to thirty orphans, all of whom were provided for. The pious endowment deeds of these schools specified their teaching objectives, which were the memorization of the Koran and the learning of the Arabic script. The expectation was that boys, upon reaching maturity, would be able to memorize the Koran and would then be replaced by other boys at the school. Those who failed to achieve this objective were, nonetheless, allowed to continue their education until they accomplished the goal.[8] Although the provision of the basic needs of orphans attending Koranic schools was common, it was not universal, and some schools provided only education.[9]

A striking illustration of the association that existed between sultanic virtue, proper rule, and the care of orphans is exemplified by the pious endowment deed of sultan Qaytbay, which detailed the provisions for his funerary complex outside Cairo. This included a Koranic school for orphans, but his commitment to the welfare of orphans is proclaimed in the introductory section of the endowment deed. It is a fascinating text that expounds the legitimization of Qaytbay's rule and offers a glimpse into the Mamluk perception of Islam. The sultan is depicted as one chosen and supported by God, and the attempt to create an aura of divinity for him prevails throughout the text. Through his military might, the sultan upholds the religion of God, and the building and restoration of mosques and congregational mosques are presented as actions associated with the promulgation of Islam and the manifestation of the sultan's personal belief in God and the afterlife. Support extended to men of religion and the pursuit of knowledge are depicted as Islamic values equal to the fulfillment of religious commands such as prayer and the payment of *zakat*. The saying "to command right and forbid evil" embodies the execution of religious obligations by the sultan, who is praised for his continuous charities to the righteous, people of religion, mystics, orphans, and the transmitters of the Prophetic traditions. These are termed as continuous charities, something that grants the donor redemption from Hell. Another value associated with virtuous rule is the maintenance of justice, which, the document states, is the principle that upholds this world and the next. The meaning of justice with regard to orphans is clearly spelled out as involving the provision of clothing and money.[10] Strikingly, in this endowment deed the care for orphans and their welfare has been elevated to being a principle that legitimizes rule.

In reality, Koranic schools were widely dispersed, and they formed part of larger educational complexes set up when palaces and towns were restored. Such complexes were also built in Cairo and the citadel as part of the usual ongoing building activities in the town.[11] It seems that this wide patronage and dispersal explains the references made to orphans in Qaytbay's endowment deed. The sultans, or at least Qaytbay, wished to be associated with a social activity that had broad appeal and participation—in the hope that, by adopt-

ing it, the sultan would enhance his position and legitimization in the eyes of the public. Much information about Koranic schools is provided by Adam Sabra, who has studied forty-six pious endowments established between 1300 and 1517 in Cairo in support of schools for poor and orphaned children. These schools, like others of this type, supplied a daily portion of bread and two sets of clothes per year. Most of the schools contained about ten children, but some had many more, and two schools had as many as 200 and 300 pupils. The school with 300 pupils, however, had only one teacher, just like the small schools designated for ten children. The school with 200 pupils had four teachers—again far less than the average. As a result of poor teacher-pupil ratio, the educational standards at the two biggest schools must have been lower than in the other institutions.[12]

Further information on Koranic schools for orphans can be gleaned from the Ottoman register of pious endowments in Palestine and Syria. The cases recorded in this register span the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries and show a certain pattern: herein provision for the education of orphans was always made in conjunction with the establishment of other religious and educational institutions. In 763/1361–62, a pious endowment created for a mausoleum and a law college also included a provision for the education of ten orphans, support for their teacher, and a daily portion of bread and two sets of clothes per year for each orphan. A few years later two Koranic schools, one in Gaza and another in Jerusalem, each containing ten poor orphans, were set up by an emir who also supplied the pupils with two sets of clothes. Other foundations set up by this patron in Jerusalem involved a law college and a lodge for mystics. The third recorded case is from 799/1396–97 and refers to a pious endowment set up for a mausoleum, a mosque, and a Koranic school for orphans. In this complex the founder appointed and provided for an imam, a muezzin, reciters of the Koran, transmitters of Prophetic traditions, ten orphans, and service staff. Perhaps the most interesting entry in the Ottoman register describes a pious endowment from 834/1430–31 set up for a lodge of mystics that included ten orphans and their teacher, who was responsible for teaching them Koran, writing, and reading. The orphans associated with this lodge, and other poor children, were provided with clothes.

The transition from Mamluk to Ottoman rule had no apparent effect on the way education for orphans was taken care of, and in this regard, three pious endowments created in the district of Jerusalem during the Ottoman period are of interest to our discussion. In 938/1531–32, Husam al-Din set up a law college in Jerusalem with a large pious endowment that supported mystics and ten orphans with their teacher. In 956/1549–50, the Ottoman cadi of the district of Jerusalem founded a small complex that included a law college and a Koranic school for orphans. This was not an isolated case, for in early sixteenth-century Homs, a patron of a very similar background—the Ottoman

governor of the district—also founded a Koranic school for orphans that supplied their basic needs.[13] These foundations of early Ottoman Syria and Palestine were rather typical of the whole Ottoman period in which the tradition of providing for the needs of children who attended Koranic schools was maintained.[14] It should be pointed out that the Ottoman register also includes information about Koranic schools that were not attached to any other institutions, and three schools of this type are mentioned: one in Gaza and two in Jerusalem. The provision of education for orphans was often combined with the desire to provide drinking water for the urban population, and these two charitable imperatives created a unique Middle Eastern institution: the *sabil kuttab* (or *maktab*), the drinking fountain and Koranic school for orphans. Such foundations were established in Mamluk Cairo, but the great flowering of this institution took place in the Ottoman period and was popular with top-ranking patrons who were members of the Ottoman ruling class in Cairo.[15]

The wish to secure the education and material well-being of orphans could assume many forms. In the great Umayyad Mosque of Damascus there were many circles of Koran reciters, and members of these circles were supported by pious endowments. One of the patrons of this sort of activity was Nur al-Din, who provided support for young and orphaned children who recited the Koran during the night. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad reminds his readers of the true nature of this enterprise by saying that the reciting of the Koran by children "brings reward to the founder of the pious endowment while the children received allowances." The reciprocal character of medieval charity was well understood and eloquently formulated by ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad. How many children there were in the circle established by Nur al-Din is unknown, but we do know that another circle in this mosque included at least 387 young children who were instructed in the art of memorization and recitation of the Koran.[16] The fact that Koranic schools for orphans were associated with *dar al-Qur'an* is attested to in the writings of al-Nuʿaymi (d. 1521), which deal with the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century history of the religious and educational institutions of Damascus. *Dar al- Qur'an* was a specialized institution designated for the study of the art of the recitation of the Koran. At least two such institutions were established in Damascus of the 1430s and 1440s and included Koranic schools for orphans, which also provided for them. In both cases the patrons were well-to-do local notables.[17]

The Koranic School as an Educational Institution

The essence of a Koranic school as an educational institution cannot be adequately grasped from historical sources—not even from pious endowment

deeds that do specify payments and provisions for pupils and staff but usually no more than that. Even when pious endowment deeds do refer to the subjects taught in the Koranic school, there is no way to evaluate how, if at all, these stipulations were implemented.[18] A unique insight into the Koranic school is, however, offered by the little known author Ibn al-Hajj (d. 733/1332–33), who wrote the famous *Kitab al-Madkhal*. Ibn al-Hajj does not indicate whether the Koranic school was supported by pious endowment or not, and he pays no attention to whether the pupils were orphans or not.[19] We can conclude that there were no differences between endowed and unendowed Koranic schools designated for either orphans or ordinary boys. Nonetheless, endowed and unendowed schools were separate institutions, even though their essence and day-to-day running were identical. A Koranic school could have been set up by a teacher as a private enterprise, but Ibn al-Hajj disapproved of any form of advertisement. It should be located in a central place such as a market or a busy street and not in a mosque.[20] The central topic of a school's curriculum had to be the memorization of the Koran, but it also had to include writing, arithmetic, and the understanding of the issues involved, while the teacher was also obliged to instruct his pupils in the rules of prayer and other religious rites. The educational aims of the Koranic school outlined by Ibn al-Hajj constituted the desirable model for such a school and are alluded to in fifteenth-century legal writings.[21]

It seems that two major problems beset the Koranic school: the socioeconomic differences among the boys and mixed age of the pupil population, since the school was also attended by boys of tender age and served as a kind of nursery. This created the need to teach the very young and the older boys separately and to employ an assistant.[22] As simple as the Koranic school was, being equipped only with blackboard and chalk, it attracted both poor and better-off boys alike. Ibn al-Hajj deals extensively with this issue, focusing on two aspects: the consumption of food on the premises of the school and the teacher's attitude toward his pupils. He advocated sending the boys home for meals, since, in his view, eating was a very private matter not done in the company of strangers and certainly not in public. For the same reason, the teacher was also to prevent the boys from buying food from peddlers. Another problem was that poorer boys who saw their better-off classmates partaking of their food might develop dissatisfaction with their fathers as providers, and this was to be avoided. The issue of food also had a religious dimension, since some of the food brought to the school was forbidden, having been gained by fathers involved in occupations that were religiously impermissible, such as the collection of customs duties. Such food had to be kept separately from the permitted food, but it is plainly clear that the realities of school life were such that boys did bring food from their homes and ate it on the school premises.

The teachers collected the food, mixed it, and shared it among the pupils and themselves.[23]

To what extent teacher-owners of Koranic schools geared their schools to boys of higher social classes is vague, but we can get an inkling of this from a very short obituary note written about a teacher of a Koranic school who died in 596/1199–1200 in Baghdad. His school was attended by sons of emirs and high-ranking people, but whether it was exclusively designated for them remains unclear. The same ambiguity is reflected by another account, which reported on accusations of the sexual molestation of a boy, the son of a local notable, by the teacher-owner of a Koranic school. People of religion in Baghdad examined this case and confined the teacher to a hospital, which does not mean that hospitals, or wards for the mentally ill, functioned as recluse institutions in medieval Islam. The question is whether the fuss made about the alleged homosexual relations due only to the high social standing of the father. In this case the confinement was instrumental to defusing the social tension caused and allowing mediation to take place between the injured party and the wrongdoer. Eventually the teacher returned to teaching, but he moved to Damascus where he continued to practice his occupation until his death in 600/1203–4. The whole affair is narrated in his obituary, indicating that it had stained his reputation.[24]

The teacher was enjoined by Ibn al-Hajj to treat all his pupils equally and to provide them with equal teaching. The simplicity of the school's equipment was due to these considerations. For example, a bench had to be avoided, as it might be used by the better-off pupils and thus undermine the equality in the class. One of the underlying problems of the Koranic school was that the teacher was poor or, at best, of very modest means and not everyone paid him regularly. Thus he found himself regularly asking for food, and Ibn al-Hajj depicts this social reality. The low socioeconomic status of teachers of Koranic schools can also be inferred from the biographical literature. For instance, there are very few biographies of teachers of Koranic schools in the huge biographical dictionary compiled by Khatib al-Baghdadi, which was devoted to people connected with the history of Baghdad, and those given are not informative. Biographies of the private tutors of sons of high-ranking people do appear in Khatib al-Baghdadi's dictionary, but it seems that, with the exception of the Syrian historian Shams al-Din Ibn Tulun (1475–1546), Koranic teachers were not included in the biographical dictionaries, and of the nine mentioned by him, only one was a person of some means. The sample here is too small. Ibn Tulun's reports are too terse to draw any other conclusions, and it is surprising that he mentions them at all. These socio-educational realities were not unique to Muslim teachers. Teachers of Jewish elementary schools are frequently referred to in the Geniza documents. Poverty was rampant among them, and for many, teaching was only an additional occupation.[25]

It is impossible to ascertain what skills the boys acquired in the Koranic school or even whether they could read and write fluently. The ceremony marking the graduation from the school emphasized the recitation of the Koran, which symbolized the highest achievement of the graduate. The centrality of the Koran in the education of boys was also motivated by the belief that knowledge of the text provided magical protection (a sort of spiritual talisman) for the child and ensured his salvation. In order to grasp the realities of medieval primary education, we must turn to different sources: the documents of the Cairo Geniza, and the works of Goitein and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, in which we see that the problem of teaching reading and writing also beset Jewish primary education. Here the alphabet was taught as an instrument for reading, and once this ability was acquired, the art of writing was not always pursued. As a result, most of the graduates of primary education were able to sign their name but were not able to write or read cursive script. The art of writing was pursued mostly by those who sought careers in administration, commerce, religious learning, or medicine.[26] In some Koranic schools founded by Mamluk emirs and sultans, however, specific provisions for the teaching of writing by a special instructor were made, and such stipulations, which albeit make no reference to a special instructor, are also known in other Koranic schools. It could be understood as an attempt to provide a skill that was beyond the normal standards of the schools, but even in these cases, what educational goals were achieved remains vague.[27] The question of skills acquisition is especially intriguing in view of Ibn al-Hajj's admonition not to send Muslim pupils to Christian primary schools for instruction in arithmetic. In addition to his own words that the subject should be taught in the Koranic school, there are also pious endowment deeds that state that the schools in question should make provisions for the teaching of arithmetic. How widespread the sending of Muslim boys to Christian schools to learn this subject was is vague, and Ibn al-Hajj's account should not be taken too seriously. His views regarding the non-Muslims were bigoted, and he used this topic to advocate strict social segregation between the Muslim and non-Muslim populations. The teaching of arithmetic to Jewish pupils is little attested to in the Geniza documents, but Goitein remarks that computing was taught without the use of textbooks, and in some cases the parents hired someone to teach their boys arithmetic.[28]

The main value of Ibn al-Hajj's writings is its contribution to our understanding of the full significance of the pious endowments set up to maintain Koranic schools for orphans. The cost of establishing and running such schools was low; they only required a modest endowment, but the impact of such foundations was considerable. Given the widespread poverty typical of medieval towns and the society at large, as well as the enormous economic gap between the poor and the better-off, it is clear that schools that offered a daily food ration, two sets of clothes per year, and a standard education made a great

difference to those receiving philanthropy. Thus this form of charity was perhaps one of the cheapest yet most effective. The Koranic schools for orphans not only provided for children in their early lives but also gave them the beginnings of a profession, since one could earn a livelihood by reciting the Koran or even from having a basic knowledge of it. The services of professional Koran reciters were in demand, and provisions for such people were made in endowed institutions and funerary complexes. Occasionally attempts were made to familiarize the wider public with the Koran, and in 790/1388–89 the market supervisor of Cairo appointed jurists whose task was to teach the traders the opening verses of the Koran and some other chapters. They received a modest remuneration of two *dirhams* (or two *fulus*, copper coins) from each of their adult pupils.[29] Above all, teaching the Koran to young boys and orphans meant their socialization into the society, its culture, beliefs, and customs as well as providing them with the possibility to earn a living. If we take a broader view of the Koranic school as an educational institution, we can see that Ibn al-Hajj's description of it does not reflect the realities of the Mamluk period alone. This institution with the above characteristics was typical of the premodern Middle East, and the situation in eighteenth-century Egypt was not much different from that in Ibn al-Hajj's time.[30]

Orphaned Girls

The fate of orphaned girls is almost unattested to in the sources. The Islamic medieval world of education and learning was almost totally male. Female scholars taught in the field of the transmission of Prophetic traditions, but how widespread has not been systematically investigated, and we can assume that girls were left largely uneducated. There are few cases of Koranic schools for girls run by female teachers attested to in Arabic sources, while Hebrew sources similarly refer to a Jewish elementary school for girls taught by a blind male teacher. The evidence indicates that care for orphans did take place within the world of education and learning but that access to Koranic schools supported by pious endowments was denied to orphaned girls and this left them instrumentally disadvantaged.

Both medieval Judaism and Islam stressed the importance of a basic religious education for women to enable them to fulfill their religious duties and rites. In the Jewish world the father was legally obliged to educate his son, and in the absence of a father, the community took on this responsibility by maintaining special teachers for orphans and poor boys or by paying for their education. The responsibility for the socialization and education of daughters was left to the mother. In both Jewish and Muslim medieval societies, opposition to

the education of women had social roots and was perceived as a threat to the established social order that emphasized gender difference.[31]

The World of Higher Learning

Libraries

Libraries were quite a typical and widespread urban institution that symbolized the Islamic medieval world of learning. This proliferation of libraries has been explained by some scholars as springing from the intense religious and doctrinal disputes that characterized the formative period of medieval Islam in the seventh through eleventh centuries. Each religious sect and theological school tried to establish its own library, which would also serve as the focal point of learning activity and as a center for the propagation of the beliefs of the founding patrons.[32] On a more fundamental level the spread of books, and subsequently libraries, was facilitated by the early introduction of the paper-making industry into the Islamic world.[33] This does not mean that books became cheap, but the ready availability of paper was important even though high quality paper was expensive and the high cost of copying seriously limited the circulation of texts. Given these limitations public libraries became very important, since only people of the urban upper class, top ranking administrators, and the rulers could afford large private libraries, many of which were eventually endowed to serve the wider learned public. Public libraries, some explicitly mentioned as endowed, existed in Iran (Shiraz, Rayy, and Ghazna), in Iraq (Mosul and Basra), in Syria (Aleppo and Tripoli), and in Cordova. The library in Shiraz was founded by the Buyid sultan ʿAdud al-Dawla, and the one in Rayy was established by the Buyid vizier Ismaʿil ibn ʿAbbad in 995 but was destroyed in 1029 when the town was conquered by the Ghaznavids. The most famous libraries, however, existed in the great imperial capitals of Baghdad and Cairo. In 991 in Baghdad the Buyid vizier, Shapur ibn Ardashir, created a vast Shiite library and an institution of learning (*dar al-ʿilm*), which supposedly contained 100,000 books but which was destroyed in 1059 by the Seljukid sultan Tughrilbeg. The library in Rayy was also reputed to be a Shiite institution, and its destruction by the Ghaznavid sultan Mahmud, a staunch supporter of Sunni Islam, was motivated by what he perceived as the questionable content of the books it contained. One of the best known libraries and institutions of learning (referred to as *dar al-hikma* or, alternatively, as *dar al-ʿilm*) was founded in 1010 in Cairo by al-Hakim who provided it with books from the palace library. Several groups of scholars with different specializations were established in it and were occasionally called to the palace to conduct scholarly disputations in the presence of the founding patron. The library also

served other scholars who could copy books there, while the cost of paper, ink, and the drinking water provided for the users was defrayed by al-Hakim. Some years after the creation of this institution, al-Hakim set up a pious endowment for it, but this institution had a checkered history, being closed and reopened due to the involvement (or suspicion of involvement) of its scholars in the great schisms that tore apart the Fatimid state.[34] Another extensive library and institution of learning associated with Shiite-Ismaili Islam was the *dar al-ʿilm* established by Ibn ʿAmmar, the ruler of Tripoli, which was an endowed institution that contained, it is said, 100,000 books, all of which were lost when Tripoli was conquered by the Crusaders in 1110.[35] The main characteristic features of Islamic medieval libraries were the patronage of royalty and those of high rank and the use of pious endowments.[36]

Youssef Eche, who has studied libraries and institutions of learning, sees the Sunni law college (*madrasa*) as evolving from the *dar al-ʿilm*. In his view, both institutions shared many common characteristics in that they were both economically dependent on pious endowments and offered support to scholars. The similarities between the two institutions, however, went even deeper, involving the motives behind their establishment, since each institution served as a channel for the propagation of a particular brand of Islam, whether Shiite-Ismaili or Sunni.[37] Eche's views on the evolutionary link between *dar al-ʿilm* and *madrasa* have been disputed by George Makdisi, a renowned historian of Islamic medieval learning and intellectual history who perceives the similarities between the two institutions as merely superficial. On a more fundamental level, Makdisi argues against Eche's perception of both institutions as being quasi-official.[38] Makdisi has put forward a conceptual framework for the study of the *madrasa* in which he points out that political, religious, and institutional histories are all entangled and "must be unscrambled before one can hope to understand the significance of the *madrasa* and its place in history."[39] Other methodological approaches must be explored as well.

Law Colleges of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries

Makdisi sees the law college as an institution that evolved from the mosque-khan complex, and in his view, Badr ibn Hasanawayh, was responsible for the massive spread of this institution. Other scholars R. W. Bulliet, Heinz Halm, and Roy Mottahedeh have pointed out the eastern origin of the *madrasa*. Law colleges evolved in Khurasan, and the earliest evidence comes from Nishapur at the end of the ninth century. Nizam al-Mulk, who was responsible for the establishment of the Nizamiyya law college in 1067 in Baghdad and other institutions of this type in the Middle East and the Iranian world, was largely responsible for the dissemination of law colleges in the Arabic-speaking lands

of the Middle East. Nizam al-Mulk is described by his medieval biographers not only as the one who consolidated the rule of the Seljukid sultans but also as a man of piety, learning, and administrative skills. The aims behind the network of his law colleges are not well explained, though, and in a typically medieval way, his biographers tended to explain his deeds as being the outcome of his personal inclinations and traits of character. Nizam al-Mulk is depicted as a sage who was active in the transmission of Prophetic tradition, and his law colleges are perceived as an extension of his interest in learning and scholars.[40] Modern scholars tend to emphasize the political dimension more. The law colleges he established were not under the influence of the caliph, and they served to implement Nizam al-Mulk's policies. His political thinking was influenced by the Persian theory of rule, which emphasized the need for fusion between kingship and religion and saw a close link between kingship and righteousness. Nizam al-Mulk in his political and personal conduct, which impressed his contemporaries so much, implemented Persian models. He consolidated the power of his political masters by playing the role of the just vizier and acting as a model for emulation. One of his most important contributions was the powerful link he forged between law colleges and the *waqf* institution.[41]

The fusion of politics and religious-educational policies is also clearly discernible in the deeds of other rulers. When Nur al-Din established himself in Aleppo, following the assassination of his father in 1146, the local Shiite community was large and powerful and religious life was dominated by Shiite rites such as the proclamation of the Shiite formula of the call to prayer. Nur al-Din, himself a Sunni Muslim whose policies were the outcome of his inner religious world and political considerations, strove to curtail the influence of the local Shias. He used a variety of means to implement his policies, such as bestowing patronage on Sunni jurists whom he brought to Aleppo, and renovating and establishing new endowed law colleges, which he provided with the financial means for operating. Neither did he shun direct confrontation with the Shias by abolishing the Shiite formula of the call to prayer, and such policies sparked two outbreaks of civil war in Aleppo. During Saladin's rule in the town, the main religious-political strife was between Shafiʿi and Hanafi jurists. This was an internal Sunni affair, the outcome of Saladin's preference for the Shafiʿis in contrast to Nur al-Din's backing of the Hanafis. Saladin also used law colleges as a tool for the implementation of his policies, they symbolized his adherence to Sunni Islam, and he established many of them as part of his effort to undermine the Fatimid regime and erase the remnants of the veneer of Ismailism in Egypt. Later he set up law colleges in Jerusalem as well to revive its Islamic Sunni character following the Frankish rule in the town.[42] In accordance with the example set by Nizam al-Mulk, all of the law colleges established by Nur al-Din and Saladin were endowed institutions.

The literary sources, with all their limitations, pose many difficulties when the methodology set forth by Makdisi is attempted. For instance, the information concerning the Nizamiyya of Baghdad and other law colleges set up by Nizam al-Mulk is very limited, since it is only derived from literary sources. For example, only a few details of the pious endowment deed of the Nizamiyya of Baghdad are known. This was an institution designated for teaching of the Shafiʿi law school, and the law professor had to be a Shafiʿi jurist who adhered to the legal theory (*asl*) and substantial law (*furuʿ*) of his school. The same applied to the preacher who delivered sermons at the law college, while other positions in the college were created for an expert on the recitation of the Koran, a professor of Arabic, and a librarian.[43] The only documentary evidence pertinent to an eleventh-century law college comes from Samarkand in the 1060s, a city very much on the fringes of the Muslim world of that period. Although the pious endowment deed of the Samarkand law college is a very important piece of information, it has been utterly neglected in the study of the *madrasa*, its essence, and its distribution. In Rajab 458/May–June 1066, the Qarakhanid ruler, Ibrahim ibn Nasr, established an endowed hospital and educational complex referred to as a *madrasa*. In this particular case, any attempt to follow Makdisi's methodological advice to study the *madrasa* within a broad historical perspective fails, since the Qarakhanid history is obscure. Ibrahim ibn Nasr was the creator of the Western Khanate base on Transoxania with Samarkand as its capital. The crucial stage in the Islamization of Central Asia and the Qarakhanid Turks took place in the middle of the tenth century, and the endowment deed of Ibrahim ibn Nasr reveals a profound Islamization of the ruling class. The survival of the endowment deed of Ibrahim ibn Nasr's law college allows another approach that focuses on the pious endowment deed itself. This document reveals the essence of the institution, irrespective of our limited knowledge of Qarakhanid history.

Although the educational institution established by Ibrahim ibn Nasr is always referred to as a *madrasa*, the concept of a larger complex is conveyed by the pious endowment deed, and the various units of the foundation are enumerated. These included a law college, a mausoleum, a mosque, rooms for students, a courtyard, a garden, a library, and cells for seclusion. The teaching activities involved Koran and instruction of Hanafi law by a jurist. The study of the Koran took place in the library, and the different ways of reciting it were taught by an expert in the field (*muqriʾ*). Literature (*adab*) or general topics were also taught by a special instructor (*muʾaddib*). Thirty students, all of them maintained through the pious endowment, lived on the complex. The essence of the institution is clearly revealed by the pious endowment deed: the teaching of Hanafi law. Consequently, the professor of law was the highest paid man in the law college. It is very important to note that the complex in question was

not only educational, since a continuous recitation of the Koran took place in the mausoleum and the complex also fulfilled certain charitable functions. On the occasion of the Festival of Sacrifice, for example, the meat of the slaughtered animals was divided up among the poor, who also received food and clothing here during the 'Ashura'.[44] The Samarkand *madrasa* resembled the Nizamiyya of Baghdad in its preoccupation with the teaching of law, but Ibrahim ibn Nasr's law college was part of a larger complex that also provided certain charitable services. The Samarkand *madrasa* can be regarded as a prototype for later medieval institutions of this type.

The Mamluk Sultans and Learning

The link between law colleges and funerary monuments is occasionally attested to in the early *madrasas* of the Iranian world. In some cases the law college's founding patron, frequently himself a scholar, was buried in his law college. In the case of Ibrahim ibn Nasr's law college, the mausoleum was part of the complex, and the salaries of the four Koran reciters established in it were drawn from the revenues of the pious endowment, which also maintained the mausoleum. The collocation "this law college and mausoleum" appears in the pious endowment deed, indicating the essence of the complex as an institution of learning and a funerary monument that also fulfilled limited charitable functions.[45] This combination of functions evolved throughout the Zankid and Ayyubid periods and became widespread during the Mamluk period. It was motivated by the desire of the founder buried in the complex to enjoy the *baraka*, blessing, that emanated from a place in which continuous learning and Koran recitations were taking place. In medieval Islam, as in Judaism, learning was a cultural and religious value, and the study of religious texts acquired the status of worship. Blessing emanated from the place of study and, as has been pointed out by Jonathan Berkey, the combination of law colleges and funeral complexes was thus deliberate and not fortuitous.[46] Other more personal motives, however, appear in the pious endowment deeds and foundation inscriptions of the complexes set up by the Mamluks.

We can begin the review of the evidence with a minor foundation set up by an emir in the provincial town of Tripoli in Lebanon. In 1287, following the conquest of the town from the Franks, the Mamluks destroyed the old town and built a new one further inland. Tripoli was a reasonably thriving provincial town endowed with mosques, law colleges, and commercial facilities, and in 1372 emir Aydamir and his wife, Lady Arghun, set up a law college and a mausoleum in the town. A large section of the foundation inscription deals with the performance of Koran recitations at the mausoleum of Lady Arghun. According to this, four Koran reciters were established at the foundation, and

on Fridays, the whole Koran was recited after which the people assembled were obliged to deliver their individual prayers (*duʿa'*) for the sultan, asking God to show mercy to him. The law college also included a Koranic school for eight orphans taught Koran and writing by their teacher, who was a jurist. The teacher's salary was thirty *dirhams* per month, but the orphans were poorly provided for, only receiving a daily allowance of a quarter of *dirham* and one set of clothes each year. The *duʿa'* prayers are a well-known type of unritualized individual Islamic prayer, in which the person praying beseeches God for himself or for others. References to the performance of the *duʿa'* prayers for the founder of a pious endowment are also repeated in other pious endowment deeds and were not just an idiosyncrasy of the emir and his wife.[47]

In 702/1302–1303, the inauguration of the *madrasa* of al-Nasir Muhammad, which also contained his mausoleum, took place. The pious endowment deed of this institution was drawn up in 1299, on the eve of the sultan's expedition to Syria to fight the Mongols. The complex had an earlier history as well, being originally initiated by the sultan Kitbugha (1294–1296), who bought and destroyed properties in Cairo to clear space for his foundation. Only the mausoleum and a section of the law college had been built by the time he fell, and on the advice of Zayn al-Din, the chief Maliki judge, al-Nasir Muhammad bought the property and completed the construction work. Zayn al-Din, the initiator of the sultan's involvement in the project, was entrusted with the composition of the pious endowment deed and tried to take full advantage of this opportunity by appointing himself supervisor of the foundation and stipulating that the post would be hereditary in his family. In addition he appointed himself as the Maliki law professor at the college and also made this post hereditary for his sons. Zayn al-Din's relations with the sultan were the result of his nomination as supervisor of the sultan's private properties. His attempt to attain long-term future security for his family by monopolizing two key appointments at the foundation aroused envy and the animosity of other people who were also trying to gain some benefit from this foundation. One of Zayn al-Din's own employees, Shihab al-Din, pointed out to the sultan that Zayn al-Din had denied him the right to appoint his own nominee for the post of supervisor, thus curtailing the sultan's ability to provide for his freedmen. These were not just general remarks, since a specific person had been suggested for the post: the Tawashi (eunuch) Shujaʿ al-Din ʿAnbar, the sultan's freedman. Furthermore, the sultan was advised to stipulate that ʿAnbar's successor be selected from among the other freedmen of the sultan. The reason for the struggle over the post becomes clear when the remuneration, 300 *nuqra dirhams* per month, is considered. Shihab al-Din's motives were neither entirely noble nor unselfish, since he admitted that he had asked Zayn al-Din not only for a position or function at the foundation but also to be named in the

pious endowment deed as one who would be entitled to hold a position—something he was refused.

It is clearly borne out by the pious endowment deed that the mausoleum and the law college were of equal importance for the founding patron and that the purpose of the foundation was to create continuous religious and learning activity in both sections of the complex. Thus prayers were conducted and readings of Koran and Prophetic traditions took place in the mausoleum. To make this possible, the personnel of the mausoleum included, in addition to its manual staff, an imam, a muezzin, a reader of Prophetic traditions, and twenty-five reciters of the Koran. The mausoleum also fulfilled a charitable function, serving as the place of retreat for four manumitted eunuchs of the sultan, or of his father, who each received a basic remuneration of 100 *nuqra dirhams* per month. The mausoleum was also provided with the necessary equipment, such as candles, mats, and oil for lighting to serve this purpose. With the exception of the Shafiʿi professor of law, the teaching of law at the college was entrusted to the chief cadis of the Maliki, Hanbali, and Hanafi legal schools. Each law professor had to teach the legal theory and substantial law of his school and had teaching assistants (*muʿids*, repeaters) at his disposal. The law college also provided religious instruction for the wider public, a service rendered by an imam who taught the people how to perform the rites of prayer correctly. No other charitable services for the public were stipulated by the pious endowment deed, although the poor are mentioned as being entitled to some payment but only under exceptional circumstances. The mausoleum also functioned as a family shrine, and so the body of the sultan's mother, which had been buried in another place, was interred there, as was the sultan's daughter, who had died young.[48]

The combination of a mausoleum and a learning institution was not incidental, and the Koran reciters as well as teachers and students at the complex were all required to beseech God's favor for the sultan and the Muslims while performing their *duʿa'* prayers. The obligation to perform the *duʿa'* prayers for the benefit of the founding patron was not some trifling detail lost among other specifications in a long and complex pious endowment deed.[49] For the founding patron it was the most significant stipulation and reflected his motives and expectations for a spiritual reward for his charity. Under the binding stipulations of the *waqf* document, the learned and pious beneficiaries of his charities were to be his advocates before God in his personal quest for salvation.

The value of the *duʿa'* prayers performed by people of the religious class and the mystics is illustrated by the following example taken from a completely different context. In 558/1162–1163, Nur al-Din suffered a defeat at the hands of the Crusaders, but his historians praised him for the way he rebuilt the army and record a conversation between Nur al-Din and one of his advisors who

suggested he use the vast resources of the pious endowments and charities dedicated for the jurists, *fuqara'*, Koran reciters, and the mystics for the needs of the army. Nur al-Din rebuked him, saying that he could hope for a victory only through the *du'a'* prayers of these people, since these prayers were like arrows that do not miss their target. Nur al-Din wrote to the ascetics in his realm, informing them about the losses suffered by the Muslims and the many prisoners captured by the enemy and asked them to continue their intercessory prayers.[50]

In light of the significance of the *du'a'* prayers in the religious life of the period, it should came as no surprise to find stipulations for their performance in other pious endowments deeds relating to religious and learning foundations. Ashraf Sha'ban's policies toward Arabia and his efforts to reform the taxation practices in Mecca and Medina have been discussed in chapter 4, but the pious endowment deed created by the sultan in 1376 had other purposes. One of the aims was to establish religious and educational posts at the two most holy sites of Islam: the Kaaba Sanctuary in Mecca and the Mosque-Tomb of the Prophet in Medina. At the Kaaba Sanctuary the posts of six reciters of Koran were established, and their duties were specified in detail. Following the morning and afternoon prayers they had to recite sections of the Koran and to deliver ten prayers for the Prophet, dedicating the rewards of their prayers to the sultan, his family, and the Muslims. A reader of Prophetic traditions was also placed at the Sanctuary, and his duties were to read Koranic exegeses, Prophetic traditions, and sections of the Koran after the Friday prayers. He was required to perform his *du'a'*, beseeching God for mercy and forgiveness for the sultan, his family, and the Muslims.[51] The teaching posts established at the Sanctuary involved a teacher of Prophetic traditions and professors for the teaching of the four Sunni legal schools. Each professor had between five and ten students, and the conduct expected and teaching duties were specified in detail, including their obligation to perform the *du'a'* prayers in the name of the sultan.[52]

Although Ashraf Sha'ban's foundation did not take the form of a law college, provisions for the education of orphans were made and the pious endowment supported a teacher and ten young orphans before the age of puberty. The teacher had to teach them Koran, Arabic script, and arithmetic, and they had to perform the *du'a'* for the sultan.[53] In fact, all of the post holders supported by this pious endowment were required to do this, and the list is a long one, including imams, muezzins, and others who performed functions related to rites at the Kaaba shrine. This pious endowment also financed an impressive array of charitable services in Mecca, foremost among which was support for the hospital in the town. Other services included the supply of clothing to the poor, widows, and those who lived in seclusion as well as shrouds for the dead. Similar provisions were made for religious and educational posts at the

Mosque-Tomb of the Prophet in Medina and the dispensation of charities in the town. The beneficiaries of the sultan's endowment were likewise obliged to perform the *duʿa'* for him, and the author of the pious endowment deed implored God to accept the charities offered by the founder.[54]

Law colleges were multifaceted, multirole institutions related to learning, but they also served much wider goals, and the great sultanic law colleges functioned as symbols of political power by manifesting the grandeur of the founding patrons and their domination over the scholars, which, although subtle, was overwhelming. Every law college was a charitable foundation and epitomized the piety of the founder, his desire for nearness to God, and his quest for salvation. Due to their political status and their control of vast economic resources, the powerful harnessed the scholars and religious functionaries for their own pietistic and political goals. By providing for scholars, men of religion, and the performance of public religious rites (recitations of Koran and Prophetic traditions), the founder, so to speak, appropriated commonly shared cultural and religious values and the *duʿa'* prayers of the beneficiaries of his charity to serve his own quest for salvation. The connection between the quest for salvation and the establishment of pious endowments that would preserve the memory of the founder has been demonstrated by Johannes Pahlitzsch in respect to late medieval Jerusalem. As indicated by some of Pahlitzsch's findings, this connection was not limited to particular cases but was a typical Islamic phenomenon widely attested to. For instance, the division of the spiritual rewards emanating from the various pious endowments set up by the Sawafid ruler shah ʿAbbas (1602–14) much concerned him, and the pious endowment deeds of his foundations specify to which of his ancestors these rewards should be given while excluding others. Shah ʿAbbas's pious endowments being dedicated for waterworks, religious-educational institutions, and charitable causes were typical of the *waqf* institution, although he himself conducted a reckoning of spiritual rewards that was far more pedantic than is usually specified in the pious endowment deeds.[55]

In the medieval world of learning there were many widely distributed law colleges, but they were by no means the exclusive medium for learning. The Ashraf Shaʿban pious endowment in support of education at the primary and higher levels in Mecca and Medina is an important illustration of this institutional flexibility.[56] The noninstitutional arrangements Ashraf Shaʿban made for learning in Arabia did have their precedents. Nur al-Din, for example, endowed classes for teaching the Maliki and Hanbali schools of law at a mosque in Aleppo. Prophetic traditions were also taught in endowed classes at mosques. For instance, Saladin set up a pious endowment for the teaching of Shafiʿi jurisprudence at the Umayyad mosque in Damascus, and he appointed Qutb al-Din al-Nisaburi, a leading Shafiʿi jurist in Damascus who had rendered him many services to be the supervisor of the endowment. In 626/1228–

29, in Baghdad, a mosque with a library was inaugurated that also served thirty young students of Koran taught by a staff that included a Koran teacher, a teacher of Prophetic traditions, and a repeater.[57] At the Ancient Mosque in Fustat, the teaching of law according to the four Sunni schools also took place. Each school occupied a certain section of the mosque, and the teaching was supported through pious endowments.[58] Such pious endowments, while serving the cause of teaching law, were much cheaper and quicker to establish than law colleges. Furthermore, given the institutional flexibility of the world of learning, different types of institutions could serve various purposes. As an example we can take the changes that a law college in thirteenth-century Jerusalem underwent. It was converted into a *zawiya* by the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-Muʿazzam ʿIsa, but it did not serve as a lodge for the mystics. In this *zawiya* he established posts for experts on the different ways of reciting the Koran and grammarians, and since this was an institution of learning, the sultan endowed it with books. The same sultan established another institution in Jerusalem that defies clear definition and is referred to as a *qubba* (a term that usually means a domed tomb or mausoleum). In this case, however, it served for the study of Koran recitation and also supported a law professor.[59]

The World of the Mystics: Ribats and Khanqahs

Three terms denoted institutions that were endowed for the mystics: *khanqah*, *zawiya*, and *ribat*. Many people of Persian origin lived in the Arabic-speaking lands of the Middle East, and Persian administrative and military terms entered the Arabic language. The term *khanqah* from the Persian became very popular, whereas the other terms are Arabic words. This usually partial but occasionally complete Persian-Arabic bilingualism is nicely illustrated in an account by Ibn al-Athir, who wrote that Nur al-Din, in towns under his rule, constructed endowed *ribats* and *khanqahs*. In another account he repeats this information on the authority of ʿImad al-Din al-Isfahani, who wrote that Nur al-Din established *khanqahs* for the mystics. The differences in the wording of both accounts are not incidental, and the second account reflects the fact that ʿImad al-Din, although fully bilingual, was a native Persian speaker.[60] It can be argued that, in these accounts, both terms refer to the same kind of institution and that the use of the terms is related to the mother tongues of the two historians, but *ribats*, *khanqahs*, and *zawiyas* were not entirely identical institutions, and their essence and the degree of congruency between them have been much debated. The safest thing to say is that, in the context of the mystics and their world, the word *ribat* meant a lodge. Some *ribats* were independent institutions, while others were parts of larger complexes. The same basic meaning of lodge is also associated with *zawiya* and *khanqah*.

Although there is a clear association between *ribats* and the world of the mystics, the term itself had a broad range of meanings, depending on the period and geographic area. It could signify a military outpost on the borders of Islam, a guard post along the shores, a lodge for travelers, or a lodge for mystics. The link between *ribats* and mystics is nicely illustrated by Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Fasi's (1373–1429) description of the *ribats* of Mecca. The essence of a *ribat*, like that of any other endowed institution, was shaped by the founder, who would usually stipulate for whom exactly his *ribat* was designated. In Mecca the range of these stipulations was very broad, and a *ribat* established in 575/1179–80, for example, was set up for mystics (*al-sufiyya*) arriving in Mecca or for those staying in the town—whether they were Arab or Persians.[61] In their stipulations certain founders emphasized that their *ribats* were intended for mystics described as ascetic, virtuous, religious, and pious. These statements reflected the fact that the world of the mystics was immense and involved many groups who adopted various styles of mysticism, worship, and conduct. Some groups, such as the dervishes, were on the fringe of what was acceptable to mainstream mysticism and the normative society as a whole. Awareness of these socio-religious complexities is illustrated by some revealing stipulations made for the *ribats* of Mecca. In 579/1183–84, the mother of the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir established a *ribat* for *al-fuqara' wa-'l-sufiyya*, a designation that, apparently even for contemporary people, seemed ambiguous, since it could mean dervishes and mystics or, less likely, the poor and mystics. To avoid confusion she added the following qualification explaining whom she meant by *al-fuqara' wa-'l-sufiyya*: "[These] ought to be pious, obedient to God, righteous, godly, ascetics of upright conduct capable of living in seclusion." In 577/1181–82, another woman who belonged to a little-known ruling family (referred to by the honorific *khatun*) established a *ribat* for mystics who were either Arabs or Persians, and in her endowment deed, she adopted a simpler terminology, instructing that the *ribat* was to be for virtuous mystics (*al-sufiyya*, avoiding the problematic term *fuqara'*).[62] Other stipulations dealt with the ethnic and geographic origins and marital status of the mystics for whom certain *ribats* were designated. In 529/1134–35, Ramisht, the well-known twelfth-century merchant millionaire, established a *ribat* for mystics from Iraq who were unaccompanied by women, while another *ribat* built in 771/1369–70 admitted only Persian mystics from the Iranian world, explicitly excluding Indians. In contrast to these two *ribats*, the Tamimi *ribat* set up in 620/1223–24 was open to both married and unmarried Persian and Arab mystics. Here, again, the term *fuqara'* is used but is qualified by saying that they should be righteous and religious mystics. Another early thirteenth-century *ribat*, however, admitted only unmarried Arab mystics who were not natives of Mecca. A wide range of selective stipulations also characterized *ribats* established for

female mystics. For instance, a *ribat* established in 590/1193–94 by two daughters of an officer was designated for God-fearing unmarried female mystics who belonged to the Shafiʿi legal school. Specifications whereby certain *ribats* were to be designated for people of a given legal school were made in other cases as well. In 578/1182–83, for example, the emir Qaymaz of Mosul, established a *ribat* for those who had chosen to live in seclusion, irrespective of whether they were devotees living temporarily in Mecca or permanent residence of the town who adhered to the Hanafi legal school.[63]

It is quite obvious that the most essential service offered by these *ribats* was lodging, and although unspecified, it can be assumed that the mystics admitted to these *ribats* could live there permanently. The crucial questions of food provision for the residents and the type and location of the properties endowed for the *ribats* of Mecca remain unanswered. We should assume that most of these properties were outside Mecca, since the narrow economic base of Mecca itself and the absence of an agricultural hinterland hindered the creation of any large local endowments. Furthermore, since the patrons who founded these *ribats* were foreigners whose wealth and properties were in their homelands, not in Mecca, these *ribats* must have relied on periodical transfers of funds from their distant endowments to Mecca. What life span institutions operating under these circumstances could have had remains unknown.

Ribats in more centrally placed towns were supported by properties either in the towns themselves or in their vicinity. The *ribat* established in 1189 in Jerusalem by Saladin, for example, occupied the house of the former patriarch of Jerusalem whose other properties were also endowed for this institution, which derived incomes from endowed rural land outside the city. This *ribat* was designated for mystics of all ages, ranging from mature adults to the old, both Arab or Persian, married or unmarried. The *ribat* also admitted, under specified conditions, mystics who arrived in Jerusalem, and their ritual obligations in this *ribat* are clearly set out in the endowment deed. These included prayers, recitations of the Koran on weekdays and Fridays, and the performance of the *duʿa'* prayer for Saladin at the end of each session of Koran recitation. The performance of the *duʿa'* prayer is also mentioned in the endowment deed of the *ribat* for female mystics set up by Tankiz in Jerusalem. This was a modest institution designated for twelve elderly, righteous, God-fearing women with no husbands, one of whom was supposed to serve as the supervisor and another as the keeper of the *ribat* with responsibilities for the visiting female mystics who wished to visit. The female supervisor of the *ribat* was to serve as the leader of prayer for the women during their daily prayers and, on Ramadan, to ensure the performance of the *duʿa'* prayers in the name of the Mamluk sultan and Tankiz. This female *ribat* was part of a larger complex that consisted of a law college for Hanafi jurists and mystics, and the ritual

obligations in both institutions established by Tankiz in Jerusalem included the deliverance of the *du'a'* prayers for the founding patron.[64]

The rise of the *khanqah* as an institution associated with the mystics, which offered them a place to live and practice their typical rites, had its origin in the Iranian world. During the twelfth century it spread throughout the Middle East and Egypt, and the size, staff, and opulence of the *khanqah* varied according to the status and wealth of its founder. One of the better known *khanqahs* of the Mamluk period was the one built at Siryaqus north of Cairo by al-Nasir Muhammad. In 725/1325 and 726/1326, two endowment deeds dealing with this institution were written and offer a glimpse into the essence of a grand late medieval Sufi institution. The two documents enumerate, in minute detail, the properties endowed and specify the functions of the institutions that made up this complex. Essentially the complex was a combination of a Sufi institution and a funerary monument to the sultan. The mausoleum was preserved as the burial place of the sultan and the sheikhs who were in charge of the mystics living there, while the simple mystics were to be buried in a different place. The burial expenses for the poor mystics, whether from among the permanent population or temporary visitors, were covered by the pious endowment of the complex. This attention to detail was not incidental, since the sultan wished to be buried in the company of the Sufi sheikhs, who enjoyed an aura of sanctity.

One of the most prominent features of the Siryaqus complex were the three *ribats* built there, one of which included sixty rooms (*buyut*) and was explicitly designated for *fuqara'* who came there. The term *fuqara'* presents the usual difficulties of interpretation, but in this context it must be understood as meaning the mystics. The two other *ribats* were smaller, each containing twenty-one rooms, and were designated for the mystics (*al-fuqara' wa-'l-sufiyya*) who lived in the complex.[65] The provision of water to the complex and specifications concerning the use of the bathhouse, washing, and laundering are dealt with in detail in the pious endowment deed. The complex included a mosque and Koran reciters as part of its staff, and the performance of the five daily prayers was mandatory.[66] The building of the *khanqah* served as a gathering place for the mystics, their sheikh, and those who stayed there on a temporary basis.[67] The initial number of mystics permanently associated with the *khanqah* was designated to be forty, and they could be either Arabs or Persians, either married or single. They had to be known for their righteousness and devoutness, and the sheikh who supervised the institution had the right to choose the candidates. The mystics who were given a large daily portion of bread, monthly allowances, and products such as olive oil, soap, and clothing, while extra provisions of food during the major Muslim festivals are also mentioned in the document. The sixty temporary residents, whose stay was usually limited to three days, were given a daily portion of bread and a small allow-

ance. In addition to the performance of their daily rites, the mystics living in the complex had obligations toward their patron, the sultan, which included the performance of *du'a'* prayers for him during his lifetime and the dedication of the spiritual rewards for reciting the Koran to him after his death and burial at the mausoleum.[68]

The stipulations laid down by the founder created a self-contained Sufi community that took care of its own spiritual welfare and daily needs. Both the imam and the muezzin were selected from among the mystics who lived in the complex, and the same applied to people responsible for manual tasks such as caring for the prayer mats, sweeping, lighting, door-keeping, cooking, and shopping. All these religious and manual tasks entitled them to extra payments, and the only manual worker hired from outside the Sufi community at the complex was the water carrier and his helper. The contacts between the mystics and the outside world were, however, a little more extensive than the above suggested, since the complex offered food to *fuqara'* (probably meaning the poor), and every three years a sum of money was allocated for the ransoming of Muslim prisoners of war.[69]

The second pious endowment deed written for this complex made no essential alternations to the foundation but did add some endowed property to the complex and enlarged the permanent population of the mystics supported from 40 to 100. The clauses stipulating the performance of the *du'a'* prayers for the sultan were repeated in the second pious endowment deed, while other clauses dealt with the medical services provided for the enlarged community. Two specialists, an eye-doctor and a surgeon, were recruited from the outside, but the internal physician was appointed from among the mystics themselves. Two new teaching positions were also created in the *khanqah*, one for Arabic language and the second for instruction in the seven canonic ways of reading the Koran. The enlargement of the permanent population at the complex did not come at the expense of visitors. Although the number of visitors permitted at the premises was not specified, a new position of supervisor over their registration was created, and the person in charge was also made responsible for determining the period of sojourn of each visitor.[70]

Al-Nasir Muhammad's *khanqah* was by no means exceptional, and other patrons among the high-ranking emirs and sultans founded similar complexes. If anything, his *khanqah* was inspired by the one established between 1306 and 1310 by Baybars al-Janshakir, then an emir and later the sultan Baybars II (1309–10). The *khanqah* of Baybars II, which was a large institution intended to provide for 400 resident and nonresident mystics, also included a *ribat* and the mausoleum of the founder. This *ribat* was populated by elderly, retired members of the Mamluk military class, and the pious endowments created to support this institution also financed a range of charitable functions that included paying the debts of jailed debtors, ransoming Muslim prisoners of war,

equipping fighters for the Holy War, and assisting pilgrims to the Holy Cities of Arabia. The poor could get medicines at the *khanqah,* and its endowment also paid for the shrouds and burial of the indigents.[71] This *khanqah*, however, had a checkered history, and following the killing of Baybars II in 1310, it was closed by the new sultan, al-Nasir Muhammad, when he began his third long reign, which lasted until 1341. For fifteen years the *khanqah* of Baybars II remained closed, its pious endowment was confiscated, and the name of the founder was erased from the foundation inscription. Only in 1326, a year after the establishment of al-Nasir Muhammad's own impressive *khanqah*, was it reopened and its pious endowment restored.

Endowed institutions with resident populations were vulnerable to changing circumstances, since the residents lacked the necessary skills and flexibility to adapt to changes, and thus found it very difficult to leave a depleted foundation in order to seek a fresh start. The plight of people caught in such a dilemma is rarely reflected by the sources, but a rare exception is a letter written by the great polymath Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (1445–1505), which attracted the attention of a perceptive scholar. It concerns the residents of the *khanqah* of Baybars II where Suyuti served as a supervisor between 1486 and 1501. This *khanqah* faced grave difficulties as a result of two droughts in 776/1374–75 and 796/1393–94, which ruined its endowed agricultural lands. The diversified composition of the original endowment at least ensured a certain cash flow, but the food rations to which the mystics were entitled were replaced by stipends. By Suyuti's time the pious endowment of the *khanqah* was insufficient to support the provisions stipulated by the founder, and in the letter, Suyuti tried to explain his actions to the discontented residents. It is a truly remarkable letter, reflecting the personal concerns of Suyuti and the difficulties he faced as an administrator. On a personal level Suyuti reminded the residents that he had reassumed his duties by their unanimous request and had relinquished the remuneration he was entitled to receive from the revenues of the pious endowment. In the strongest terms Suyuti insisted that he had adhered to the law, tradition, and the stipulations of the founder, and he accused his opponents of unlawfully profiting from the pious endowment. At the same time Suyuti writes that, in fact, he was the one who was flexible in interpreting the stipulations made by the founder who had designated the *khanqah* for the mystics and not for jurists. He went on to say that the current residents in the *khanqah* at that time were an ignorant lot with no knowledge of mysticism or of the law, implying that they should have been replaced by others. The level of education of the people affiliated with the *khanqah* was a significant issue that had been indirectly addressed by the founder who had envisaged the eventuality of shrinking incomes. In such case he had stipulated that those who were entitled to continue to enjoy the benefits granted by the pious endowment were to be the most deserving ones, meaning the most learned among the occupants of the

foundation. Suyuti insisted that, if he had literally followed the stipulations made by the founder, most of the residents of the *khanqah* would have had to be expelled—certainly the jurists and the ignorant mystics.[72]

The problems Suyuti faced as a director were by no means unique, and similar cases are known from literary sources. In 797/1394–95 the occupants of the *khanqah* Saʿid al-Suʿada' in Cairo complained to the sultan that their daily meals were curtailed due to a drought that had ruined the agricultural lands endowed for their institution. Their complaint should be seen in the broader context of the fact that the number of residents had grown to 300 and had adversely affected the overall ability of the pious endowment to finance the provisions to which they were entitled, such as the monthly delivery of soap and the annual distribution of garments. The sultan appointed the emir Yalbugha as director, and with the support of people of the religious establishment, he tried to implement the original stipulations of the founder, Saladin himself, who had designated this *khanqah* to be for foreign and local mystics and people with an inclination toward mysticism among the jurists. Yalbugha's reforms involved the expulsion of those who held positions outside the institution and the better-off residents. The reconstruction, from literary sources, of the original provisions of the pious endowment deed suggests that Yalbugha's policy was highly problematic, since Saladin had not necessarily intended this *khanqah* for the very poor mystics. One of his provisions stipulated that the property of a dead occupant below the value of twenty *dinars* was not to be seized by the authorities but was to be divided among the other mystics in the lodge. This stipulation envisioned celibacy but not utter poverty, because a legacy of about twenty *dinars* in the twelfth century could have been described as typical of people of modest means.[73]

Learning and Mysticism Combined

The combination of students and teachers of law and mystics in the same institution became common practice in the late Mamluk period, and the formal designation of such institutions, whether *madrasas* or *khanqahs*, reveals little about their essence. This is only discernible when a pious endowment deed has survived or a detailed foundation inscription has been preserved. The Dawadariyya established in 695/1295–96 in Jerusalem, which is referred to in the inscription as a *khanqah* designated for thirty mystics and novices who could be either Arabs or Persians, exemplifies this problem quite well. Twenty of the occupants were supposed to be bachelors, and ten were supposed to be married, while visiting mystics and novices were offered hospitality for ten days. The founding patron, a Mamluk emir, also provided for the teaching of law, Prophetic traditions, and Koran.[74] Such a blend of functions became typical

irrespective of the rank and status of the patron. Sultan Qaytbay created a large pious endowment for a congregational mosque and a law college in Damietta, the Ashrafiyya Madrasa. This institution combined mystics, the teaching of law, education for children, and charitable functions such as lodging and food for traveling mystics. In addition, a Koranic school for children and orphans was also financed through the pious endowment of the Ashrafiyya. The teaching was entrusted to a jurist, and the children were expected to be taught writing and arithmetic.[75] Another foundation of Qaytbay—the shrine established for the thirteenth-century saint Ibrahim al-Dasuqi in the Delta—reveals the same fusion of mysticism and law with charities distributed to the rural population. The shrine complex housed Shafiʿi jurists, who taught law according to their school, mystics, and a Koranic school. The people affiliated with the shrine received food, while larger amounts were distributed during religious festivals for visitors and the poor. Women were also associated with the shrine, and some stayed at the complex in a *ribat*. Although this was a sultanic foundation, it was located in the midst of a rural area and served local needs, but the people associated with it received far less than in similar urban institutions. The ubiquitous stipulation to mention the name of the sultan in the prayers of those enjoying his munificence was, nonetheless, not forgotten.[76] The fact that institutions founded by the Mamluks combined the functions of a Sufi lodge and a law college did not go unnoticed by the scholars. This trend is explained by Doris Behrens-Abouseif as testifying to the growing fusion between religious learning and mysticism whereby the mystics acquired education and the law students became exposed to mystical practices.[77] Leonor Fernandes has noted the desire of the Mamluks to gain legitimization and popularity by identifying themselves with the mystics who were appreciated by the masses.[78] When the issue is approached from the point of view of the Mamluk patrons, the endowments for mystics had the same rationale as the endowments for scholars and learning. In the eyes of the Mamluks, the mystics, like the scholars—perhaps even more than the scholars—constituted a channel of intercession with God for their salvation. The fact that mystics and scholars were established in the same institution, thus blurring the distinction between the *madrasa* and the *khanqah*, was as much due to the personal considerations of the founding patrons as to the socio-religious realities of the age. In late medieval Egypt, the primary motive behind the creation of pious endowments that supported scholars and mystics was to provide sustenance for people who belonged to these two groups and not to establish institutions of a certain type. People and their activities, not institutions, embodied the religious-cultural values of the society and, at the same time, served as channels of communication with God on behalf of the founding patrons. Thus scholars, mystics, and Koran reciters were located in any place where their presence was considered

beneficial and instrumental to the founding patron's quest for salvation. The essence of the institution was of lesser concern and could either be large funerary complexes consisting of learning and Sufi institutions or more modest establishments such as mosques, *ribats*, and charitable institutions.

A nice illustration of a charitable institution in mid-sixteenth-century Jerusalem that provided an essential service (the distribution of food to the poor) and was also instrumental to the salvation of the benefactor was the soup kitchen set up by Haseki Hurrem Sultan, the wife of the Ottoman sultan Süleyman (1520–66). She, in fact, established a complex of three institutions: a soup kitchen, a lodge for devotees living in the city, and a lodge for travelers. Her motives are clearly stated in the pious endowment deed, which shows that the patroness, so to speak, was trading the riches of this world for the prayers of supplication for her salvation, delivered by the devotees living on her foundation, and ultimately divine reward.[79] The efforts made by high-ranking Muslim patrons to secure the *du'a'* prayers of people living on their foundations for themselves as well as the establishment of Koran reciters at funerary complexes and other institutions have their parallels in other civilizations as well. Western Europe of the late Middle Ages, for example, saw a proliferation of chanteries in which prayers were offered aimed at interceding with God for the soul of the founding patron. Some of these chantries were associated with places of burial, while others were set up in churches and cathedrals, but in certain cases chantries were also established within religious-charitable institutions.[80] *Du'a'* prayers, Koran recitations, and chantries are cognate phenomena and spring from religious affinities between the monotheistic religions. Thus the decline of chantries is linked with theological shifts in Christian doctrine, which questioned the validity of masses and other pious deeds for the benefit of the dead.

6

Charitable Institutions and Causes

The Terminology of Charitable Institutions

Medieval Islam did not develop a specialized nomenclature for designating types of charitable institutions, unlike Byzantium, whose terminology for them was rich and diversified, albeit overlapping. In Byzantium, as in Judaism and Islam, poverty was legally defined, and people under a certain economic threshold were regarded as poor. Houses for the poor (*ptocheion/ptochotropheion*) in Byzantium admitted only the poor who were incapacitated by illness or old age, making it difficult to distinguish between hospices for the aged (*gerocomeia*) and those for the poor. Medical services were provided not only in hospitals (*xenones/xenodocheia*) but also in homes for the aged. There were institutions designated for orphans, the blind, and the lepers and lodges for pilgrims, strangers, and travelers. In both Byzantium and Catholic Europe, churches and monasteries dispensed charitable services and ran charitable institutions. Some Byzantine towns, including Jerusalem, were endowed with an impressive array of charitable institutions, including hospitals and houses for the poor, the elderly, and the blind. Other towns in Byzantine Palestine had certain charitable institutions, and the monasteries in the Judean Desert extended hospitality and care to travelers and the needy.[1] When one compares Byzantium and medieval Islam, however, one is struck by the absence in Islam of what Michael W. Dols has called "public institutions and services for the poor and disabled."[2] Although this statement, made by a renowned historian of Islamic medieval medicine, does not ignore the existence of hospitals in Islam, it does point out that the existence of other types of institutions known to exist in Byzantium is not attested to in the lands of Islam. The different institutional realities between Byzantium and Islam are nicely illustrated by the care offered to the orphans. In Byzantium, in contrast to Islam, the existence of orphanages, including impressive and well-equipped institutions, is well attested to. In 472, for example, the emperor Leo I established a large orphanage in Constantinople that enjoyed a long life span and was reorganized by Alexios

I (1081–1118). Nonetheless, as Timothy S. Miller has pointed out, orphanages never came to dominate the child welfare system in Byzantium. The tendency was to leave the orphans with their extended family and to appoint guardians to take care of their needs, while Church institutions offered them education. In Byzantium, there was no parallel to the Islamic network of endowed Koranic schools for orphans, which also supplied food and clothing.[3]

The lack of a precise terminology that deals with charitable institutions in Islam is exemplified by the most crucial text describing such institutions in medieval Muslim urban society: Ibn Khallikan's account of Muzaffar al-Din's activities in twelfth-century Irbil. Ibn Khallikan says that Muzaffar al-Din not only established and maintained four *khanqahs* for the chronically ill and blind (meaning, perhaps, two establishments for men and two for women) but also built houses for widows, young orphans, and foundlings. The term *khanqah* is also used later on in his account to mean an institution for the mystics. The use of the term *khanqah* in conjunction with houses for the chronically ill and blind (in fact, hospices) indicates the lack of any special nomenclature for such institutions. There were no special terms used for orphanages, and the general and flexible term *house*, used in the account, had to be qualified as a house for such and such a group.[4] In the same way, the lodge for visitors established by Muzaffar al-Din is referred to as a guesthouse, whereas the hospital in Irbil is referred to as a *bimaristan*, the most widely used appellation for referring to hospitals. Although making an argument based on the silence of the sources has its dangers, it must be noted that Ibn Khallikan mentions neither pious endowments for the charitable institutions founded by Muzaffar al-Din nor makes any reference to pious endowments for the law college established by him. Only the two *khanqahs* established for the mystics are explicitly referred to as endowed institutions. One must draw the conclusion that Muzaffar al-Din's charitable institutions and deeds were financed by cash payments, which means that these unendowed institutions had no future, being entirely dependent on the goodwill of the donor. In his assessment of Muzaffar al-Din, Ibn Khallikan says that his charitable deeds were extraordinary. If by this he meant the totality of Muzaffar al-Din's exploits, he was certainly right. When considered separately, however, many of Muzaffar al-Din's deeds appear to be common acts of piety and philanthropy in the medieval Muslim world: support for mystics and jurists, celebration of the Prophet's Birthday, dispensation of charity, ransom of prisoners of war, and care for the sick in hospitals. One cannot escape the impression that what struck Ibn Khallikan as being unusual, not to say an oddity, were the charitable institutions established by Muzaffar al-Din.

The absence of a specialized terminology designating charitable institutions does not necessarily mean there was an institutional void, since charitable institutions and services are attested to in connection with the most common

institutions that served other goals. The complexity of mixing primary and secondary functions is illustrated when two institutions, the *ribat* and the *zawiya*, are examined.

Charitable Ribats and Zawiyas

Although the word *ribat* meant a lodge for the Sufis, *ribats* were built for other groups and purposes while retaining the basic function of a lodge. When the *ribats* of Mecca are reexamined, it becomes clear that some were established for visitors and pilgrims arriving in town. One *ribat*, for example, was endowed for poor Arabs and Persians who were unaccompanied by women and had come to Mecca as pilgrims or were staying there as devotees. The hospitality offered at this particular *ribat* was limited to three years, but another *ribat* admitted people from Isfahan for only forty days, while people from other regions could stay in it for as long as ten months and twenty days. The intentions of the founder and the logic behind his stipulations remain unclear. In some *ribats* both mystics and other people were admitted, which turned the place into a lodge that accommodated a variety of groups. The most universal *ribat* in Mecca was the one established in 529/1134–35. It admitted men of religion, Koran reciters, and *fuqara'* (probably meaning mystics) from Damascus or Iraq who were either Arab or Persian.[5] The designation of *ribats* as lodges was not limited to Arabia, however, and in 679/1280–81 sultan Qalawun built a *ribat* for pilgrims arriving in Hebron. The foundation inscription of this *ribat* states that it was for *fuqara' zuwwar al-Khalil*, meaning mystics, the poor, or both. In 681/1282–83 he established another *ribat*, bearing a similar inscription in Jerusalem. The close association between *ribats* and shrines was also common and is widely attested to. In 666/1267–68, for example, a *ribat* that provided for the needs of the pilgrims was established next to the shrine of ʿAli in Kufa. Another *ribat*, designated for *fuqara'*, was set up at the shrine of Sulayman al-Farsi.[6] In other cases, specific charitable designations of *ribats* are clearly discernible.

Charitable *ribats*, which provided shelter and most likely also food, functioned as homes for the aged, especially elderly women (or widows) and the indigent. At least three of the *ribats* of Mecca were explicitly designated for the poor, and the same was true for Medina, where a *ribat*, built in 706/1306–7, was designated for the poor and foreigners unaccompanied by women.[7] The fact that, during the Mamluk period, *ribats* served as homes for the elderly and the poor has been noted by scholars such as Donald P. Little and Th. Emil Homerin, but the evidence extends beyond the Mamluk period.[8] In sixteenth-century Jerusalem, for example, an Ottoman officer who had become rich established a *ribat* for the poor, and in the first half of the twelfth century, a

ribat for the needy was established by the Qarakhanid khan Muhammad ibn Sulayman in the rural hinterland of Bukhara.[9] *Ribats* built for women were common. In tenth-century Fustat and twelfth-century Cairo, *ribats* for *ashraf* women and aged widows were established, while in 492/1098–99 the former stewardess (*qahramana*) of the Abbasid caliph al-Muqtadi (1075–94) built a *ribat* for widows who chose to lead a life in seclusion in Mecca. Another well-known *ribat* for women was the *ribat* al-Baghdadiyya built in Cairo in 684/1285–86 by the daughter of sultan Baybars. This was one of the most interesting charitable institutions of Mamluk Egypt, being designated for women who were divorced or who had run away from their husbands. Here they found shelter until they remarried or returned to their husbands. The woman who was in charge of this *ribat* was known for her piety, learning, legal education, and asceticism. The Mamluk historian Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalani described this *ribat* as a hospice for widows, but having no word for hospice, he used the term *mawdaʿ*, a deposit box.[10] Other *ribats* built for female mystics are known to have existed in Mecca, twelfth-century Baghdad, and thirteenth-century Cairo and Damascus. In other cases, institutions for female mystics were referred to as *khanqahs,* and six institutions of this type were established in Zankid and Ayyubid Aleppo and enjoyed the highest possible patronage—that of Nur al-Din and the Ayyubid royal women.[11]

Other *ribats* were built as homes for retired people who had once belonged to the households of rulers and other high-ranking members of the ruling class. For example, in 656/1258–59, the Ayyubid princess ʿIsmat al-Din Zuhra built a *ribat* for her manumitted eunuchs, slaves, and Koran reciters, but she made the poor the ultimate beneficiaries of the properties endowed for this institution. She was not an exception, and there is much evidence of care and provision being shown for former slaves and eunuchs by their owners in medieval and Ottoman Islam.[12] *Ribats* that primarily served the mystics also offered charitable services for the wider population, primarily providing food and shelter for the needy. This combination of functions was common, for example, in thirteenth-century Anatolia.[13]

Ribats figure prominently in the descriptions of the Iranian world, and Transoxania provided by the two most famous geographers of the tenth century, Ibn Hawqal and Muqaddasi. In their accounts, however, the link between mystics and *ribats* is little attested to. In Tirmidh (modern Termiz in Uzbekistan on the border of Afghanistan), for example, a *ribat* served students of law and religious subjects while other *ribats* served as local shrines of Koranic and Islamic figures.[14] One in the vicinity of Marw (modern Mary in Turkmenistan) contained the head of Husayn, the son of ʿAli, while other *ribats* were known as the shrines of Dhu ʾl-Qarnayn, usually identified with Alexander the Great and the far more enigmatic Dhu ʾl-Kifl.[15] *Ribats* for military purposes, especially for guarding the roads, are mentioned, but the most frequent allusions

are to *ribats* that were endowed as lodges for travelers. This role is explicitly attested to for the Iranian world, but things are less clear with regard to Transaxonia. Ibn Hawqal, who was enthusiastic about Islam in Transaxonia, notes that the Muslims there were rich and spent large amounts on *ribats*, the maintenance of roads, the Holy War, and charitable deeds. What *ribats* functioning as lodges for travelers could offer besides shelter is not specified.[16]

The *zawiya* was another institution that served the mystics. One of the better-known *zawiyas* is that of Hasan ibn Illiyas al-Rumi in early sixteenth-century Cairo. Its pious endowment deed has survived and has been studied by Leonor Fernandes, who offers insight into what such an institution really meant. The *zawiya* was populated by non-Arab mystics who lived, prayed, and studied there, had their food cooked and served on the premises, and led their daily lives according to the stipulations of the founder as recorded in the endowment deed. The staff included a supervisor, a teacher, an imam, and a muezzin, while other post holders were responsible for cooking, storing the wheat, and keeping accounts. The daily life of the residents moved between study (the *zawiya* was equipped with a library), prayers, and meals and was characterized by Fernandes as austere. In exchange, the residents received life tenure, medical care, and provisions, and as long as the pious endowment was economically viable and properly managed, they could expect to enjoy the privileges accorded to them by the founder as an expression of his piety and religiosity.[17] The link between *zawiyas* and the world of the mystics was not, however, exclusive, and often *zawiyas* functioned as charitable foundations rendering services similar to that of the charitable *ribat*. A notable example is provided by the Maghrabi *zawiya* in early fourteenth-century Jerusalem, which was established by a private patron and designated for the poor.[18] This association between *zawiyas* and charitable functions, such as the provision of shelter and food, in late medieval Egypt has been pointed out by Fernandes. There was also a certain association between *zawiyas* and the education of women—something that provoked criticism by the puritans.[19] As in the case of the charitable *ribat*, the evidence available to us goes beyond the Mamluk period and geographically extends to North Africa as well. From documentary sources we learn that, in early sixteenth- century Hama, a certain *zawiya* provided meals for travelers and functioned more as a charitable caravansary than as a lodge for mystics, while in another *zawiya* the poor received alms.[20] Other institutions associated with the mystics in sixteenth-century Damascus also assumed functions of dispensing bread and food to the poor. The renovation inscription of a Tekka, in the Salihiyya quarter of Damascus (962/1554–55), reminds the reader that the distribution of food to the poor, orphans, and prisoners is God's command and that the food offered by the renovator is a charity given in quest of God, asking for neither reward nor gratitude from the recipients.[21] The association between the *zawiyas* for the mystics and their

charitable functions for the wider public and the manipulation made of charities for political ends was also common in Morocco during the twelfth through seventeenth centuries.[22]

The institutions known as *ribats*, *zawiyas*, and *khanqahs* coexisted, and contemporary people either knew how to tell the difference between them instinctively or did not care too much. A modern reader of medieval texts, however, frequently feels lost as to the precise character of each of these institutions and the possible differences that existed between them. Ibn al-Mustawafi (d. 637/1239–40), for example, in *Ta'rikh Irbil,* his biographical dictionary of people associated with Irbil, frequently refers to these institutions, but his remarks are casual and terse, and it is impossible to gauge whether these institutions were exclusively designated for the mystics or were also offered other charitable services.[23] Our efforts to make clear distinctions between the services rendered by these institutions to the mystics and other charitable functions is really misplaced. From the point of view of a medieval Muslim, both donor and recipient, each institution, whatever its precise designation and function, was a charity. This was the rationale of the *waqf* institution, and mystics deserved charity just as much as the poor, if not more.

Hospitals

The European medieval hospital was quite an elusive institution that had many facets and escaped clear-cut definition. Nonetheless, Miller holds the view that "Byzantine hospitals (*xenones*) had begun to focus exclusively on caring for and curing the sick as early as the fourth century." The hospital services offered by the *xenones*, a term synonymous with *nosokomeia*, involved "bed, board, nursing care, and access to trained physicians.[24] He sees the Sampson hospital of Constantinople as a true hospital for the sick and the Byzantine hospitals, being institutions focused on curing the sick, as very different from their medieval counterparts in Latin Christendom. The latter "remained refuges for all sorts of suffering humanity—homeless, poor, orphans, the aged, and the maimed."[25] Other historians of Byzantine medicine adopt a broader view of medical institutions in Byzantium. For instance, Demetrios J. Constantelos, in his chapter on Byzantine hospitals, has discussed a wide range of institutions and comments that "the hospitals that existed in the Byzantine empire were general hospitals, leprosaria, maternity clinics, ophthalmological dispensaries, and foundling institutions." He perceives the *xenon* as a hospice, characterizing it as a "home for strangers, foreigners, and travelers."[26] The Sampson hospital is described by Constantelos as a *xenon,* "both a house for the poor and strangers and a hospital." He uses the term *xenodochiea* as a synonym for *xenon,* with both meaning "hospice."[27] Dols has pointed out that making a

"distinction between caring and curing is not a helpful one for understanding hospitals in the medieval period."[28] He has observed that in Byzantium from the fourth century onwards the hospice (*xenon*) and infirmary (*nosokomeion*) merged, and both terms came to signify a hospital. The same evolution from hospice (*xenodocheion*) to hospital also took place in the Byzantine East, and after the sixth century, the term *xenon* became more associated with a hospital.[29]

When the research literature dealing with European medieval hospitals is examined, their multipurpose nature and the merging of care and cure functions are clearly seen. For many centuries the medical component in those institutions was minor and sometimes nonexistent. As has been noted by Nicholas Orme and Margaret Webster, one can at least learn something about institutions from the terminology applied to them, and in the case of the European medieval hospital, the original Latin meaning of the term referring to "hospitality" conveyed the essence and functions of this establishment well. Medieval hospitals admitted the poor, the sick, the disabled, and the aged and served as hospices for them.[30] When referring to medieval hospitals, the distinction between the modern meaning of hospital as a medical institution and the different nature of the medieval institution referred to must always be emphasized.[31] The multi-role character of the medieval hospital is attested to all over Europe, changing slowly only in the later Middle Ages but still prevailing during the early modern period. Michael R. McVaugh, for example, sees the early fourteenth century as a period of increasing medicalization of many aspects of life in the Aragonese society, but hospitals continued to fulfill a more social than medical function for their inmates. Both McVaugh and James William Brodman see changes in European hospitals only in the early fifteenth century when the focus shifted more toward curing and an emphasis on medical treatment.[32] The shift that began during the fifteenth century, however, did not bring about a total change in the essential nature of the European hospital. Colin Jones, writing about the Montpellier region, has noted that, even up to the closing decades of the ancien régime, hospitals were small multi-role establishments "more attuned to the exigencies of poverty than disease," which helped its poor and exhausted inmates to recuperate by providing better nourishment. The hospitals that formed the network of Hôtels-Dieu were not much different, serving the social needs of their patients more than their medical requirements. Things were quite similar even within the network of the Hôpitaux Général, established during the seventeenth century. The military counterpart of this network, the Hôtel des Invalides, on the other hand, from its inception at the end of the seventeenth century, assumed a more medical character.[33]

To return to medieval Middle Eastern realities, it must be pointed out that multi-role hospitals, similar to the European ones, were also typical of the

Outremer. The hospital of the Order of the Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, for instance, as depicted in an eyewitness account in the 1180s, was a most impressive institution. It was a large hospital with at least 1,000 beds, and it not only admitted sick and poor men and women but also cared for foundlings and abandoned children. The hospital was divided into wards, and the patients were attended to by physicians and ancillary staff. Dietary regulations were an integral part of medieval medical treatment, with proper nutrition certainly being of immense value for exhausted pilgrims and the poor suffering from malnutrition. St. John hospital was well provided with food, including meat, fish, and vegetables. Susan Edgington points out that the "overwhelming concern of the hospital was not curing but caring," emphasizing that the "modern analogy is not the hospital, but the convalescent house." This large institution had only four qualified physicians on its staff, although it occasionally treated a great number of soldiers wounded in the battles between the Crusaders and Muslims. Other smaller and more modest institutions in the Outremer also extended food, shelter, and care to the poor, pilgrims, and sick, placing an emphasis on hospitality rather than on professional medical treatment.[34]

The Islamic medieval hospitals, about which we have meaningful information, appear to be more like medical institutions with large staffs of physicians than the multi-role hospitals that were common in medieval Europe and the Outremer. Islamic hospitals resembled the great Byzantine hospitals, which, according to Miller, focused on providing medical care to their patients. Islamic hospitals are mostly referred to by the Persian term *bamiristan*, denoting a place for the sick, and the Arabic appellations *dar al-sihha* and *dar al-shifa'* are far less common. Like the Persian term, however, the Arabic terms convey the medical essence of the Islamic medieval hospitals by alluding to their role in the preservation of health (*sihha*) and the provision of cure (*shifa'*). Occasionally, alongside these technical terms, an explanation also appears, noting that the hospital (*dar*, house) is designated as a place for the sick.[35]

Hospitals, which became normative urban institutions common in the great capital cities of Baghdad and Cairo, gradually spread to provincial towns as well.[36] One of the better-known hospitals of the ninth century is the Tulunid hospital, built in Fustat between 259/872 and 261/874. A summary of its original pious endowment deed appears in the writings of late medieval historians who had access to earlier tenth-century sources and thus offers a glimpse into the nature of the institution. The first thing that catches the eye is that this was a richly endowed institution designated for the exclusive use of the civilian population with no entrance given to Ahmad ibn Tulun's military slaves. This reflected his policy of separating the slave and foreign army from the civilian population in order to minimize friction. The isolation of the army was also motivated by the desire to secure its single-minded loyalty to the ruler. The pious endowment of the hospital included houses and a covered market, and it

derived income from the slave market in Fustat, apparently meaning the various dues, customs, and rents collected at the market. Revenues were also generated by two bathhouses (one for men and another for women) built by Ahmad ibn Tulun and dedicated for the hospital. The hospital's procedures are briefly described and involved providing the incoming patients with new clothes (apparently a kind of hospital uniform) and linen. A meal was given immediately upon the conclusion of the reception, at which stage physicians took over. After recovery, the patient was served his last meal at the hospital, which consisted of bread and pullet, and after receiving his clothes and money back, he was discharged. The medical regimen is barely alluded to, but it can be understood that the underlying assumption was that treatment by physicians, the administration of medicines, and the provision of food led to recovery. The stress on nourishment, not as a therapeutic diet but as sustenance, is much emphasized. The Tulunid hospital had a special ward for the mentally sick, and until an unpleasant encounter between one of its patients and Ahmad ibn Tulun, the ruler used to visit the hospital and personally supervise its proper administration.[37]

The hospitalization of the insane must have been quite common in the middle ages and is well attested to in the writings of Abu Qasim al-Hasan al-Nisaburi (d. 406/1015–16). In his work devoted to wise fools (*'uqala' al-majanin*), or the intelligent insane to use an expression coined by Dols, al-Nisaburi reports on the hospitalization of wise fools in Basra, Baghdad, Mosul, Nishapur, and Syria (al-Sham, probably meaning Damascus). The institutions in which those people were kept are referred to as *bimaristan,* the House for the Sick (*dar al-marda*), and Mad House (*dar al-majanin*). The existence of a specialized institution for the insane is otherwise unknown, and perhaps the *dar al-majanin* should best be understood as being a hospital ward for the insane.[38] Parallel to the confinement of some wise fools in hospitals, others lived on the fringes of society, and one of the better known wise fools of the tenth century was Sibawayhi of Fustat, to whom the contemporary historian Ibn Zulaq devoted a short monograph. Sibawayhi's life was a difficult one and oscillated between periods of clarity and delusions. He was marginalized and yet protected by the learned, who saw him as a member of their class in spite of his mental situation. Perhaps Sibawayhi's position in society was exceptional, due to his wide learning in grammar and the traditional sciences, an education he acquired in his youth before he became afflicted by delusions. He was only twice forcibly confined for short periods in the *bimaristan*, apparently meaning the Tulunid hospital.[39]

In comparison with the Tulunid hospital, little is known about the hospital founded in Fustat around 346/957–58 by Abu Bakr Muhammad al-Khazin, an official in charge of the Arsenal in Fustat who commanded naval raids in the Mediterranean and whose other building activities involved two bathhouses

and two waterwheels. Al-Khazin's hospital and the other foundations established by him received pious endowments from Muhammad ibn Tughj (935–46), the Ikhshidid ruler of Egypt, who dedicated commercial properties he had built in Fustat, including covered markets and shops for that purpose.[40] Whether the Fatimids built any hospital in the tenth through twelfth centuries in Cairo remains a mystery, and what hospital al-Zahir visited in 1025 in the capital is unclear, but the references to a distribution of money during the visit to mentally ill patients suggest that it was the Tulunid hospital.

In comparison with the fragmentary knowledge about the pious endowment of the Tulunid hospital, little is known about the economic aspects of the ʿAdudi hospital, one of the finest imperial hospitals in medieval times, set up in 982 in Baghdad by the Buyid sultan ʿAdud al-Dawla. The hospital's initial staff included twenty-four physicians recruited from different places, and it also served as a teaching institution. During the many centuries of its existence, until the Mongol destruction of Baghdad in 1258, the ʿAdudi hospital attracted additional pious endowments and was taken care of by high-ranking patrons.[41] Abu Mansur ibn Yusuf, a civilian notable in Baghdad (395–460/1004–67), reestablished the ʿAdudi hospital while serving as its supervisor by renovating the building, recruiting physicians, and providing it with new pious endowments. Little information is available on the way the hospital functioned after this time, but in 626/1228–29 an inspection team from the court of the caliph arrived at the hospital to investigate its stock of drugs. The visit came about following information that the hospital was buying drugs; the investigating team found that the hospital actually had a stock sufficient for a year. This is a valuable report that indicates that the needs of the hospital were monitored and supplied by the ruling circles.[42]

The best known hospital of the Islamic high Middle Ages is the one set up in 1066 by Ibrahim ibn Nasr in Samarkand, and the survival of the hospital's pious endowment deed provides unique information on the motives for founding the hospital and its operation. In the deed, the founder states that the hospital is a sign of gratitude to God, who has bestowed prosperity on him and brought him victories over his enemies. His hospital, referred to as *bimaristan*, is described as a house for the sick intended for the helpless poor who had no support where they would find a cure for their maladies and afflictions. It was an institution exclusively for the Muslim inhabitants of Samarkand and travelers. The medical team of the hospital included a physician and an expert on bloodletting who were provided with the necessary medications. The sick were given meals, heating was provided during the winter months, and from the revenues of the pious endowment a special fund was set up to provide shrouds and the burial expenses for those who died in the hospital. Religion was very much present in this hospital. Its pious endowment was supervised by the person in charge of Samarkand's Congregational Mosque, and a muezzin and

an imam who were responsible for conducting the Friday prayers at the hospital's mosque were on the hospital's payroll. The physician was the highest paid staff member, receiving ten shares of the income of the foundation, while the bloodletting expert received only two shares. The duties of the physician are specified in general terms as having to attend the sick at all times and not neglect their affairs. The muezzin and imam were not well paid. The servant (*khadim*) of the hospital was better paid, but his duties were extensive and involved attending the sick, sweeping the hospital and mosque, and keeping the lamps lit. The founder, who was very realistic, took a long view of his foundation and made provision for the revenues of the pious endowment to go to the poor Muslims in the eventuality that the hospital became dilapidated.[43] The Samarkand hospital was designated as an institution for the poor and sick, and in this respect it bears resemblance to the foundation inscription of Nur al-Din's hospital in Damascus, which speaks of the hospital as a place for curing sick Muslims (literally weak) from among the poor (*fuqara'*) and those living in seclusion who wished to be cured. The hospitals inaugurated by Saladin in 1182 in Cairo and Fustat, which were intended for the weak (probably meaning the poor) and the sick, are described in similar terms. The hospital in Cairo was staffed by internal physicians and surgeons, and the one in Fustat was staffed by a physician and an oculist.[44] Although the Samarkand hospital was modest in comparison with the great imperial hospitals founded in Baghdad, Cairo, Damascus, and Aleppo, it epitomized the true nature of the Islamic medieval hospital as a healing institution supported by pious endowments that, while symbolizing the piety of the founder, also had wider social implications.

In the urban world of medieval Islam, hospitals became a widespread phenomenon, and along with some large and famous hospitals founded by rulers in their capital cities, there were many others, including some in provincial towns. This wide geographic distribution of hospitals is one of the more impressive traits of this institution. For example, in 413/1022–23, in the town of Wasit in southern Iraq, a Buyid vizier built a hospital that was an endowed institution but otherwise little known. The vizier was motivated by the fact that Wasit was a large provincial town, which also served as an urban center for the vast area of the swamps of southern Iraq and, as such, he reasoned, it needed a hospital. This is not entirely incidental information, for the provision of hospital care in provincial towns is mirrored by other reports as well. In 629/1231–32, the caliph instructed the governor of Basra to rebuild the congregational mosque in the town and to set up a hospital. The caliph financed the building of the hospital from his own legally obtained funds, indicating that he regarded this project as a pious deed, and he ordered the governor to provide the hospital with extensive pious endowments.[45] Hospitals in capital cities and provincial towns, if properly endowed at the inauguration, were able to survive

for many centuries, as seen by the fact that hospitals set up in the twelfth century by Nur al-Din in Homs and Hama whose endowments consisted of urban properties and rural estates functioned well into the sixteenth century. By the sixteenth century, however, both hospitals needed urgent repairs, and although the administrative costs absorbed most of its incomes, the larger hospital in Hama, which employed a physician, an eye doctor, and a surgeon, still provided the patients with medicaments, food, and beds.[46] The survival of hospitals depended much on their ability to attract new pious endowments and caring patrons over time. Obviously, the prestigious imperial hospitals enjoyed an advantage in attracting new benefactors, and this is what happened with both the ʿAdudi hospital in Baghdad and the Mansuri hospital in Cairo. This hospital, built by Mansur Qalawun in 683–84/1284–85, was a prestigious institution, and in many cases, the people appointed as the supervisors of its pious endowment acted as patrons, using their private funds for the hospital. One of the more renowned patrons of the hospital was the emir Aqush al-Ashrafi (d. 736/1335–36), a military slave of Mansur Qalawun who rose to the highest military rank in the Mamluk army and who also held administrative appointments. While serving as the supervisor of the pious endowment and the Mansuri complex, to which the hospital belonged, he financed renovations at the complex from his own pocket and paid special attention to the welfare of the insane patients. Another civilian administrator of the hospital improved its declining pious endowment and took great care of the sick as well.[47]

The essential nature of Islamic medieval hospitals is nicely illustrated in the account of Ibn Jubayr's travels. He admired the hospitals and law colleges he saw in the Middle East, saying that they were "among the greatest glories of Islam." This attitude might explain why he, of all writers, provides an account of the medical practices in the hospitals he saw. In all he describes four hospitals in Alexandria, Cairo, Damascus, and Baghdad. The one he describes in Alexandria was established by Saladin, and Ibn Jubayr gives the impression that it was designated for North African pilgrims arriving in the town, but such a designation seems too narrow and thus doubtful. In any case, the medical team consisted of physicians and ancillary staff, with the physicians prescribing medications and a diet for each of the patients and the staff having to carry out their instructions. Some sick people preferred to stay away from the hospital and were visited by the ancillary staff, who reported on their conditions to the physicians, who in turn prescribed medications for them. Saladin's hospital in Cairo far exceeded the one in Alexandria, and Ibn Jubayr regarded it as one of most splendid deeds of the sultan. In the hospital there were separate wards for men, women, and the mentally sick, all of which were well stocked with medicines, and physicians conducted two daily rounds, their orders being carried out by the ancillary staff. The hospital in Fustat operated in the same way but was smaller. In Damascus, Ibn Jubayr saw two hospitals, one undoubtedly

established by Nur al-Din, and the other established more recently by Saladin. This newer hospital enjoyed a hefty income of 15 *dinars* per day and was well managed, keeping records on the patients, their medications, and their diets. Ibn Jubayr says little about Nur al-Din's hospital, but some illuminating details are provided by Ibn al-Athir, who had personal experience with the Nuri hospital in Damascus. In an autobiographical note, Ibn al-Athir recounts how he arrived sick in Damascus after a pilgrimage to Jerusalem shortly after Saladin's conquest of the town from the Crusaders. In Damascus, he sought the help of a North African physician, but was let down by him. Having had a bitter experience with one physician, he decided to treat himself, relying on his own medical knowledge, but his illness only intensified. Eventually he found a physician at Nur al-Din's hospital who provided him with a prescription for the hospital's dispensary. Ibn al-Athir assured the physician that he had the means to buy the prescribed drugs, saying, "God elevated me above the mass of the poor," but his physician replied that it did not matter, since the hospital had been set up by Nur al-Din as a pious endowment for all Muslims—rich and poor alike. To make his point even clearer, he added that the members of Saladin's family also received their prescriptions from that hospital.[48] The ʿAdudi hospital in Baghdad impressed Ibn Jubayr much with its splendor and spaciousness, but although the patients were well cared for, they were only examined twice a week by the doctors.

The teaching of medicine, like that of the law, was maintained through the pious endowment system, and the terms employed for describing such teaching institutions in both fields are identical. Abu Shama uses the term *madrasa*, literary law college, when he refers to an endowed institution established in Damascus (probably in 621/1224–25) for the teaching of medicine. The same term, *madrasa*, used for a place where medicine was taught, is employed in connection with a hospital and teaching institution established in Basra in 1231–32 and with regard to another medical school set up in Damascus in the late thirteenth century.[49] The feeling that the teaching of medicine was inadequate and lagged behind the teaching of the law is reflected by a document from the Mamluk period and is explicitly stated in a letter of appointment given to Abu 'l-Hasan ibn Muwaffaq to the chair of medicine at the Mansuri hospital in Cairo. This was an endowed position, and the nominee was given the title of chief physician.[50] Mansur Qalawun, the founder of the hospital, was well aware of the preferences given to religious learning and religious institutions at the expense of medicine and hospitals, and he depicts himself as someone who would redress the balance by establishing both a hospital and a law college at his funerary complex in Cairo.[51]

In Muslim medieval society the availability of medical care was not limited to the hospitals. The rulers, viziers, and leading emirs, for instance, employed physicians at their courts who provided medical treatment to members of their

households. This facet of Islamic medieval medicine is well attested to due to the attention devoted to the ruling elite by the historians of the period. Although warfare was constant and widespread, we know surprisingly little about medical services for the military. According to one account, in the fourteenth-century Mamluk sultanate, for example, surgeons and eye doctors were stationed with garrisons in forts and strongholds maintained by the state.[52] One of the reasons for this poor state of knowledge of the history of military medicine is that the profession of surgeon was considered less prestigious than that of the physician educated in the Greek tradition, and therefore historical and biographical sources provide no information on surgeons.[53] In contrast to the lack of knowledge we have about military medicine, there is relatively much information on medical services provided for the communities of teachers and students and Sufis attached to institutions supported by pious endowments. For instance, the *khanqah* of Baybars II in Cairo included a hospital for the people affiliated with it, and the same sort of provision was made by the sultan al-Nasir Hasan (1354–61) when he built a large complex in Cairo during his second reign. This included his mausoleum, a law college, a Koranic school for orphans, and a hospital manned by a physician, an oculist, a surgeon, and ten ancillary staff.[54]

In conclusion, it can be said that the hospital is the charitable institution most clearly attested to in medieval Islam, and what made the Islamic hospital unique is the fact that it not only cared for patients but also offered them medical care that was sometimes diversified.

Charitable Caravansaries

Caravansaries usually functioned as business enterprises that supplied services to travelers and other users for a payment, and these caravansaries were occasionally endowed to finance charitable foundations. As has been recently shown by Olivia R. Constable, offering hospitality to travelers and strangers had a long tradition in the Mediterranean world, and medieval Islam was no exception. A charitable caravansary (*khan al-sabil*, *khan fi 'l-sabil*), however, was intended to provide lodging and food to travelers free of charge, and as such, it had to be supported by a pious endowment. In 1169, in Cairo, after Saladin's rise to power, one of his leading emirs, Baha' al-Din Qaraqush, built a charitable caravansary in the Husayniyya quarter outside the city's walls for the use of wayfarers who could stay there without paying rent. The choice of the Husayniyya quarter was not incidental, since it had been laid waste during the war between Saladin and the black regiments of the Fatimid army, and now it provided space for new uses and developments. The subsequent history of this institution is unknown, although it is possibly referred to in the events of

664/1265–66 when Baybars concentrated crippled people in a place described as a charitable caravansary before sending them away to Fayyum, where he allocated a village for them and provided for their needs. Most of the deportees, however, managed to return to the capital.[55]

One of the best-known charitable caravansaries is the *khan* built in 662/1263–64 by Baybars outside Jerusalem. Great efforts were invested in the erection of this building, in which were installed the doors of a former Fatimid palace in Cairo. This *khan*, equipped with an oven and a mill, served food and also provided spiritual welfare. A mosque and an imam were part of the foundation, which was supported by a pious endowment that comprised half a village. It seems that this charitable caravansary was part of Baybars's wider efforts to support pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He also established a pious endowment to cover the cost of bread, shoes, and other expenses incurred by pilgrims going by foot to Jerusalem. Other charitable caravansaries alluded to in the sources were built in several places in northern Syria and formed part of larger complexes that usually included a law college or a mosque. These complexes were built by military men of the ruling class, and at least in one case it is stated explicitly that the complex was maintained by pious endowments. Other charitable caravansaries were built next to existing monuments, such as the shrine of Husayn in Aleppo.[56] A complex that included a charitable caravansary, a congregational mosque, a law college, a hospital, and a bathhouse was established in Gaza in the first half of the thirteenth century by the emir Sanjar al-Jawali. Vast pious endowments were created to support this complex, especially the hospital.[57]

Some idea about the way a charitable caravansary functioned can be gained from the Ottoman register of pious endowments in Syria. In early sixteenth-century Hama, a certain charitable caravansary that served food had quite a large kitchen and waiting staff. Every day 20 dishes were prepared for staff and 100 for visitors, and each dish was accompanied by two portions of bread. The nature of the dishes is not specified, but the Ottoman register does refer to the preparation of soups and the purchase of meat.[58] In the second half of the sixteenth century, a pious endowment created in Syria also included provisions for a charitable caravansary and a mosque. This mosque had a basic staff to supply religious services for the travelers as well as bread, soup, and meat, with the composition of each serving of food precisely defined by the pious endowment deed. This *khan* was similar to one established by Baybars and reveals a continuous tradition of providing for the spiritual and physical needs of travelers. In this case Islamic values, based on Koranic teachings, merged with Middle Eastern religious and cultural traditions. Although a number of inscriptions commemorating the foundation of charitable caravansaries have been published, the epigraphic evidence does not provide information beyond the documentary and literary sources.[59]

Funerary Complexes and Charities

Medieval people were preoccupied with salvation, and funerary rites were aimed at helping them achieve this goal. In Islam, as in Judaism and Christianity, the notion of charity and salvation was deeply embedded in religious thought and social practice. Cemeteries, for example, became one of the venues where charities were handed out and pious deeds performed. These beliefs are well expounded by Ibn ʿUthman al-Ansari (d. 1218), who wrote a guidebook to the shrines in the cemeteries of Fustat-Cairo. He states that the presence of a person at a funerary procession opens the door of salvation for him; thus attendance at a funeral was not primarily a social act but acquired religious significance. The socio-religious importance of funerals is reflected in Musabbihi's writings, and in his chronicle of the events in 1024–25 in Fustat-Cairo, he devotes a lot of attention to the size and composition of the mourning party, recording whether or not the corpse was carried by the participants at the funeral.[60] The cemeteries became places where charities, especially in the form of food, were distributed. These deeds were not only motivated by the social considerations of commemorating the deceased and maintaining the family's prestige, but aimed at securing redemption for the deceased.

What ordinary people did, the powerful did on a grand scale, and the ideological underpinnings of their actions are clearly stated in the pious endowment deeds written for the funerary complexes they built for themselves. We can begin with the funerary complex that the sultan al-Nasir Hasan established during his second reign between 1354 and 1361 in the heart of Cairo. The pious endowment deed states that this *waqf*, meaning the complex itself, was to be a continuous charity whose bounties would last forever.[61] The relation between the pious endowment and the complex was, of course, symbiotic, since the complex could not operate without the revenues derived from the pious endowment, and the act of endowment would become meaningless without the functions fulfilled by the complex. Thus the document's emphasis on the pious endowment as a symbol of continuous charity and not the complex is insignificant. What is significant is the allusion to the notion of continuous charity, which explains, in fact dictates, the content of the complex. Continuous charity is considered one of the deeds that secures salvation, the other two being learning and prayers for the deceased. Thus a funerary complex had to have an element of learning and employ people to deliver prayers for the deceased founder. The learning component was fulfilled through the law colleges and a Koranic school for orphans, which also epitomized the concern for the welfare of the orphans, a Koranic injunction. The prayers for the deceased sultan (*duʿaʾ*) were performed by a large group of Koran reciters established at al-Nasir Hasan's complex.[62] The charitable services financed by the pious endowment involved the distributions of food to the poor on Fridays and during

Muslim festivals such as 'Ashura', Ramadan, and Rajab. The recipients were not only people affiliated with the complex but also the poor, and detailed instructions concerning these distributions appear in the pious endowment deed.[63]

A hierarchical division is discernible within the professional groups associated with the complex, with the teachers and teaching assistants attached to the law colleges ranking higher than those of the Koranic school. The hierarchy among the physicians to which everyone at the complex also had access took the form of placing internal doctor above eye doctor and surgeon (whose specialization was considered merely a craft).[64] There were also religious functionaries at the complex, including imams, muezzins, and Koran reciters, and manual staff. One group, however, is especially notable: the eunuch freedmen of the sultan who were attached to his mausoleum. When examined as a whole, the complex indeed served as a continuous charity whose beneficiaries were those associated with the complex, but it also had a certain impact on the wider society. Eventually much depended on the way the endowed properties were managed, and knowing this, the founder left detailed instructions about how the long-term interests of the endowment were to be secured.

Funerary complexes became common, and the ideological foundations of such institutions were often stated. As an example we can take Qaytbay's pious endowment deed for his funerary complex outside Cairo. The document restates the belief that continuous charity and the prayers of men of religion, mystics, and orphans redeem one from Hell, and it also refers to the Prophetic tradition concerning the three deeds.[65] The concept of continuous charity could only be implemented through a pious endowment, and Qaytbay's pious endowment deed explains why the combination of mystics, men of religion, and orphans was so important at the funerary complexes and other institutions. Prayers for the deceased founder performed by the learned, the religiously inspired, and the innocent were instrumental for his salvation.

The concepts outlined in Qaytbay's endowment deed were widely shared in medieval Islam, and the deeds and views of the Ilkhanid khan Öljeytü (1304–16), who founded Sultaniyya, a new capital city in northwestern Iran, reflect an identical frame of mind. His funerary complex, which was situated within the citadel, included the tomb of the khan as well as a mosque, a law college, a lodge for mystics, a guesthouse, a house for Koran reciters, and a house for students of Prophetic traditions. In one of the houses a holy relic, the hair of the Prophet, was preserved. Öljeytü's worldview, although somewhat crude, was simple and direct, and he is cited as saying: "No matter how many sins I have committed, with this strand of hair I still have hope [for redemption]."[66] In most other cases it was not a holy relic but the funerary complex itself, with its religious and charitable institutions, that was intended to secure salvation and eternal life for the founder. Öljeytü's vizier, Rashid al-Din (1247–1318), a man

of high culture and sophistication, a patron of learning, and a renowned historian, drew the link between continuous charity and heavenly rewards, and this reflects the standard thinking of the age. Near Tabriz he constructed a large funerary complex for himself that was supported by an exceedingly rich pious endowment and included a law college, a lodge for the mystics, a school for orphans, a hospital, a bathhouse, and a guesthouse. More than 300 were provided accommodation and food in this complex, while visitors to the tomb could stay for three days in the guesthouse and be fully cared for. Adjacent to the complex was a public kitchen that, in addition to this, provided meals to 100 indigent people each day. The workforce in the complex included 220 married slaves whose work and life were regulated in detail by the pious endowment deed written by Rashid al-Din himself.[67] Ilkhanid tradition goes back to Ghazan Khan (1295–1304), who established a large funerary complex outside Tabriz that included the usual mix of charitable institutions and functions providing education to 100 orphans and giving food and clothing to the poor.[68] Funeral complexes in Iran of the Timurid period (1405–1507) were identical. Typically, the mausoleum of the founder was surrounded by religious, educational, and charitable institutions, and the people established at such complexes included both the jurists and mystics, while the charitable services offered included the dispensation of food and the provision of medical services.[69]

The Distribution of Food

During the period under discussion, most of the urban population lived at a subsistence level. Many went hungry most of the time, if not all the time, and malnutrition was surely rampant. Bread was the staple, and for many bread was the only food available. Ibn Saʿid al-Maghribi (d. 1286) says that the plight of the poor in Cairo was only tolerable due to the low price of bread, but it is difficult to establish whether this remark reflects a passing impression or is an observation of more enduring realities. Fluctuations in the price of bread in the urban market were watched with great apprehension, and the situation could easily deteriorate into panic. When freshly harvested grain became available in Cairo, the better-off tried to buy enough for a year's consumption by their household and, in that way, protect themselves from price fluctuations and occasional shortages. The state and the ruling class, who had both political power and direct control over rural areas and the peasantry, secured vast supplies of grain for themselves that were far above their immediate needs. The surplus grain was stored, sold for profit, distributed on various occasions as an act of patronage and charity, and occasionally used to relieve famine. In times of plenty the state dispensed food among the elite on the occasion of religious festivals as a social act aimed at solidifying their loyalty toward the ruler. But food was also given to the poor.[70]

Ibn Tuwayr's description of the administrative practices of the Fatimid and Ayyubid rulers offers insight into the management of the grain surplus kept at the state granaries. During the Fatimid period this grain was given to state officials and palace servants, to those entitled to charities, and to the staffs of both mosques and congregational mosques. Grain was also allocated to the black corps of the Fatimid army, the navy, and the royal guesthouse. Supplies for the court figure prominently on Ibn Tuwayr's list, with grain from state granaries being ground at special mills after which the flour was brought to the palace. During Muslim religious festivals, the Fatimid regime distributed food to state officials and meals were prepared in Dar al-Fitra, at the annual cost of 7,000 *dinars*. In the Fatimid palace, during the nights of Ramadan, meals were served for army officers according to their rank, and even more exclusive were the receptions attended by the Fatimid ruler himself during the Festival of the Breaking of Ramadan and the Day of Sacrifice. Altogether the state spent 14,000 *dinars* annually on meals served on these occasions.[71] The customs prevailing under, or created by, the Fatimids in Egypt had their parallels in other places in the Middle East and under other regimes. For instance, in Zankid Mosul during religious festivals, food was distributed in a law college founded by ʿIzz al-Din Masʿud ibn Mawdud (d. 589/1193–94), the local ruler. In Aleppo, meals were also distributed on Fridays at the shrine of Husayn during the Ayyubid period and during Ramadan in the Mamluk period. In Homs during the Mamluk and early Ottoman period, meals were dispensed at a Sufi lodge during religious festivals.[72] It is true that, in these cases, the poor were not specifically targeted, but they certainly could enjoy the meals offered.

The provision of food, especially during Ramadan, became a well-established tradition under the Fatimid and Abbasid rulers, and Baybars maintained this custom. During the nights of Ramadan he distributed food to 5,000 poor people, while his other charities involved the provision of 4,000 shirts and the manumission of thirty slaves.[73] The distribution of food and charity to privileged groups, not necessarily the poor, during religious holidays had a long tradition going back to the eighth century, and its continuation into the Fatimid and Mamluk periods is not surprising.[74] State patronage over religious festivals and the massive presence of rulers at mosques also had a long history. Ahmad ibn Tulun, with his army and full entourage, was present at the inauguration of the Tulunid mosque (built 876–78), and he used this occasion for distribution of charities and meals for the poor.[75] In Fustat, during the rule of Ahmad ibn Tulun and later that of Muhammad ibn Tughj, military reviews were held during the Festival of the Breaking of Ramadan, and both rulers used to visit Fustat's two congregational mosques, where they provided meals for the people (*nas*, a vague term with no precise sociological meaning).[76] Distribution of food also played an important role in mourning rites. For example, following the death of the mighty Fatimid vizier Yaʿqub ibn Killis in 980,

mourning rites took place at his mausoleum for a month. Koran reciters were present during the whole period, and food was served by slave girls to the low- and high-ranking women who participated in the rites. The sociological terms *khassa* and *ʿamma*, employed by Maqrizi in his account of these events, are generally understood but have some ambiguity, and it is not clear whether he specifically meant low- and high-ranking women of the court or women of the elite and commoner women. In any case, recitations of the Koran, the presence of women, and the offering of food marked the official mourning rites ordered by al-ʿAziz for the deceased vizier.[77]

The grain policy of other Muslim rulers was similar to that of the Fatimids. For example, Baybars made generous distributions of surplus grain to the poor, mystics in their lodges, and people living in seclusion, and he even established a pious endowment for buying bread for the poor. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, in the very clear distinction he makes between the distribution of grain termed as favor (*niʿma*) and the pious endowment, says that the sultan relinquished possessions in this world (grain) in the hope of a reward in the afterlife. Although the term *niʿma* usually appears in the context of relations between patron and protégé, in this account it acquires the slightly different meaning of charity, political expediency, and patronage. Baybars's distributions were large, 16,000 *irdabb* per year, and depended on the existence of a surplus, but the size and composition of the pious endowment set for purchase of bread for the poor are not specified, and their impact cannot be assessed.[78] It must be kept in mind that Baybars's foremost concern was to ensure enough grain and fodder for his household and the Mamluk troops, and he designated 120,000 *irdabbs* for these purposes. Nonetheless, the sultan maintained generous food distributions during the Ramadan and fed 5,000 people each night.[79] The Mamluk sultan Barquq, when serving as an emir and later as sultan, is said to have provided food including meat and bread on each day of Ramadan to a variety of people—in mosques, shrines, and lodges of the mystics as well as prisoners in jails and the *fuqara'* in the cemeteries. These meals were provided in addition to his annual distributions of grain among the righteous and those who lived in seclusion (*arbab al-satr*).[80]

The questions that need to be asked are how widespread food distributions to the poor really were, and whether these became institutionalized and supported by pious endowments. The pious endowment deeds of law colleges and lodges for the mystics did include stipulations concerning the provision of food for those affiliated with these institutions. The combination of urban properties (which provided a cash flow) and agricultural lands (which provided grain) became standard features of pious endowments for institutions of this type created in Egypt by Saladin, his Ayyubid successors, and the Mamluks. To what degree communities of scholars and mystics affiliated with law colleges and lodges could become independent of the highly volatile urban grain market

for their basic food requirements remains unknown. In any case, these arrangements only provided for small and selective communities of scholars and mystics and had little to do with feeding the poor. Even when food distributions for the wider public were stipulated in the endowment deeds of these institutions, the first priority was to satisfy the needs of the people affiliated with the foundation.

These observations are in line with Sabra's remark that, until the fifteenth century, pious endowments created specifically for the feeding of the poor were rare. He has found that, between 1349 and 1516, only twenty-three pious endowments in Cairo included provisions for feeding the poor, especially at the tomb of the founder of the endowment in question.[81] Pious endowments whose aim was to offer food to the poor and needy were also created in Palestine, and the Ottoman register contains entries about several such pious endowments that were set up and dedicated for several charitable causes. These provided for food distribution to the poor in Jerusalem, for the provision of food to the sick at a hospital in Jerusalem, and for the distribution of meals in Hebron. They were multipurpose pious endowments, which either gave very specific instructions about how the food was to be distributed at a certain *ribat* or provided general stipulations, such as "flour for the poor."[82] One can only agree with Sabra, who states that "feeding the poor was not an important priority for the founders of endowments in the Mamluk period." The institution of the public kitchen, however, was already known in the Middle East prior to the Ottomans as exemplified by the Dashishah established by the Qaytbay in Medina, which has been mentioned already. Another such kitchen is alluded to in a family pious endowment created in Mamluk Palestine for the Dashishah at the Barid Gate of Damascus, which provided food for prison inmates.[83]

It is important to emphasize that distributions of food were not necessarily dependent on specific institutions such as public kitchens, and when provisions of food for the poor are examined, considerable institutional flexibility is discernible. Free meals provided under various kinds of arrangements were available at holy places, shrines, and endowed institutions. These charities were supported by pious endowments and were intended to operate for long periods.[84] For example, the distribution of food for pilgrims to the Tomb of the Patriarchs in Hebron was a long-established custom linked to the tradition that depicts Abraham as the epitome of hospitality and describes him as sharing his food with everyone and distributing it to the poor. Nasir Khusraw, who visited the Tomb of the Patriarchs in 1047, left a vivid description of the food distribution there. Bread, olives, and lentils cooked with raisins in olive oil were given to hundreds of pilgrims who visited the place daily in a public kitchen that employed girls to grind the wheat and barley and to serve meals. A tradition circulating in the late Middle Ages even claimed that the partaking of food distributed by the public kitchen in Hebron was a prerequisite for a valid and

meaningful pilgrimage. Thus this food distribution acquired the status of a ritual duty obligatory for each pilgrim visiting the site, irrespective of his economic circumstances.[85] Ibn Fadl Allah al-ʿUmari, who visited Hebron in 745/1344–45, noted that the kitchen distributed between 7,000 and 10,000 loaves of bread on a regular day and as many as 13,000 loaves on the Day of Sacrifice. The kitchen also dispensed a lentil dish with fish and a *dashisha* meal that was a charity to be enjoyed by the poor, the rich, and people of authority as well. Although the activity of the public kitchen in Hebron was financed by a special pious endowment that consisted of a great number of villages in the Jerusalem area, institutions supported by pious endowments were not immune from deterioration, and their ability to operate depended on the fortuitous combination of many factors. The public kitchen of Hebron ceased to function for unknown reasons, and only the intervention of the Mamluk regime in 663/1264–65 brought it back into operation. In 665/1266–67 and 668/1269–70, Baybars took over as patron of the place by restoring the shrine and distributing charities.[86] The arrangements for charitable food distributions in the Islamic medieval world, impressive as they were, could not meet the needs, and the overwhelming majority of people in the medieval Middle East led a precarious existence and were exposed to malnutrition.

Famines

Famines challenged the readiness of regimes to distribute food to the needy and the population at large. There were no typical patterns of response to famines, and sometimes the whole system of supplies and price control simply collapsed. For example, in 940–41, a severe famine caused high mortality rates in Baghdad. Corpses were buried, unwashed without shrouds, in mass graves without even a prayer being said. While some people behaved in a proper religious way, offering charities and shrouds, most people remained indifferent and sinful. Occasionally, it seems, it was easier to care for the dead than for the living, and in 1056–57 in Baghdad, the regime that was either unable or unwilling to feed the poor instead took care to provide for proper burial of the victims by supplying shrouds.[87] Although no effort was made to alleviate the plight of the population during the relatively well documented famine of 1024–25 in Egypt, charities were dispensed to the poor during other crises. In 1012–13, when Cairo suffered a shortage of bread, al-Hakim himself distributed charities among the poor, and during the Egyptian famine of 1200–1201, emirs and people of the civilian elite, Muslims and Christians alike, dispensed charities. The involvement of the elite was certainly influenced by the conduct of the ruler, the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-ʿAdil (1200–1218), who, it is said, personally distributed charities to both the pious living in seclusion and the poor

and made extraordinary efforts to supply shrouds for the dead. Other accounts credit al-ʿAdil with more than just handing out charities: he provided food for 12,000 people in Cairo and acted as an example to emirs and people of means who cared for others. In 1200–1201, in spite of the difficulties, the power of the state and its structure remained intact, but the internal crisis of the 1060s in Egypt was marked by political fragmentation and temporary collapse of the state's administration. The starving people were abandoned to their fate, but a flour merchant continued to supply flour to the needy, earning himself a name for posterity, and the memory of his deeds lingered on into fifteenth-century Cairo.[88]

Baybars took very determined, and apparently successful, steps to fight the famine of 1263–64. After making several futile attempts to ensure the supply of bread in the capital, the sultan ordered the sale of wheat from the royal granaries, insisting that the sale be made to the poor and widows and not to the privileged. In addition, he ordered the *fuqara'* to assemble at the royal residence, the citadel of Cairo, to register their names, and the emirs and top-ranking dignitaries of the state were ordered to provide food for three months to those registered. Members of the civilian elite, leading merchants, and witnesses of the court also provided sustenance for certain groups of people. Baybars's biographer, Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, is quite enthusiastic about the response of the civilian elite, saying that people opened their private granaries and distributed charities.[89] Three other social groups received special attention: the blind, Turkomen, and Kurds—the latter two probably being nomadic tribes who had entered Egypt under special permit and had rendered military service to the state. The ambiguous term *fuqara'*, however, is problematic, and we do not know whether the sultan provided for mystics alone or for the urban poor in general. Another biographer of Baybars says that those who were cared for were *saʿalik*, beggars or vagabonds, meaning the lowest class of the urban poor. Leaving aside the problem of terminology, however, the inner logic of Baybars's deeds suggest that his policies could not have been selective and aimed only at the mystics but must have had broader designs to pacify the wider urban masses.[90]

The Mamluk sultans to some extent repeated the policies of Baybars in other cases of famine caused by the high prices of food but not necessarily by the failure of crops. During the crisis of 1395–96, Barquq ordered a daily allocation of 20 *irdabb* of flour for the baking of bread for the poor in the capital, and he had it distributed among prison inmates and in cemeteries where the righteous used to congregate; money was handed out to those who did not receive their portion of bread. Maqrizi is clearly appreciative of the sultan's efforts and notes that no one died of starvation. Some, in his words, even got rich by receiving several allocations of bread while continuing to beg and thus were able to sell the extra bread they had at their disposal. It seems

that, more than reflecting reality, these remarks represent the prejudice of the urban upper class toward the masses.[91] Even during more severe famines, the Mamluk sultans either adopted the practices of al-ʿAdil and Baybars and imposed the responsibility for providing for the poor on the emirs and people of means or distributed charities themselves. The years 1294–96 were marked by a famine caused by an insufficient rise in the level of the Nile, which was aggravated by a drought in Libya. State granaries were empty, but the sultan Kitbugha (1294–96) made the emirs and others bear responsibility for feeding the poor. The policies of sultan al-Muʾayyad Shaykh (1412–21) were similar, but more selective, during the famine of 1416–17. The prices had began to rise during 1415, but sultanic intervention only took place in March and April 1416, when money and bread were dispensed among the *fuqaraʾ* and those living in seclusion in mosques and *zawiyas*. These distributions were later discontinued due to a shortage of food. Measures to relieve the plight of the poor also took place during 1425–26, when Barsbay provided assistance to the *fuqaraʾ* affected by the famine.[92]

Waqf al-Turahaʾ

Proper burial and the performance of funerary rites were religious duties provided for by the *waqf al-turahaʾ*, the pious endowment dedicated for the burial of indigents. In Egypt the first known pious endowment of this type was established by Baybars, and other endowments were created during the Mamluk period.[93] The establishment of special installations for the ritual washing of the dead, especially dead foreigners, is mentioned as a pious deed performed by some Mamluk emirs and sultans.[94]

Attention to and provision for the burial of indigents predates Baybars's *waqf al-turahaʾ* and the Mamluk period and is exemplified by the deeds of Abu Bakr Muhammad al-Khazin, whose building projects included two ablution basins dedicated for the ritual washing of the dead. The hospital that he apparently founded also provided shrouds for the dead.[95] Hospitals did provide shrouds, and we find such stipulations in a number of hospitals, including the hospital in eleventh-century Samarkand and the Mansuri hospital in thirteenth-century Cairo.[96] This aspect of socio-religious life not only was taken care of through institutional arrangements but, in many cases, was an initiative of individuals who took upon themselves the fulfillment of this service. In Cairo, during the early stages of the Black Death, some people made efforts to provide proper burial for the dead, but, as the epidemic intensified, this proved to be impossible.[97]

The Ransom of Prisoners of War

The treatment of prisoners of war was an issue much debated in early legal writings, and jurists such as Shaybani (750–805) and Abu ʿUbayd agreed that prisoners of war could either be treated with mercy or killed. The ruler was given wide discretionary powers to decide the fate of the captives in his hands. The jurists authorized an exchange of prisoners of war and the acceptance of ransom for the captives held by Muslims. The killing of women, the young before puberty, and defenseless people such as the blind, the crippled, the old, and the weak was prohibited, and those who embraced Islam were to be spared. The jurists based their rulings on the Koran and the deeds of the Prophet, who never hesitated to execute prisoners or to slaughter the defeated enemy. However, since the Prophet had also accepted offers of ransom for prisoners he held captive, the jurists discussed the ransom of Muslim prisoners from enemy captivity.[98] Abu ʿUbayd was very explicit on this issue and said that the ransom of Muslim prisoners had been made incumbent on the early Muslim community in Medina by the Prophet and that his example (*sunna*) had to be followed. He and Shaybani present several cases to illustrate that the Prophet did indeed ransom Muslim prisoners from captivity, but it must be said, despite the strength of Abu ʿUbayd's statements, the factual evidence supporting them are rather flimsy, lacking in detail, and few in number.[99] When Arabic medieval historical writings are examined, it is evident that Muslim rulers regarded the ransom of Muslims from enemy captivity as their foremost duty. Abbasid, Fatimid, Ayyubid, Mamluk, and Ottoman rulers did exchange prisoners of war with their enemies, whether Byzantine, Crusader, or European and, when it was necessary, paid ransom for the release of Muslims held by them. Occasionally, the Abbasid even ransomed non-Muslims such as Jews and Christians captured from their territories by the Byzantines. Legally, this was in line with Abu ʿUbayd's view that non-Muslims could be ransomed, using for that purpose the financial resources of the Treasury without stipulating conversion to Islam upon their release.[100] Local rulers such as Muhammad ibn Tughj in Egypt were also active in the ransoming of prisoners from Byzantine captivity. Ibn Tughj discovered that this was a costly but politically important affair, which ensured he developed both a local and international reputation. This issue, along with trade, figures prominently in Ibn Tughj's exchange of letters with the Byzantine emperor in 325/936–37.[101] Ibn Tughj's conduct was influenced by the Abbasid policies and practices of the ninth and tenth centuries when they regularly made exchanges of prisoners, known as *fida'*, with the Byzantines at a site on the Lamas-Su river in southern Anatolia. The Abbasids explained that they were driven by obedience to God and by compassion for the Muslims and the desire to see them free.[102]

Twelfth-century rulers Nur al-Din and Saladin are depicted as being very attentive to the issue of Muslim prisoners. In Harim (Harenc), in northern Syria, Nur al-Din, for example, established a kind of lighthouse whose aim was to act as a beacon for Muslim prisoners escaping the Franks in the direction of Muslim territory. It is said that the Franks offered Nur al-Din 20,000 *dinars* to cease the operation of this lighthouse, which he refused. Saladin, for his part, liberated many thousands of Muslim prisoners in the towns he conquered from the Crusaders after Hittin, and in Jerusalem he released 3,000 captives whom he provided with clothing.[103] The biographers of Baybars portray him as a ruler who was also much concerned with the fate of Muslim prisoners held in captivity. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir clearly stated that the ransoming of prisoners of war was a Koranic duty supported by sayings of the people of religion.[104] Many Muslim prisoners of war were set free as a result of political agreements made between the Crusaders and Baybars, who was also ready to set his Frankish prisoners free, thereby confirming the reciprocal character of such agreements. On the other hand, Baybars also executed Christian prisoners held by him as a form of retaliation for injuries inflicted on Muslims by the Crusaders.[105] The fate of Muslim prisoners of war was also dealt with in thirteenth-century truce agreements made between Muslims and Christians, which contained clauses for the release of Muslim captives.[106]

Political agreements were only one expression of the efforts made to ransom Muslim prisoners, and the use of the funds accumulated in pious endowments set up for this aim was also common. Tankiz, for example, ransomed Muslim prisoners brought to Beirut by a Frankish merchant, and on another occasion this was done in Damascus itself when a group of European traders arrived to the town in 727/1326–27 and were paid 60,000 *dirhams* for the ransom of the Muslim prisoners they had brought with them. The money was taken from the revenues of the pious endowments dedicated to this cause, and the cadi in charge of these *waqfs* declared that each prisoner brought to the town would be ransomed.[107] Sometimes the efforts to ransom prisoners necessitated going to Christian territories, and in 818/1415–16 a Muslim delegation, in cooperation with the local authorities, ransomed Muslim prisoners held in Cyprus, spending 13,000 *dinars* for the purpose. As a manifestation of goodwill toward the Mamluk regime, the ruler of Cyprus himself ransomed a number of Muslim prisoners.[108] In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the problem of Muslim captives was aggravated because of Christian naval raids on Muslim shipping and the coastal towns of the eastern Mediterranean. One of the more devastating raids took place in 1365 against Alexandria and ended with as many as 5,000 Muslims being captured and carried away. The ransom of so many people would normally have necessitated a heavy expenditure and prolonged negotiations, but the Mamluk authorities instead took retaliatory steps and arrested Europeans in their territories and forced the Coptic patriarch and

monasteries to put up the money needed for the ransom of the Muslims captured in this raid.[109]

The need to ransom prisoners was constant, since war was endemic in the medieval Middle East, and the danger of being captured by the enemy or by brigands was very real. Legal injunctions and the deeds of the rulers set an example for conduct by Muslim society, and this resulted in communities and individuals becoming involved in ransoming prisoners from captivity. For instance, the tenth-century geographer Muqaddasi writes that Byzantine ships used to bring Muslim captives to the coastal outposts (*ribats*) of Palestine, where they were ransomed by the local population. This was a communal effort with no involvement of the authorities. The costs incurred must have been enormous, since the standard ransom price for a person was 33.3 *dinars,* which represented more than a year's income of a skilled worker in the tenth through twelfth centuries. It seems that some kind of pan-Islamic solidarity prevailed in the Muslim Middle Eastern society, attested to by the fact that in 628/1230–31, Muslims from Majorca that had been brought to the port towns of Palestine and Syria were ransomed. On another occasion in 658/1259–60, the Mongols brought prisoners captured in a raid on Palestine to Damascus. In their habitual way, says the historian, they had killed the men but had imprisoned the women and the young, many of whom were bought from their captors while others escaped.[110]

Very few private people could rely on their private wealth to ransom prisoners, and although known, such cases were rare. Rulers and ordinary people as well had a powerful tool at their disposal for this purpose: the pious endowment institution. Perhaps it was not a coincidence that Qadi al-Fadil, Saladin's close aide, established a pious endowment for the ransom of captives. Although he was never personally involved in warfare, he was more than familiar with its gruesome consequences. For example, he unequivocally denounced the killing of prisoners even though his patron did this on many occasions. Other foundations were established in twelfth-century Damascus, and the practice continued from then on. In Damascus, in 664/1265–66, for example, the commander of a fleet of galleys delivered women and men whom he had ransomed from the Franks using *waqf* revenues.[111] In Mamluk Damascus there was a special administrative office set up to deal with the maintenance of the city's walls and ransom of Muslim prisoners. It seems that those in charge of this office were recruited from the ranks of the Mamluk emirs, and their letters of appointment remind them of the importance of both duties and the need to properly manage the pious endowments dedicated for those purposes.[112]

The ransom of captives is also a central obligation in Judaism, and the rules concerning ransom—such as who should be ransomed first and what kind of funds can be used for such purposes—are set forth in Jewish law. As borne out by the documents of the Cairo Geniza, Jewish communities and their leaders

invested great efforts and large sums of money for the ransom of captive Jews, and on the whole their endeavors were successful.[113]

Pious Endowments for Certain Social Groups

The founder of a pious endowment had the legal power to define the purpose and uses of his foundation, including the insertion of restrictive clauses to stipulate who could or could not benefit. Thus a pious endowment deed seen by the historian al-Nuʿaymi in 1496 in Damascus, which stated that people of North African origin were allowed to stay in a *zawiya* built for them, was a perfectly legal stipulation. In this case the founder could fully exercise his legal rights and had defined which group would be allowed to enjoy his foundation. He went a step further and defined which individuals within that group would be permitted to stay in his *zawiya*: people of good qualities and upholders of the traditional ways. His other stipulations were of a similar nature but were formulated in negative terms; for example, he insisted that the supervisor of the endowment must not be a cadi. These conditions were in line with other restrictive stipulations made by the founders of certain *ribats* in Mecca.[114]

There are other examples of pious endowments designated for specific social groups, especially the *ashraf*. A large pious endowment for *ashraf* living in Fustat and Arabia was set up in the twelfth century by a Fatimid vizier, and similar endowments were created throughout the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods. The supervision of these endowments was in the hands of the *nuqaba'* of the *ashraf*, the officials responsible for checking the pedigrees of those claiming to belong to the *ashraf*.[115] These endowments reflected the religious and social esteem that this particular group enjoyed in Muslim society, and both individuals and regimes saw it as their duty to support them.[116]

Al-Nuʿaymi reports upon another type of pious endowments common in the Damascus of his day that was restrictive in nature but formulated in positive terms and designated for members of a local community. He mentions a pious endowment that supported newly married couples among the indigent Hanbalis. The Hanbali community also enjoyed two other pious endowments: one that supported the sons of old women and another that supported the *fuqara'* (in this context probably meaning the needy and not the mystics). Yet another pious endowment rewarded those who studied law according to the Hanbali legal school.[117] The Hanbalis, in Damascus and elsewhere, formed small close-knit communities, and this facilitated the creation of pious endowments within the community itself for its less fortunate members. The Hanbalis, although a minority in the town, were firmly entrenched in the Salihiyya quarter outside the city walls where they had established themselves and developed a community strongly identified with their quarter. For example, the

Hanabli law colleges in the Salihiyya were founded by members of the community and enjoyed no support from the respective rulers of Damascus who did support institutions established for other legal schools. The relations between the Hanbalis and the rulers of Damascus were complex, but in 1220 the Ayyubid sultan al-Malik al-Muʿazzam established a Hanabli circle in the Umayyad Mosque. The people of this circle figure in a truly remarkable document that was published by Dominique Sourdel. This document says in plain language that the people listed are poor and thus qualify for a charity given for the *duʿa'* prayers they performed for the ruler.[118]

The Hanabli pious endowments were not an isolated case, for other legal schools were also the beneficiaries of pious endowments. The collocation "Shafiʿi pious endowments," for example, appears in the sources, but the nature of these foundations is not clear, since the purpose of the endowments is not specified. How the "Shafiʿi pious endowments" were used for the much larger and amorphous Shafiʿi community (if such a community existed at all) remains an open question.[119] The pious endowments created for the Hanbali and Shafiʿi communities are the reflection of a fundamental issue in the social history of the late medieval Middle East: to what extent the adherence to schools of law served as a social marker, indicating associations that turned into social units within society. According to Ira M. Lapidus, schools of law "preserved traditions of legal studies and teaching, maintained schools of higher education, administrated the application of law, and in many parts of the Muslim world, provided for the organization of cohesive social life."[120] Pious endowments for law colleges identified with a certain school of law were the norm, and given the deeply rooted division of Islam into schools of law, it must have been the case. Law was taught within the framework of this division, and thus law students of the different schools were recipients of special endowments.[121] Zealous adherence to schools of law (*taʿassub*) and intense competition for posts and patronage are widely attested to in the medieval period. In tenth-century Egypt it is said that money was distributed for the adherents of the Maliki school by the Umayyad rulers of Spain, and this triggered similar support for the Shafiʿis by Kafur, the local ruler. In Mamluk Egypt the main rivalry was between the Shafiʿis and the Hanafis. The creation, in 663/1264–65, of four posts of chief judges in Mamluk Egypt by Baybars, each of which represented a different legal school, was explained by the dissatisfaction of the sultan at the way the Shafiʿi chief cadi carried out his duties. Even after the establishment of the four chief cadis, however, the Shafiʿi chief cadi managed to retain a superior position in terms of prestige and the supervision of the orphans fund. In 773/1371–72 and again in 781/1379–80, the chief Hanafi cadi unsuccessfully attempted to establish a separate orphans fund under his management. This Hanafi-Shafiʿi competition took place in four-

teenth-century Damascus when it revolved around the appointment of cadis and the supervision of the endowments of the Umayyad mosque, which traditionally were in the hands of the Shafiʿi chief cadi. Given the social importance of schools of law, it is thus rather surprising that endowments created for adherents of the different legal schools are not more widely attested to in the sources and that, when alluded to, with the exception of the Hanbali communal endowments, the purpose of these endowments remains vague.[122]

One of the most enigmatic references found in the sources is to *sadaqat al-nisa'* (*sadaqat* of women). It seems that the term *sadaqat* must be understood as applying to pious endowments. If indeed the term does refer to pious endowments, the only sensible interpretation is that these were set up for women and not by women, since there is no reason to believe that pious endowments created by women would be treated as a special and separate administrative category. It must be kept in mind that women were massively represented among the founders and patrons of pious endowments and, in many cases, women administered the endowments they set up. The beneficiaries of the *sadaqat al-nisa'* must have been women in need: the poor, the old, the sick, or widows. These endowments were supervised by the chief cadi, who occasionally enacted regulations concerning the way they should be handled.[123]

Less mysterious and better understood are the Jewish and Christian endowments dedicated for the poor of their communities. The best known are the pious endowments of the Karaite Jewish community of Cairo. Sometimes the stipulations explicitly related to the poor Karaites of Cairo, or Cairo and Fustat, but they were also for the Karaites and Jews in general, meaning both the Jewish Karaite and Rabbinic communities. The creation of endowments, or the dedication of portions of endowments, among the Christian communities of the medieval and Ottoman periods for their poor was also quite common.[124]

Unspecified Charitable Pious Endowments

In some cases the reasons why certain pious endowments were created remain vague. For instance, in 663/1264–65, Baybars endowed two stables for charitable causes (*ʿala wujuh al-birr*), and although one might wonder what income stables could generate at all, the main problem concerns the phrase "for charitable causes." It possibly had some concrete meaning that contemporary people understood without any further elaboration, but more likely the historians did not bother to specify, or had no concrete information regarding such endowments. If the causes for which these endowments were created had not been specified, it gave the supervisor of the foundation wide discretionary powers in his choice of beneficiaries.[125] Such endowments were not rare and are sometimes termed *al-ahbas al-mabrura* (charitable pious endowments), but

more commonly the general expression "for charitable causes" is used. For example, in 689/1290–91, a Mamluk emir created such an endowment that consisted of a caravansary outside Damascus and yielded a monthly income of 500 *dirhams*. In addition he left a large estate worth 300,000 *dirhams,* which, according to his will, was to be divided among Mamluk soldiers.[126] In 777/1375–76, another Mamluk emir set up an endowment to provide women with financial help to get married; however, the purposes of other pious endowments established by him remain unknown.[127]

The allocation of revenues for charitable causes was typical, or at least common, in a variety of pious endowments, and the endowment created in 1324 by the sultan al-Nasir Muhammad illustrates this point. The endowment in question was of the family type and was typical of the transfer of state land to ownership by the ruling class. The sultan bought land from the treasury and endowed it for the benefit of his descendants, but certain shares of the *waqf* revenues were dedicated "for charitable purposes," and this designation is explained as being motivated by the wish to approach God. A wide range of charitable purposes is referred to in the document: the provision of food, potable water, and clothing as well as care for pilgrims and fighters of the Holy War and the ransom of prisoners and debtors. One share of the revenues was dedicated for the benefit of Mecca and Medina, while other designations were left to the discretion of the supervisor of the endowment.[128] Judging from this pious endowment it can be inferred that when the phrase "for charitable purposes" appears in literary sources and pious endowment deeds, it meant the charities, or some of the charities, mentioned in al-Nasir Muhammad's pious endowment deed.

The expression "for charitable causes" also appears in connection with the treasury. In 974, in Egypt, the incomes of pious endowments were deposited in a section of the treasury that dealt with charitable causes and were to be divided among the beneficiaries who could prove that they were entitled to these payments.[129] This account is open to several interpretations. On the one hand, it can be seen as an attempt by the new Fatimid regime to control pious endowments and use them for its own purposes. On the other hand, one can also infer that this type of pious endowment already existed in the tenth century, indicating that unspecified endowments were indeed regularly created.

7

The Wider Context of Islamic Charity

The Ethics and Practice of Medieval Islamic Charity

In the three monotheistic religions, charity is the embodiment of a life of piety, the key for salvation, and an instrument of repentance and expatiation for sins. The ethics of medieval Islamic charity were rooted in the teachings of the Koran, but they also shared many common values with the ethical systems of Judaism and Christianity, which were similarly based on revelation and sacred texts.[1] Some of the relevant key Koranic concepts are expressed by terms such as *khayr* and *hasana* (a good moral deed), *maʿruf* and *salihat* (pious good deeds), and *birr* (piety, righteousness). The Koran implies that there is a connection between belief and charitable deeds, while disbelief is manifested by a refusal to help orphans and to feed the poor. The terminology used in the Koran shaped the vocabulary of charity in medieval Islam. The word *sadaqa* is the most common expression used in reference to charity, but charitable deeds are also described as *birr*, *maʿruf*, and *khayr,* while a righteous, pious, and charitable person is referred to as *salih*.[2]

Islamic charity was a sacred charity, a form of worship, rather than a form of altruistic behavior. It would be wrong, nonetheless, to depict Islamic charity, or the charities in other monotheistic religions, as driven only by bad conscience or by an expectation of divine reward. Complex motives were at work, and the distinctly human trait of altruism and its existence within the system of a sacred charity cannot be denied. When religiously motivated behavior, combined with or unrelated to altruism, was translated into practice, it assumed forms of assistance relevant to the needs of the premodern, preindustrial agricultural world in which the basic necessities for sustaining life—food, clothing, and shelter—were scarce and beyond the reach of many. The fundamental similarities of the sacred charities that prevailed in the premodern Jewish, Christian, and Muslim societies were the outcome of these realities. In Judaism, charity (*tsedaqa*) is a religious duty (*mitzva*) and a prerequisite for a life of

piety. The rules of charity are defined in detail by the religious law (*halakha*), and the Jewish communities of the medieval Mediterranean world maintained impressive charitable services, which provided for the distribution of wheat, bread, and clothing and helped individuals to pay their poll tax, as well as their medical education and burial expenses. The Jewish communities, also very active in the ransom of prisoners (a task that demanded great efforts and strained their limited financial resources), financed their expenditures through public appeals and pious endowments that were dedicated either to the community or to certain specific purposes.

The charitable services provided by the Jewish communities were no exception in the medieval Mediterranean world. In Byzantium, for example, the Church, the state, and private people were responsible for charitable institutions such as hospitals, hospices, orphanages, and homes for the poor and aged. The notion of charity was deeply entrenched as part of Christian ethics. The identification of the charitable drive with Christian ethics has been studied by Peter Brown, who has demonstrated how between the years 300 and 600 charity and Christian beliefs became congruent in the minds of Christian emperors, bishops, and people of the upper class. This spiritual-moral evolution led the Church to become involved in charitable activities and bishops to become associated with relief for the poor and charitable institutions such as *xenodocheia*. In legislation made by the emperor Justinian (527–65), the bishops were granted a role in the administration of the Byzantine Empire and were entrusted with responsibility for welfare and the management of charitable institutions.[3] For Christians, the poor came to signify Christ himself, and aid extended to the needy was given for Christ. Catholic moral teachings set forth seven good deeds that embodied charity and piety: feed the hungry, offer hospitality to the wayfarer, clothe the naked, satisfy the thirsty, visit the sick, provide for the orphan, and bury the dead. In Catholic Europe, as in Byzantium, providing food for the hungry, offering hospitality, ransoming prisoners, and ensuring a proper burial for the dead were charitable services provided by the Church, the state, individuals, and confraternities—the latter being more common in Europe than in Byzantium.[4]

I am not advocating, however, a deterministic approach, which claims that religion and actual needs explain the essence and form of Islamic medieval charity. Koranic teaching did govern some forms of charitable activity, but not exclusively, and other forces were also at work. The best example is provided by the case of the orphans and their treatment in Muslim societies. Taking care of orphans and their material needs as well as honest administration of their funds are Koranic injunctions. When Islamic society took shape and put Koranic values into practice, the cadi and the courts assumed the role of the guardians of the orphans, and these Koranic injunctions were not only institu-

tionalized but deeply embedded themselves in the ethical code of the society. Edward William Lane recognized that. In his work on the Egyptian society of the early nineteenth century, he makes the comment that "wasting the property of the orphans" was regarded as one of six grave sins—the others being disobedience to parents, idolatry, murder, falsely accusing a woman of adultery, and desertion while fighting infidels. Lane grasps the reciprocal nature of Islamic sacred charity very well when he writes that alms giving and expectations for heavenly rewards went hand in hand. He was also much impressed by the practice of hospitality that permeated Egyptian Muslim society and perceived it as a virtue. Lane's mode of thinking was biblical, and the hospitality offered by a Bedouin chieftain to his guests evoked in his mind the conduct of Abraham, the epitome of hospitality. Equally impressed by Middle Eastern hospitality was Alexander Russell. He offered the following two insights: hospitality was more visible in the countryside and among the Bedouins than in the cities, and the relations between host and guest were conceived as sacred.[5]

The care of Muslim societies for orphans also reveals other factors that shaped the practice of medieval Muslim charity beyond the parameters of Koranic ethics. Cultural values shaped the nature of charity at least as much as religion, and placing emphasis on the education of orphans exemplifies both the values of Muslim society and the dynamics of social interpretation of Koranic teachings. Learning was a value of paramount importance that was instrumental for the perpetuation of culture and was thus elevated to the status of worship. This dynamic process was responsible for the orientation of medieval Islamic charity toward the scholar and mystic, and the institutions identified with them rather than the poor. Medieval Islamic charity was more focused on society at large than on the individual in society, and within this broad orientation it preferred scholars to the poor. Learning was also a cherished ideal among the Jewish communities of the medieval Islamic world, and scholars, education, and synagogues were supported by pious endowments and charities. Elinoar Bareket, in her study of the Jewish community of Fustat, remarks that one of the major expenses of the synagogue was lighting to enable people to study into the night.[6] The fact that scholars were major recipients of charities reflected the centrality of learning to medieval Islam and Judaism. Learning was instrumental to cultural and religious survival, and those societies such as the Copts who failed to preserve their language and culture have found it hard in the long run to preserve their religious identity.[7]

The Life Span of Endowed Institutions

Medieval people were torn between acute realization that humans were mortal and material assets vulnerable and the wish to achieve salvation, pass on

wealth to their heirs, and immortalize their names. The massive creation of pious endowments is a reflection of the wish to attain these goals. The *waqf* institution, although it had religious underpinnings, also had wide social ramifications, manifesting both the social and cultural preferences of society and offering basic social services to both the needy and the population at large. To what extent pious endowments indeed provided security for personal and familial wealth and for the institutions and causes supported by them is a complex issue. Even with the most honest and capable management, ensuring the durability of a pious endowment was a very difficult task. Many factors worked against the longevity of pious endowments: fires, epidemics, wars, changing economic and monetary circumstances, changes in the urban fabric, crop failures, social unrest, and riots. These difficulties are nicely illustrated by one of the better-studied cases concerning the ability of a pious endowment to support the causes for which it had been created. In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Trabzon on the Black Sea, the 'Imaret-i Hatuniye enjoyed one of the richest and most extensive endowments in the town. The complex, established in the early sixteenth century, included religious, educational, and charitable institutions. Ronald C. Jennings has traced the composition of its *waqf* properties, the destruction inflicted on the complex in 1625 because of war, and the restoration of the foundation on orders from Istanbul. The mother of sultan Selim was reputedly buried in the complex, and this association of the complex with the Ottoman house apparently motivated the involvement of the central government. Another significant point clearly borne out by Jennings's study concerns the heavy expenditure laid out on the administration of the complex especially by the administrators' large salaries—drawn from the revenues of the pious endowment.[8] The restoration of this complex was rather atypical and reflected political considerations, since in most cases destruction suffered by an endowed complex would have terminated its existence.

The misuse and seizure of pious endowments were rampant abuses. Cases of misuse, meaning the use the revenues of a pious endowment for causes not specified by the founder, are not frequently referred to in the sources. Sometimes, as in 783/1381–82 and again in 784/1382–83, the pressure to divert the incomes of pious endowments to other purposes came from the regime and was resisted by the cadis.[9] Cases of actual seizure are frequently referred to, however, and given the sacred nature of pious endowments, the seizure of these properties was far more common than one might assume. The Mamluk sultan Lajin, for instance, during his short reign (1296–99) restored a number of pious endowments to their original designations. Among these was a pious endowment that had been set up for the *fuqara'* (probably meaning the poor) by Saladin's emir, Qaraqush. This must have been a rich foundation, which at the end of the thirteenth century still yielded an income of 10,000 *dirhams* per

year, and the cadi who was entrusted with its management tried to ensure the proper use of this money. Other restored endowments were sultanic familial *waqfs*, one established by Baybars and another by the wife of al-Kamil.[10] Greed and politics motivated the seizure of endowed properties. Barquq, for example, confiscated the pious endowments of a *khanqah* built by the emir al-Muzaffari. This seems to have been a modest institution that provided food for mystics and their sheikh and included two drinking installations for people and animals as well as a Koranic school for orphans. Even pious endowments set up by much higher-ranking patrons were not immune from confiscation, and in 774/1372–73 this happened to the pious endowment of the law college established by the mother of Ashraf Shaʿban, which was seized upon her death.[11]

Political changes could affect institutions as famous as the Azhar mosque. This mosque was founded in 970 as a symbol of the Fatimid rule in Egypt, and in 1010 al-Hakim set up a pious endowment for it that functioned until Saladin's overthrow of the Fatimids in 1171. Saladin closed the mosque and removed some very valuable silver plates upon which the names of Fatimid rulers had been inscribed and which symbolized the mosque's Ismaili character. In this case, as in so many others, Saladin was able to combine proper Sunni conduct with the profitable by melting the plates and benefiting from their silver content. It must be said that the institutional history of Azhar during the Fatimid period is obscure, but it is obvious that al-Hakim's pious endowment was insufficient to sustain the mosque over the whole span of the Fatimid period. During this period Fustat and Cairo suffered two major calamities: the civil war of the 1060s and the burning of Fustat in 1169; thus any commercial properties endowed originally by al-Hakim must have also been lost. On the other hand, Azhar was a mosque identified with the Fatimid regime and would, therefore, have been maintained by it in one or another form either by cash injections or by new endowments. What happened to Azhar's pious endowments and staff following Saladin's closure remains unknown. The restoration of the mosque, being initiated by a Mamluk emir and supported by Baybars and his khazindar (guardian of the royal treasures), emir Baylabak, took place only in 1267. The latter created a pious endowment for the mosque and established there a group of Koran reciters and jurists who taught law according to the Shafiʿi legal school. Present at the inauguration ceremony of the mosque were the higher echelons of the Mamluk military class, which turned the event into a state occasion and a display of Mamluk support for religious life. The piety of the Mamluk emirs and Baybars's political considerations—his constant search for legitimization—all combined in Azhar's renovations. This high-ranking patronage ensured a new future for the mosque, which was rebuilt in 720/1320–21 following an earthquake, and further works were carried out in 725/1324–25. Even more extensive renovations were carried out and new endowments created in 761/1359–60 by emir Saʿd al-Din,

who also built a nice residence for himself close to Azhar. Saʿd al-Din's renovation project required the permission of the sultan and involved building two typical charitable institutions characteristic of the Mamluk period next to the mosque: a water fountain and Koranic school for orphans. His other deeds were also entirely consistent with the usual forms of pietism and institutional provisions typical of the Mamluk period. He provided meals to the mystic who made Azhar their home, and he established at the mosque a Hanafi jurist who taught law according to his legal school.

The Azhar mosque became fully ingrained in the fabric of the religious life of the Mamluk period and served as a congregational mosque, a place for the mystics, and a law college. Between 761/1359–60 and 818/1415–16 the Sufi character of Azhar much intensified. In 1415–16 when the emir Sudub al-Qadi, who served as chamberlain and Azhar's supervisor, expelled the mystics from the mosque, they numbered 750 and were divided into several groups, each of which occupied a different section of the mosque. Azhar, however, did not lose its fame as a place of learning, and a whole range of religious topics was taught there. Maqrizi's description of the mosque conveys the impression that it was a popular place—in his words, a place of "spiritual elevation." Mystics and scholars in the mosque were supported by wealthy patrons who belonged to neither the military nor the religious class and who bestowed money and food upon them, especially during religious festivals. Maqrizi is unequivocal in his view of the consequences of emir Sudub's expulsion of the mystics, saying that God was quick to punish him through imprisonment at the hands of the sultan.[12]

Other Fatimid mosques also had complex histories, and their survival was ensured only when new patrons were able to integrate them institutionally into the mainstream religious life of the Mamluk period. The best example of how new relevance could invigorate a defunct institution is provided by the history of al-Hakim's mosque. During its long and checkered history, this mosque twice fell into disuse and served as a prison for Frankish prisoners of war and as a stable. In 702/1302–3, an earthquake ruined the mosque, and the repair works were carried out by the emir Baybars al-Jashankir, the future sultan Baybars II. More significantly he invested the mosque with a new essence: the teaching of law with all four Sunni schools of law being taught there each by a professor with a group of students. Other topics such as Prophetic traditions, Koran recitations, and grammar were also taught, and the scholars and students were provided with a library and sufficient water. In addition, a Koranic school for orphans was set up as part of the foundation, which was supported by endowed properties scattered in a number of Egyptian provinces. The ability to maintain learning activity in the mosque was seriously curtailed by the crisis of 806/1403–4 but somehow continued into Maqrizi's time.[13] The same process of converting an ancient mosque into an institution with a new and

relevant essence also took place in the mosque of Ahmad ibn Tulun. The urban area around the mosque had suffered much in the 1060s and had become uninhabited, causing the mosque to lose its importance and to deteriorate. For example, it was used as a place for lodging by North African pilgrims who stopped in Cairo on their way to Arabia. In 696/1296–97, however, Lajin restored the mosque following a vow he made when he found refuge in it while fleeing from his enemies. He allocated 20,000 *dinars* for the task, which was entrusted to the emir ʿIlm al-Din Sanjar, who carried out his assignment efficiently, buying land and setting up a pious endowment for the mosque. Lajin ordered him to carry out the restoration work properly, meaning he should pay the workers and artisans wages and buy materials at full price. The aim of these stipulations was to show that this reconstruction was an act of piety and was not to be tarnished by a bad reputation. The essence of the whole project was to add a new dimension to the mosque by incorporating the teaching of the four Sunni schools of law within it, but other topics such as Prophetic traditions and Koran were also taught there, and the ubiquitous Koranic school for orphans became part of the foundation as well. A chair for the teaching of medicine was established, and the place continued to serve as a congregational mosque with an imam and muezzins. In the context of the teaching of law in Mamluk Egypt, the addition of medicine was unusual, but it did present a sort of symbolic revival of a tradition associated with this mosque from Tulunid days, when a physician had dispensed medicines to people attending the mosque on Fridays. It was the teaching of law that made the mosque relevant, viable, and capable of attracting continued patronage, ensuring its survival.[14]

The decline and revival of institutions was a dynamic process marked by what seem to be contradictions and paradoxes, and although Fatimid mosques acquired new meanings and relevance, it cannot be said that relevance was always the key to institutional longevity. In the early years of the Ayyubid rule in Egypt, during the 1170s and 1180s, a number of large and well-endowed law colleges were built in Fustat and Cairo by Saladin, his nephew, and Qadi al-Fadil. In 1242, toward the end of the Ayyubid period, another important law college, the Salihiyya, was established by al-Malik al-Salih, and although this institution functioned throughout the Mamluk period, the building was used for different purposes. The early Ayyubid law colleges, notwithstanding their high level of patronage, began to deteriorate during the fourteenth century. Although the Nasiriyya law college, established by Saladin, still showed some signs of activity even in the early fifteenth century, the Qamhiyya law college, also established by Saladin, ceased to function as a learning institution much earlier. In 1422, Barsbay confiscated two of its pious endowments in the Fayyum district and granted these lands as fiefs to his emirs. By this time the law college was already in ruins, and although the sultan offered other lands in exchange, the decline of the Qamhiyya was irreversible. The Suyufiyya law

college, which continued to function somehow into the early fifteenth century, fared better. Another famous law college established by Saladin, the Salahiyya college adjacent to the tomb of al-Shafi'i in the Qarafa cemetery, also faced serious difficulties in the thirteenth century and was unable to pay the stipulated salary of 40 *dinars* to its professor of law. As a result, in 672/1273–74, a dismissed cadi took the teaching position in the college but received only half of the stipulated salary. Following his death, the position became honorary and unpaid. The institution continued to function with most of the teaching being done by assistants. Qadi al-Fadil's college, the Fadiliyya, fell into ruin, as did the neighborhood. This must have been a great loss, since the college was renowned for its large and diverse library donated by Qadi al-Fadil, a known bibliophile. Other Ayyubid law colleges founded by emirs and administrators had even shorter life spans, since they were less prestigious and not as well endowed.[15]

A partial explanation for this parallel process of institutional decline and revival, together with the establishment of identical institutions, is that relevance was essential but not of overriding importance. Religious and educational institutions were established to manifest the piety of the founder and his grandeur, his quest for divine reward, and his personal economic interests. There were many reasons behind the establishment of new institutions or the revival of defunct ones if this served the goal of the founder. There was no commitment, however, to preserve old institutions, and even if these were still socially relevant, they were allowed to degenerate.

In many other cases the decline of institutions was the outcome of external circumstances that were beyond the control of individuals. Maqrizi comments that many endowed institutions in Cairo ceased to function as a result of the 806/1403–4 crisis, which was caused by an insufficient rise of the Nile and subsequent food shortages. The monetary crisis had begun a year earlier and brought in its wake high prices and a lack of funds for paying the army. The following year was marked by the same combination of high prices and food shortages.[16] Among the institutions affected by the events of 1403–4 was the Sirayqus *khanqah* established by al-Nasir Muhammad in 1323, which failed to provide the daily food rations for its mystics, substituting allowances of money. Given the circumstances, this change must have gravely affected the mystics, and although the *khanqah* and the urban district around it continued to exist, food rations were not reinstated, and the mystics had to make do with cash payments. Other *khanqahs* fared even worse, and in 1403–4 the activity of the Baktamur's *khanqah*, established in 726/1325–26, came to an end and brought about the decline of the neighborhood that had evolved around it while Qasun's *khanqah*, established in 736/1335–36, shared the same fate. These two institutions were by no means minor foundations but had been established and endowed by two high-ranking emirs and key personalities in

al-Nasir Muhammad's reign. In addition the Baghdadiyya *ribat*, one of the most interesting charitable institutions of the Mamluk period, ceased to function following the crisis of 1403–4.[17]

According to ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, fifty law colleges were active in Damascus during the second half of the thirteenth century. Of these, thirty-nine can be dated to the twelfth century and eleven to the thirteenth. At the time Ibn Shaddad wrote his book about Damascus (674/1275–76), all of the fifty institutions were still active, which meant that law was still being taught by a professor.[18] The economic situation of these law colleges, however, remains unknown, and one must assume that their pious endowments provided revenues to support the teaching activity mentioned by Ibn Shaddad. We are better informed about the founding patrons and the properties endowed for their foundations. Among these patrons we find Nur al-Din and women of his family, his emirs and eunuchs, as well as Saladin and other Ayyubid rulers, including women of the Ayyubid family. The foundations set up by emirs vastly outnumbered those of any other group in Damascene society, and in spite of these differences in patronage, all of the above functioned at the time of Ibn Shaddad and lasted between 100 and 150 years. When we take a longer view, however, the picture changes considerably, and we see that only a few Ayyubid institutions figure in the Ottoman register of Palestine, including the hospital and lodge for mystics established by Saladin in Jerusalem. A law college set up in 606/1209–10 by Muʿazzam ʿIsa in Jerusalem also functioned somehow, but by the end of the fifteenth century it had lost most of its pious endowment. The villages that comprised the endowment were appropriated and turned into private holdings or granted to soldiers as fiefs.[19]

Some institutions, nonetheless, had a surprisingly long life span. The Mustansiriyya law college in Baghdad, for example, survived the Mongol conquest of the town and continued to function in the Ilkhanid period. In 696/1296–97, sultan Ghazan (1295–1304) visited the place and met the teachers and students of law, who assured him that he was the Shadow of God on Earth and that obedience to him was a religious duty. What they got from him in return is left unspecified, but the continued existence of this institution seems to indicate that support was given by the Ilkhanid regime.[20] Some of the large sultanic hospitals founded in the Middle Ages also had exceptionally long life spans. The obvious need for hospital services and the charitable nature of these foundations might be what contributed to their durability over the centuries because they attracted new donations. European parallels are suggestive and indicate similar patterns of conduct. The Hospital of St. John in Cambridge, for instance, acquired 235 separate properties from 181 donors during the thirteenth century.[21] This flow of endowments reflected a genuine widespread social interest in the existence and activity of the hospital. In the Muslim world,

donations for an existing hospital would, more likely, have come from fewer donors, with each offering a larger and more substantial endowment.

Pious Endowments versus State Interests

The preservation of private and familial wealth through the establishment of waqf *ahli* is well known and needs little elaboration. In fact, many public pious endowments also served for the personal aggrandizement of the founders, and this was done in a perfectly legal way that had nothing to do with the misuse of funds or embezzlement. A pious endowment would be created for a certain institution or cause, and part of the revenues generated by the *waqf* would, indeed, be remitted to the beneficiaries or transferred for the specified purposes. The founder, however, would keep most of the income for himself and his family by virtue of various legally binding stipulations. For instance, there were no legal restrictions on the level of salary paid to the founder by the pious endowment while he acted as its supervisor. The gains of the founder were manifold and not limited to economic advantages, for he gained prestige from his patronage of charitable causes as well as political and social support from people affiliated with the institutions he had created. A full assessment of the impact of such foundations is, however, complex, since these served both the selfish aims of the founder and genuine social ends. To illustrate this, we can take as an example the lodges established for mystics in thirteenth-century Anatolia. As has been pointed out by Sara Wolper, these lodges were cheap to build and maintain, and the emirs who patronized them appointed themselves as their supervisors.[22] In many of these lodges food was distributed to the poor, and from the perspective of the poor, this was a vital service notwithstanding the self-aggrandizement of the patrons. The same contradictions are typical of other, far more extensive pious endowments set up by richer and higher-ranking patrons. One of the better-studied cases concerns the pious endowments set up by Jawhar al-Lala, an Ethiopian eunuch (d. 1438), who served as the tutor of Barsbay's sons. He set up a number of pious endowments that supported law colleges and Koranic schools for orphans, distribution of charity in Cairo and the Holy Cities, and provisions for the corps of the Ethiopian eunuchs at the Tomb of the Prophet in Medina. Jean-Claude Garcin and Mustapha Anouar Taher, who studied Jawhar al-Lala's pious endowments, point out the considerable surplus income left at his disposal after he covered the charitable expenditures stipulated in his endowments.[23] It appears that the higher the rank of the patron, the wider the discrepancy was between incomes derived from pious endowments and charitable expenditures. An immense gap, ranging from 80 to 90 percent, is discernible in the pious endowments set up by Qaytaby, which have been studied by Carl F. Petry.[24] Even more far-reaching and fascinating

was the *waqf* policy of the sultan Qansuh al-Ghawri, who appropriated many pious endowments including those of Qaytbay's widow, Fatima, which were transferred to al-Ghawri's control immediately upon her death in 1504. Petry puts forward the suggestion that al-Ghawri's *waqf* policy must be seen in the wider context of his reign, since it served to finance his military policies and innovations, which were unpopular with the Mamluk soldiers.[25] Rather than seeking narrow personal gains, the sultan wished to create, through the control of pious endowments, an independent financial tool for himself to assist in the pursuit of his policies, which were aimed at preserving the Mamluk, or rather his own, regime in the face of the Ottoman challenge.

Al-Ghawri's *waqf* policy illustrates the obvious fact that, in premodern, preindustrial agricultural societies, the main wealth of the country consisted of its agricultural lands. The main problem of the pious endowment system was its success and extent, which proved to be self-defeating. When vast amounts of the agricultural land of the country became tied up in pious endowments, the state's interests were affected, even endangered, and the state's military capabilities became much reduced. Late medieval Muslim armies were maintained through the distribution of fiefs in exchange for military service, and although these fiefs were mostly granted on a temporary basis for usufruct only, the illicit endowment of these lands took place. A reduction in the amount of agricultural lands available for distribution had direct consequences on both the size of the army and the quality of its armament. The larger and richer the fief, the more troops and equipment the beneficiary was obliged to provide. The extent and spread of urban pious endowments was less problematic, since it did not directly threaten the economic-military interests of the state, and although trade and the urban economy were important in the medieval Middle East, they were only secondary sources of wealth. The conversion of economically viable urban properties into pious endowments perhaps reduced the ability of future patrons to create their own monuments, but given the relatively short life span of endowed institutions, this was not a serious problem. The dynamics of urban and economic change could, within a century or two, bring about the degeneration of earlier pious endowments, which paved the way for new patrons to take advantage of the opportunities now available for setting up their own endowments. This was not the case with agricultural lands. The development of new agricultural lands required heavy investment over long periods, and even the upkeep of existing lands required determination and the investment of funds and labor. Thus a reduction in the amount of agricultural land available for distribution, as a result of natural causes or endowment, was harmful to the state and the rulers in power. The attempts of the Mamluk regime to nullify or tax *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* must be seen within this context, that is, the struggle of different regimes to maximize the land resources available for their use.

Muhammad ibn Khalil al-Asadi, a writer of the fifteenth century, was fully cognizant of the clash between the interests of the state and the conversion of lands into pious endowments. His treatment of the subject, in a memorandum on economic issues he wrote for the benefit of the Mamluk rulers, is clear and articulate. He begins with a short and schematic description of the *iqta'* system in which state lands served to maintain the army, which mostly consisted of cavalry during the Mamluk period. In many cases, however, land granted as *iqta'* was converted into pious endowments, and in other cases, state land was bought from the treasury and endowed as familial *waqfs*. Asadi not only laments the transfer of lands from the Office of the Army to the Office of Pious Endowments but also describes the deterioration and ruin of *waqf* lands and blames the supervisors of the pious endowments who failed to maintain the prosperity of the endowed lands. His description is a powerful testimony to the managerial deficiencies of the Muslim pious endowment system and explains the short life span of most of the endowed institutions. According to Asadi, familial pious endowments fared no better, and in the long run, their supervisors were unable to prevent the decline of the endowed properties.[26] In other premodern Muslim societies in which the pious endowment system operated alongside the allocation of fiefs to the army, there was also potential for a clash between the two—something that happened early in Ottoman history at the time of the empire's expansion. Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror (1451–81), carried out land reforms in which all the agricultural land was transferred to the ownership of the state and only limited agricultural assets such as vineyards and gardens were left to private owners and pious endowments. This transfer of privately owned agricultural lands and *waqf* lands was carried out on a massive scale and involved 20,000 estates and villages. Furthermore, Mehmed II also cancelled military fiefs (*timar* lands) that had been endowed by their recipients and seized pious endowments belonging to the Church.[27] This action closely resembled the Mamluk policy of seizing Muslim, and especially Christian, *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya,* but it must be emphasized that this was not a problem unique to the Muslim world. The attempts of the central government in Byzantium to maintain its control over the land resources of the state and the consequences this had on the army have been much discussed by John Haldon and Warren Treadgold.[28]

From the state's point of view, the pious endowment system had serious drawbacks, but there is agreement on more positive aspects of the *waqf* institution among scholars, as different in their specialization as Goitein and Halil Inalcik. Goitein has characterized the charity in the Islamic state as "semipublic: members of the ruling class or otherwise wealthy people, after having drained the population, often returned to it a part of the spoils in the form of pious foundations, or other charitable works, made to save the donor on the Day of Judgment."[29] Inalcik's view is almost identical, and he has noted that

"institutions derived from charity played a significant part in redistributing wealth in society. Large groups of the destitute and unemployed in Ottoman cities and towns were maintained through such charity institutions. Thus, a significant part of the fortunes accumulated in the hands of the elite . . . were ultimately bestowed on charitable endowments." In the Ottoman Empire, as Inalcik points out, pious endowments supported a whole range of institutions and policies, including law colleges, mosques, hospitals, lodges for travelers, and bridges, whereas endowed complexes, known as *'imarets*, which consisted of educational, religious, and charitable institutions, served as a tool for the urban development of Ottoman cities. Inalcik perceives the Ottoman state as a welfare state governed by the precepts of charity and claims that "the belief that charity pleases God and brings God's blessings determined Muslim behavior in many basic acts of economic importance in Islamic states, and the Ottomans were particularly zealous in that regard." Inalcik's view is a challenging one and must be examined within the broader perspective of Islamic charity as a whole. Goitein sees the medieval Islamic state as indifferent to the needs of the "faltering individual," which, at best, were met by philanthropy, "an impressive aspect of Islamic society during its periods of efflorescence."[30]

As a broad generalization, Goitein's statement aptly characterizes the conduct of medieval Muslim rulers and regimes, but no society, certainly not the large and complex urban societies of medieval Islam, could live without making investments in infrastructure and paying attention to social needs. Muslim rulers did invest in civilian and defense projects, which were either financed through a direct injection of funds or by the creation of pious endowments for the upkeep of water installations and walls, often using the *waqf* system to set up charitable institutions and provide for charitable causes. Although Muslim regimes did not care for the needs of the "faltering individual," they were not indifferent to the needs of the people associated with the ruling establishment and especially the religious class. None of this undermines Goitein's observation, but it does provide a wider and more balanced view. Medieval sacred charity should not be confused with modern concepts of welfare, however. Welfare states and welfare policies are anchored in state legislation and governed by impersonal bureaucratic rules and regulations. None of these apply to either medieval and Ottoman charity or their underpinning religious system of belief.

Medieval Islamic Charity in Perspective

On the personal level, alms giving and the performance of charitable deeds among medieval Muslims, Christians, and Jews sprang from related religious ideologies and assumed similar meanings and forms, but on the higher levels of

society and state, there were many differences in the way charity became institutionalized in Islam and Christianity. In Byzantium and Catholic Europe there were four agents, or outlets, for the dispensation of charity: the Church, the state, private people, and confraternities (whose role was crucial in Europe, but not in Byzantium). The Church and the clergy were the most important agents of charity in Christendom. The absence of the Church, or Church-like institutions, in Islam created a situation in which the state and the individuals became the sole agents of charity. Ostensibly the state was supposed to assume the central role in the distribution of charity and was duty-bound to collect and divide *zakat*. But *zakat* did not evolve into any kind of social leveler, and its handling by the state was a dismal failure. Very little is known about the distribution of *zakat,* and the paucity of the sources is the strongest indication of the absence of the practice. One cannot argue that most of the *zakat* was paid, or given, directly to the needy, although one must assume that this did take place to some extent. The fact that this aspect of the private lives of medieval people is not illuminated by our sources is less surprising than the absence of data on the administrative practices concerning *zakat*. When *zakat* was collected, as in the Mamluk period, it was not usually distributed, certainly not regularly, to the needy and turned into yet another form of taxation. The issue of *zakat* is indicative of the limited ability of Koranic ethics to influence the conduct of the state.[31]

In Islam the men in power and the women of the ruling families came to play central roles in charitable activities, and their charities, in contrast to the concept of *zakat*, were not solely motivated by a commitment to aid the poor and needy. The same applies to the charities conducted by people of the civilian society. The charities of these two segments of medieval Muslim society primarily reflected their religious and cultural preferences. The poor, the needy, and the sick were in the minds of these people, but the focus of their charitable activities was aid to scholars and mystics, with a by-product (so to speak) being the education of orphans. This broad orientation toward religious symbols and cultural values is also responsible for the disproportionate attention paid to the Holy Cities of Arabia, and the effort to provide grain for the population of these two cities was unprecedented in medieval and Ottoman Islam. It reflected real needs, such as the scarcity of agricultural resources in Arabia, but evolved into a kind of commitment that medieval rulers and later the Ottomans took upon themselves. The charities lavished on Mecca and Medina were, however, unique in yet another aspect. The charities given by certain Mamluk sultans to the Holy Cities aimed at creating microcosms of a pure Islamic taxation system inspired by Muslim law. This was a pious effort that necessitated the injection of large amounts of money and turned out to be an unrealistic endeavor even when confined to Mecca and Medina.

In Christendom, the Church and clergy were ideologically committed to the poor and needy, and the Church was both the recipient and the distributor of charity. "Charity," to quote Suzanne Roberts, "was inextricably bound with the theory and practice of the Christian religion."[32] There was not any equally powerful parallel agent of charity in the Muslim world, and this point is nicely illustrated by the following case. At a certain time after 1077, Lanfranc, the archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1089), established a number of charitable institutions outside the city's walls, including an infirmary (or a hospice) for sick men and women who were provided with food, clothing, care, and eventually burial and a hospice for lepers. The infirm were cared for by clerics for whom Lanfranc built a church and allocated sources of income for their maintenance. All of the above were financed by foundations based upon grants of lands and the assignment of tithe rents.[33] Muslim rulers set up such charitable institutions, and the examples of Muzaffar al-Din of Irbil and Mujahid al-Din of Mosul come immediately to mind. It would, of course, be futile to compare twelfth-century Irbil to eleventh-century Canterbury, and one can assume that, in terms of material culture, textiles of high quality, the availability of luxury goods, and the opulence of the court, Irbil probably surpassed Canterbury. But this goes beyond the point. What is significant is who undertook charitable works.

Confraternities were agents of charity unique to Catholic Europe, and late medieval European cities saw a great proliferation of confraternities whose charitable work was inward as well as outward. European practices also had an impact on the Jewish communities of Italy, and in these communities, confraternities operated in a fashion similar to that of Catholic society by providing services for the burial of the dead, assisting the sick and dying, helping with dowries for brides, and supporting poor and orphaned students.[34] In Byzantium, however, confraternities did little or nothing for charity. Michael Angold argues that the state obstructed the growth of corporate institutions.[35] To what extent this explanation also applies to medieval and Ottoman Islam needs further study. In Byzantium, the existence of the Church compensated for the absence of confraternities, but this was not the case in Islam.

Medieval and Ottoman Islamic charity was individualistic and religiously motivated. This was certainly useful for those who received it, but its overall social impact was limited. The Ottoman state, despite its impressive range of *ʿimarets* and other charitable institutions, was not a welfare state. The state's involvement in welfare, for instance, the networks of Hôpitaux Généraux, Hôtel-Dieu, and Hôtel des Invalids, were uniquely French phenomena unmatched by developments in the Ottoman Empire. The sacred character of medieval Islamic and Ottoman charity made it less effective as a tool for the relief of poverty but perhaps more humane. One must not overlook the coer-

cive nature of some of the premodern European charitable institutions. This aspect of coercion is hardly attested to in the Islamic forms of charity, and Russell's observations are helpful in outlining these differences. His description of charity and beggars in eighteenth-century Aleppo must be understood in contrast to English realities. Russell noted that there were no laws against begging and there were no workhouses. Alms and food were distributed by the wealthy on Fridays at the mosques, and long-term relations occasionally were created between donor and beggar.[36]

Going back to the *waqf*, one is struck by the immense proliferation of this institution in medieval and Ottoman Islam, and the reasons for this are manifold. This institution, in the words of Hoexter, "was particularly well-suited to the requirements of a patrimonial, premodern system of government."[37] It also served as an outlet for the fulfillment of some very basic psychological needs of man: the manifestation of piety and the desire to secure economic interests against future adversity. On a higher level it served as an instrument of policy that was open to manipulation and frequently to abuse. Shatzmiller has recently drawn attention to widespread abuses, the poor economic performances, and both the institutional and legal weaknesses of the *waqf* system.[38] It is important to note that the system was dynamic and capable of assuming new forms. The cash *waqfs* of the Ottoman period and the *mursad* loans that were extended to *waqf* administrators for the repair of endowed property exemplify the dynamic side of the system and its ability to be in tune with changing economic circumstances.[39] Dynamics, however, created new abuses, and much of what has been said about the traditional *waqfs* also applies to the cash pious endowments and the *mursad* loans as well.

When we look at the *waqf* system as a whole, with its abuses and weaknesses, we can see that the system was capable of providing certain vital social services such as learning, hospitals, and various charitable causes. I would argue that the system was more than just the sum of its components—i.e., the individual *waqf* foundations and the way they were managed. It fulfilled an important social role in the life of premodern Muslim societies by affecting the patterns of landholding and impacting upon the urban life and economy.

Conclusions

Du'a' is the third most common term that appears in this book after *sadaqa* and *waqf*. I would argue that this reflects the fundamental drive behind medieval monotheistic charity: the quest for personal salvation through giving and the wish to oblige the beneficiaries of charity to pray for the salvation of their benefactors. The notion of salvation has a central role in monotheism, and charity on its two manifestations of *sadaqa* and *waqf* was a way of achieving

this goal in Islam. The quest for nearness to God and salvation symbolized the deepest meaning of medieval sacred charity. This meaning remained constant and unchanging, irrespective of the function served by a particular charitable deed or a *waqf* foundation. The distinction between meaning and function can be demonstrated when personal charity is examined. Whatever the position of the individual in society, the giving of *sadaqa* was a way of communicating with God, and the meaning could vary between *kaffara* (expiation for sins), *tawba* (repentance), *qurba* (quest for nearness to God), and *thawab* (a desire for a reward for a meritorious deed in the afterlife). In many cases the giving of charity also had political or social functions; however, the basic inner meaning of charity always remained constant.

One of the most fascinating aspects of medieval Islamic charity was the possibility of institutionalizing charity through the pious endowment system. If one considers the huge proliferation of *waqfs* and *waqf*-supported institutions, it can be said that medieval Islam was a "charitable society." A charitable society does not necessarily mean a "welfare society," however, and one must take into account the numerous abuses of the pious endowment system. The definition of "charitable society" reflects the fact that the charitable drive in the form of the sacred duty to give *sadaqa*, a concept also embodied in the *waqf* institution, came to dominate many aspects of communal life. The functions that charity served were religiously and culturally determined. The existence of extensive pious endowments for the Holy Cities of Arabia and the support of learning and social groups such as the mystics were reflections of clear social preferences. Religious and cultural needs were given preference over aiding the poor and welfare services. The alleviation of poverty and social misery were not the primary objectives of medieval Islamic charity. Islamic charity was an inadequate tool for dealing with welfare problems, but was better suited to providing religious services and learning.

Notes

Abbreviations

AI	*Annales Islamologiques*
BEO	*Bulletin des Études Orientales*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
JESHO	*Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*
JSAI	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*
MSR	*Mamluk Studies Review*
RCEA	*Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe*

Chapter 1. Charity, Society, and the State

1. J. B. Simonsen, *Studies in the Genesis and Early Development of the Caliphal Taxation System*, 37; S. Bashear, "On the Origins and Development of the Meaning of Zakat in Early Islam," *Arabica* 40 (1993): 112; F. Rosenthal, "Sedaka, Charity," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950–51): 411. For *zakat* and *sadaqa*, see A. Nanji, *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, s.v. "Almsgiving"; T. H. Weir (A. Zysow), "Sadaka," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Sadaka"; D. S. Powers, *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, s.v. "Alms Tax, Islamic."

2. In the text that outlined the fiscal policies of the Umayyad Caliph ʿUmar II (717–20), *sadaqa* refers to taxes paid by the Muslims from their property, cultivation, capital, and livestock, whereas *zakat* indicates the payments made by those who joined Islam. See H. A. R. Gibb, "The Fiscal Rescript of ʿUmar II," *Arabica* 2 (1955): 3, 4, 6–7, 10. For the interchangeable use of these two terms, see M. G. Morony, *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest*, 58, 534, 536.

3. See Yahya ibn Adam, *Kitab al-Kharaj*, in *Taxation in Islam*, trans. A. Ben Shemesh, 1:77–78, 88–89, 94–95.

4. Qudama ibn Jaʿfar, *Kitab al-Kharaj wa-Sinaʿat al-Kitaba*, 182–89, 194–97; also found in *Taxation in Islam*, trans. A. Ben Shemesh, 2:45–50, 56; Abu Yusuf, *Kitab al-Kharaj*, in vol. 3 of *Taxation in Islam*, trans. A. Ben Shemesh, 3:134–36, 137–40.

5. Abu ʿUbayd, *Kitab al-Amwal*, ed. M. Kh. Hiras. For the merits of *sadaqa*, see 486–92; for *sadaqa* paid from capital, see 25, 131.

6. See D. Sourdel, "Fragments d'al-Suli sur d'histoire des vizirs abbasides," *BEO* 15 (1955–57): 104–5; Abu ʿUbayd, *Kitab al-Amwal*, 559.

7. Ghazzali, *Ihya ʿUlum al-Din*, 1:209, 211. For a detailed study of *zakat* and *sadaqat al-fitr* in the Hanafi law, see B. Johansen, "Amwal Zahira and Amwal Batina," in *Festschrift for Ihsan Abbas*, ed. W. al-Qadi, 247–65. For debates to whom *zakat* should be paid, see M. J. Kister, "Social and Religious Concepts of Authority in Islam,"

JSAI 18 (1994): 104–5. For the shifts in Imami thinking about how *zakat* money should be spent, see N. Calder, "Zakat in Imami Shiʿi Jurisprudence, from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century, A.D.," *BSOAS* 44 (1981): 268–80. Christian Décobert's notion about the existence of "une économie de l'aumône" in early Islam is speculative and unsupported by the limited body of sources and the selective research literature on which his work relies. See *Le mendiant et le combattant: L'institution de l'Islam*, esp. 238–52. The sources pertinent to this issue have been examined by Michael Bonner (see "The Kitab al-Kasb Attributed to al-Shaybani: Poverty, Surplus, and the Circulation of Wealth," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 121 [2001]: 410–28), who employs the term *economy of poverty* as embodying the distribution of *sadaqa* from surplus income to the poor, whose entitlement to these payments is described as *haqq* (claim/right). Sarakhsi's contribution to this debate is also dealt with by N. Calder, "Exploring God's Law: Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abi Sahl al-Sarakhsi on Zakat," in *Law and the Islamic World*, ed. C. Toll and J. Skovgaard-Petersen, 57–75, esp. 62.

8. For *sadaqat al-ʿArab* taxes, see M. ʿAql, "The Abbasid State under Mutawakkil (232–47/847–61)," Ph.D. diss., vol. 2, chap. 6 (in Hebrew). For Qaysi Arabs in Egypt, see Kindi, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt*, ed. R. Guest, 76–77; Kh. ʿAthamina, "Some Administrative, Military, and Socio-Political Aspects of Early Muslim Egypt," in *War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean, 7th–15th Centuries*, ed. Y. Lev, 110–11.

9. G. Khan, ed. and trans., *Arabic Papyri from the Khalili Collection*, 53. For the rural poor, see F. Løkkegaard, *Islamic Taxation in the Classical Period*, 181. For Muhammad's concern with the exploitation of agricultural laborers, see M. J. Kister, "The Social and Political Implications of Three Traditions in the Kitab al-Kharadj of Yahya B. Adam," *JESHO* 3 (1960): 333–34.

10. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Muluk waʾl-Umam*, ed. Muhammad and Mustafa ʿAbd al-Qadir ʿAta, 15:112–13; 16:274; Ibn Saʿi, *Jihat al-Aʾimma al-Khulafaʾ min al-Haraʾir waʾl-Imaʾ*, ed. M. Jawwad, 111–15. For direct payment of *zakat* to the poor in Egypt, see Ibn Zayyat, *Kitab Al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*, 248 (with no indication of the period); Maqrizi, *Kitab al-Muqaffa al-Kabir*, ed. M. Yalaoui, 3:77.

11. In 400/1009–10, al-Hakim ordered the cadis to stop the collection of *zakat* and three other types of taxes paid by the Ismailis. See A. F. Sayyid, *Al-Dawla al-Fatimiyya fi Misr: Tafsir Jadid*, 170. For a reference to the collection of *zakat* in early twelfth-century Egypt, see Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz al-Hunafaʾ bi-Akhbar al-Aʾimma al-Fatmiyyin al-Khulafaʾ*, ed. J. al-Din al-Shayyal and M. H. M. Ahmad, 3:115.

12. Maqrizi, *Kitab al-Suluk li-Maʿrifat Duwal al-Muluk*, ed. M. M. Ziyada and S. A. ʿAshur, vol. 1, pt. 1, 44–45.

13. Ibn Mammati, *Kitab Qawanin al-Dawanin*, ed. A. S. Atiya, 308–17. For a partial English translation and discussion, see R. S. Cooper, "Ibn Mammati's Rules for the Ministries," Ph.D. diss., 264–70. For the Office of Zakat in Ayyubid and Mamluk Egypt, see H. Rabie, *The Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564–741/A.D. 1169–1341*, 95–100; Y. Lev, *Saladin in Egypt*, 134. Al-Nabulsi (d. 660/1261–62) says that in the Fatimid period *diwan al-majlis* was responsible for the *zakat*. See Al-Nabulsi, "Kitab Lumaʿ al-Qawanin al-Mudiyya fi Dawawin al-Diyar al-Misriyya," ed. C. Becker and Cl. Cahen, *BEO* 16 (1958–60): 36.

14. Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, ed. W. Wright, 2nd ed., rev. M. J. De Geoje, 39–40, 41–42; English translation by R.J.C. Broadhurst, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, 34–35.

15. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 48, 107–8; Lev, *Saladin*, 168.

16. For Baybars's collection of *zakat*, see Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir fi Sirat al-Malik al-Zahir*, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz Khuwaytir, 275–76, 285; Baybars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-Fikra fi Ta'rikh al-Hijra*, ed. D. S. Richards, 92; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, ed. S. A. ʿAshur et al., 30:149; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 558, 562–63. For *zakat* as a form of taxation, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 3, 664; Rabie, *Financial System of Egypt*, 95–100.

17. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 510–11. For the failure to collect *zakat*, in the meaning of alms tax in 789/1387–88 and 827/1423–24, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 564, vol. 4, pt. 2, 663.

18. Qudama ibn Jaʿfar, *Kitab al-Kharaj wa-Sinaʿat al-Kitaba*, 206; also found in *Taxation in Islam*, trans. Ben Shemesh, 2:67.

19. Ibn Mammati, *Kitab Qawanin al-Dawanin*, 314; Cooper, "Ibn Mammati's Rules," 269.

20. Ibn al-Ma'mun, *Akhbar Misr*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 36, 41, 42; Musabbihi, *Akhbar Misr*, ed. A. F. Sayyid and Th. Bianquis, 38; Abu Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. I. al-Zaybaq, 1:387; Th. E. Homerin, "Ibn Taimiya's al-Sufiyah wa-al-Fuqara'," *Arabica* 32 (1985): 219–45. For legal definitions of poverty, see M. Bonner, "Definitions of Poverty and the Rise of the Muslim Urban Poor," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6 (1996): 335–44. The definition of poverty and who are the poor entitled to charity is much discussed in Judaism. See M. Hellinger, "Charity in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature," Ph.D. diss. (in Hebrew with extensive English summary). For the diversified world of marginal groups of mystics and their relation to and dependence on the normative society, see A. T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550*, 9, 14–15.

21. For these topics, see F. Rodríguez-Mañas, "Encore sur la controverse entre soufis et juristes au moyen âge," *Arabica* 43 (1996): 406–21.

22. Maqrizi, *Ighathat al-Umma bi-Kashf al-Ghumma*, ed. M. M. Ziyada and M. al-Shayyal, 72–73, 75; French translation by G. Wiet, "Le traité des famines de Maqrizi," *JESHO* 5 (1962): 1–90; A. Allouche, *Mamluk Economics: A Study and Translation of al-Maqrizi's Ighathat*.

23. Balawi, *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, ed. K. ʿAli, 180–81; Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:225. George Makdisi, editor and translator of Ibn Banna's diary (covering August 1068–August 1069), translates *mastur* as an honorable, or pious, man. See "Autograph Diary of an Eleventh-Century Historian of Baghdad," *BSOAS* 18 (1956): 247, 259; 19 (1957): 281, 292; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 15:211, 17:140–41, 157, 188, 189. For *mastur* in the Geniza, see M. R. Cohen, "The Voice of the Jewish Poor in the Cairo Genizah," in *Semitic Papyrology in Context*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, 246–52. For the meaning of *mastur* as a person of high social meaning, see S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. 6, s.v. *mastur*.

24. Musabbihi, *Akhbar Misr*, 101. For a ninth-century Egyptian cadi who had sympathy for the poor and impoverished *masturs*, see Ibn Hajar, *Rafʿ al-Isr ʿan Qudat Misr*,

ed. R. Guest, as an appendix to his edition of Kindi, *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, 522.

25. Ibn Hajar, *Rafʿ al-Isr*, 524, 528, 529; Ibn al-Hajj, *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:324.

26. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 5:138. For the term *satr/mastur*, see Musabbihi, *Akhbar Misr*, 110, 111.

27. Balawi, *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, 180–81, 184, 197, 198–99.

28. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 4:433, 599; Abu Shama, *Tarajim Rijal al-Qarnayn al-Sadis wa-'l-Sabi*, 147.

29. For the development of the distinction between deserving and undeserving poor in medieval Europe, see M. Mollat, *The Poor in the Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer. For Italian and Spanish towns, see A. Spicciani, "The 'Poveri Vergognosi' in Fifteenth-Century Florence," in *Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe*, ed. T. Riis, 119–83; J. Henderson, *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence*, 256–57, 269; M. Flynn, *Sacred Charity: Confraternities and Social Welfare in Spain, 1400–1700*, 79–80.

30. For appeals for private charity, see M. Cohen, "Four Judaeo-Arabic Petitions of the Poor from the Cairo Geniza," *JSAI* 24 (2000): 449, 456; M. R. Cohen, "The Voice of the Jewish Poor," 246–49; A. Bareket, "'Thou Shalt Surely Open Thy Hand unto Thy Poor and Needy Brother': Letters Requesting Financial Aid from the Geniza," *Teʿuda* 16–17 (2001): 379, 386–87 (in Hebrew).

31. C. E. Bosworth, *The Islamic Mediaeval Underworld*, 1:13; A. Sabra, *Poverty and Charity in Medieval Islam: Mamluk Egypt, 1250–1517*, 42–50.

32. Musabbihi, *Akhbar Misr*, 29–30, 35, 71.

33. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:128.

34. Ibid., 2:12.

35. M. Q. Zaman, *Religion and Politics under the Early Abbasids*, 153–66.

36. Maqrizi, *Kitab al-Mawaʿiz wa-'l-Iʿtibar bi-Dhikr al-Khitat wa-'l-Athar*, 2:238 (hereafter cited as *Khitat*).

37. Miskawayh, *Tajarib al-Umam*, ed. H. F. Amedroz (reprint), 2:404–8; cf. J. L. Kraemer, *Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam*, 277, 278.

38. Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels (Safarnama)*, trans. W. M. Thackston, 49–50, 58; Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:112.

39. G. Khan, ed. and trans., *Arabic Legal and Administrative Documents in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*, docs. 82, 84.

40. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:262, 2:245.

41. Ibn al-Ma'mun, *Akhbar Misr*, 70–71; S. Vryonis, "Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor," *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 29 (1975): 60–61. For beggars, their tricks, and their world, see Bosworth, *The Islamic Mediaeval Underworld*, 1:1–48; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:306; N. Orme and M. Webster, *The English Hospital, 1070–1570*, 116, 123.

42. Hilal al-Sabi, *Kitab Tuhfat al-Umara' fi Ta'rikh al-Wuzara'*, ed. H. F. Amedroz, 142–43, 322–23.

43. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:16–17.

44. Hilal al-Sabi, *Tuhfat*, 222; Ibn al-Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa* (Beirut ed.), 13; Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 14, 124.

45. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, ed. J. al-Din al-Shayyal, H. Rabie, and S. Ashour, 5:158–61, 164; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 260.

46. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:367; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 648–49.

47. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 33:272.

48. Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, ed. Q. Zurayq and N. ʿIzz al-Din, 7:180.

49. A. N. Poliak, *Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250–1900*, 32–33. The most important study of the various categories of *rizaq* lands is by Nicolas Michel, "Les rizaq ihbasiyya, terres agricoles en mainmorte dans l'Egypte mamelouke et ottomane" *AI* 30 (1996): 105–89. For his discussion of *al-rizaq al-jayshiyya*, see 116–17, 118–19.

50. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 476, 518.

51. See, e.g., the events of 748/1347–48 as reported by Maqrizi in *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 724, 748–49. For other general references to recipients of salaries from the regime, see *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 486, vol. 4, pt. 1, 27.

52. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur fi Waqa'iʿ al-Duhur*, ed. M. Mustafa, 2:156, 419.

53. Ibn Taghribirdi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa-'l-Qahira*, ed. J. al-Din Shayyal and F. M. Shaltut, 16:82–83. For payments to orphans and other groups in 745/1344–45, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 672. Sultan Jaqmaq (1438–53) was characterized as one who loved orphans and allocated them salaries. In 907/1501–2, however, orphans and many other groups lost their salaries, reflecting the growing financial difficulties of the state. See Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 2:299, 4:25.

54. Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Égypte, 720–21.

55. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:20, 22–23, 24, 277, 4:321–22.

Chapter 2. Charity, Piety, and Politics

1. Balawi, *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, 74.

2. See M. Fierro, "Caliphal Legitimacy and Expiation in al-Andalus," in *Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and Their Fatwas*, ed. M. K. Masud et al., 55–63.

3. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 3:119, 125–26, 127.

4. Ibid., 1:209.

5. For the Court of Complaints in Fatimid Egypt, see ibid., 1:117, 128, 277, 2:78, 3:120, 122.

6. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Ta'rikh al-Bahir fi 'l-Dawla al-Atabekiyya*, ed. A. A. Tolaymat, 170.

7. Wakiʿ, *Akhbar al-Qudat*, ed. M. Maraghi, 2:57–58; Ibn ʿAli al-Husayni, *Akhbar al-Dawla al-Saljukiyya*, ed. M. Iqbal, 73.

8. Miskawayh, *Tajarib al-Umam*, 2:231.

9. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 5:142–43, 144.

10. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:272.

11. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 3, 744–45. For Qalawun's grief on the death of his son, see L. S. Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 142–43.

12. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, 5:478, 480–81.

13. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:240–41 (quoting 'Imad al-Din al-Isfahani). In the chapter on the virtuous of Saladin, 'Imad al-Din tells this story with further details. However, he entirely omits the context: that these charities were given during a sickness for the purpose of recovery. He uses the story to illustrate Saladin's generosity, ignoring the essentially instrumental nature of these charities. See 'Imad al-Din, *Al-Fath al-Qussi fi 'l-Fath al-Qudsi*, ed. M. M. Sabuh, 658.

14. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:298, 17:243–44; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil fi 'l-Ta'rikh*, 10:200; Safadi, *A'yan al-'Asr wa-A'wan al-Nasr*, ed. 'Ali ibn Zayd et al., 3:120–21. For more details about the Mamluk period, see Sabra, *Poverty and Charity*, 56–58.

15. Ibn Sa'id al-Maghribi, *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Hula Hadrat al-Qahira*, ed. H. Nassar, 96–97; Makdisi, "Autograph Diary," *BSOAS* 19 (1957): 18 (text), 35 (trans.); Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 491, pt. 3, 702.

16. Ibn Hajar, *Inba' al-Ghumr bi-Abna' al-'Umr*, ed. H. Hubashi, 2:20, 38, 49, 68. People were also crushed to death in 721/1321–22 when the sultan distributed clothing upon recovery from illness. See Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 33:52.

17. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 3:220, 239; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 3, 779.

18. Idris 'Imad al-Din, *'Uyun al-Akhbar*, edited by M. Yalaoui and published under the title *Ta'rikh al-Khulafa' al-Fatimiyyin bi-'l-Maghrib*, 378, 442–43, 444; Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 2:175; *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 317–18.

19. Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 3:53; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 18:134, 190.

20. Ibn al-Ma'mun, *Akhbar Misr*, 39–40; Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 3:85–86.

21. Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 1:222, 275; *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 535, pt. 3, 764; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:114, 31:197, 213.

22. Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 1:288–89; Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 2, 514; Ibn 'Asakir, *Ta'rikh Dimashq*, ed. 'Umar ibn Gharama al-'Amrawi, 41:436–37; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, vol. 5, pt. 1, 119; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 174; Ibn Sa'i, *Al-Jami' al-Mukhtasar*, ed. M. Jawwad, 248–49. The belief in the power of charity to influence the fate of a soul bears some resemblance to the Christian view that a soul in purgatory could be helped by prayers, charity, and fasting.

23. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:17, 257.

24. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 778, 780.

25. Baybars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-Fikra fi Ta'rikh al-Hijra*, 11–12.

26. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 18:108.

27. Balawi, *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, 180–81.

28. Ibid., 237–39, 344–45; Ibn Zayyat, *Kitab Al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*, 128–29.

29. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 6:235, 236.

30. Ibid., 6:243, 246; M. Sharon, "Waqf Inscription from Ramla c.300/912–13," *BSOAS* 60 (1997): 98–108.

31. Maqrizi, *Itti'az*, 2:42.

32. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:378, 397; Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-*

Quds wa-'l-Khalil, ed. M. B. al-ʿUlum, 2:34; Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 411.

33. For the Abbasid period, see N. Abbott, *Two Queens of Baghdad*, 119–20, 243–44, 245–46, 251. For Seljukid Damascus, see Ibn al-Qalanisi, *Dhayl Ta'rikh Dimashq*, ed. H. F. Amedroz, 201; Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 241–42. For Seljukid women and their involvement in politics and charities, see Jean-Michel Mouton, *Damas et sa principauté sous les Saljoukides et les Bourides, 468–549/1076–1154*, 136–42, 167–69; C. Hillenbrand, "Seljuq Women," in *The Balance of Truth: Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, ed. C. Balim-Harding and C. Imber, 145–63.

34. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:322–23. For the inscriptions of al-Amir's wives and their titles, see *RCEA*, vol. 8, no. 3092, no. 3188.

35. The site on which the Mosque of the Qarafa stood had its history: in the pre-Fatimid period it was occupied by the Mosque of the Qubba, which served as a gathering place for Koran reciters, and the money of the orphans fund was kept there. Ibn Zayyat (*Kitab Al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*, 174) writes that in his time, the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the site was a sacred place visited by people who prayed to God for deliverance during troubled times.

36. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:83, 253, 17:199; Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa* (Beirut ed.), 113, 149; Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 29, 33.

37. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:243–44; R. S. Humphreys, "Women as Patrons of Religious Architecture in Ayyubid Damascus," *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 42–43.

38. Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 362; Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:244, *Tarajim*, 119; Safadi, *Al-Wafi bi-'l-Wafayat*, ed. B. Radke, 15:120–21; Humphreys, "Women as Patrons," 47–48.

39. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:403.

40. Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 2, 474; Al-Makin, *La chronique des Ayyoubides*, ed. Cl. Cahen in *BEO* 15 (1955–57): 135; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 3:138–39, 4:199, 216. For other emirs, see Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 291–92; pt. 2, 705; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 4:12.

41. Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 2:42, 120–21, 134, 469.

42. For Mamluk emirs of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:367–68, 456–57, 459, 461, 3:77, 651; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 7:93, 8:133, 9:181.

43. Ibn Taghribirdi, *Al-Nujum*, 16:323; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 4:10.

44. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 3:123; *Khitat*, 4:321–22; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:262; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 5:77.

45. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 15:126–27; Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa* (Beirut ed.), 145, 149.

46. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:275; Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat al-Aʿyan*, ed. I. ʿAbbas, 1:93.

47. See Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 12:159. In sharp contrast to other long obituaries devoted to Qadi al-Fadil, that of Ibn al-Athir is only five lines long, but his charities are much emphasized.

48. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 5:90; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:533; Lev, *Saladin*, 24, 128.

49. Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 19.

50. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:69; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 1:228.

51. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 1:233; Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 4:503.

52. Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 1:87, 91, 294, 3:23, 120–21, 4:503, 567, 618. For administrators, see 3:150–52, 5:154. For more information on administrators, derived from a wider selection of sources, see B. Martel-Thoumian, *Les civils et l'administration dans l'état militaire mamluk (IXe/XVe siècle)*, 340–46.

53. Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 4:190.

54. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 18:254; Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 2:388, 4:27.

55. Ibn al-Furat, *Taʾrikh al-Duwal waʾl-Muluk*, vol. 5, pt. 1, 178–79; Al-Makin, *La chronique des Ayyoubides*, 128.

56. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:194; Ibn Duqmaq, *Kitab al-Intisar*, ed. K. Vollers, 4:98; R. T. Mortel, "Madrasas in Mecca during the Medieval Period," *BSOAS* 60 (1997): 237–38.

57. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 18:254.

58. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 1:246; Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 3:159; C. Morisot, "Patrimoine des commerçants à l'époque mamelouke d'après les archives conservées au Caire," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen, 3:313, 319.

59. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 3:664; Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Miraʾt al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 91–92, 352.

60. Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Miraʾt al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 1, 29; pt. 2, 547.

61. *RCEA*, vol. 12, no. 4440; vol. 14, no. 5278, no. 5369, no. 5564; vol. 15, no. 5801; vol. 16, no. 6273; vol. 17, no. 780012.

62. See, e.g., C. S. Taylor, "Saints, Ziyara, Qissa, and the Squocial Construction of Moral Imagination in Late Medieval Egypt," *Studia Islamica* 88 (1998): 103–21.

63. Balawi, *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, 252–53.

64. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:114.

65. Ibid., 2:179, 181; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 18:191.

66. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 9:350.

67. Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Miraʾt al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 2, 763–64.

68. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, ed. A. Hutait, 80; Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 251, 360.

69. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:93, 185; 3:140.

70. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 2:300. For the festivals created by the Fatimids, see Ibn al-Maʾmun, *Akhbar Misr*, 35–36, 60, 62, 71, 72, 98.

71. Ibn al-Maʾmun, *Akhbar Misr*, 42, 64; Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:294; 2:89; 3:95, 104. Maqrizi, in the entry about the kitchen of the Fatimid royal palace, writes that the food prepared there was distributed among state dignitaries (*arbab al-rusum*) and the poor. See *Khitat*, 3:165. For the Abbasids, see Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 15:83–84; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 9:411, 12:278, 440.

72. Such events took place in the Fatimid state in 951 and 962; see Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:94. For Baghdad of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, see Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 18:125, 199–200, 203. For Nur al-Din and Baybars, see

Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Zubdat Halab min Taʾrikh Halab*, ed. S. Dahan, 2:340; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:103, 31:253–54.

73. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 82, 200; Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli, *Kitab Husn al-Manaqib al-Sirriyya al-Muntazaʿa min al-Sira al-Zahiriyya*, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz al-Khuwaytir, 35, 78.

74. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 501, 944, 945, pt. 3, 1067.

75. Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 5:226, 285.

76. For the financial difficulties of the state in 837/1433–34 and 915/1509–10, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 2, 914; Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 4:170. In Cairo of the late Mamluk and early Ottoman periods, there were four main prisons, and the chief cadi of each of the four schools of law had his own jail. In addition, there was a prison for women referred to as *hujra*. See Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 5:65, 80.

77. Ibn Hajar, *Inbaʾ*, ed. Hubashi, 3:328, 421–22.

78. Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 4:127, 166. Ibn Ayas is a rich source of information about sultanic charities in the holy months of Rajab, Shaʿban, and Ramadan. See 2:28; 3:68–69, 231, 432; 4:49, 86, 94, 102, 125, 126, 141, 285–86; 5:349.

79. Kh. ʿAthamina, "Arab and Muhajirun in the Environment of Amsar," *Studia Islamica* 66 (1988): 19–22.

80. See, e.g., L. P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, 209–10; A. Singer, *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence*, 165–70.

81. N. Elisséeff, "Un document contemporain de Nur al-Din," *BEO* 25 (1972): 137, 138, 140 (text), 127–28, 129, 132–33 (trans.); Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Taʾrikh al-Bahir*, 163–74.

82. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 9:21–22.

83. Abu Shama, quoting ʿImad al-Din, writes that many of Nur al-Din's charities were distributed in 569/1173–74. See *Rawdatayn*, 1:51–52, 62, 69, 70–71, 2:270, 277–78; Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 1:105, 280 (also quoting ʿImad al-Din).

84. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, 302–3. For the depictions of Saladin, see Lev, *Saladin in Egypt*, 34–36.

85. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 82; Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli, *Kitab Husn*, 34.

86. Wakiʿ, *Akhbar al-Qudat*, 2:61.

87. *RCEA*, vol. 9, no. 3492, vol. 11, no. 4164. The epitaph "father of the poor" also appears in other sultanic inscriptions; see *RCEA*, vol. 12, no. 4458, vol. 15, no. 5801 (nonsultanic inscription), no. 5945.

88. Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Égypte, 304, 305, 317, 324. Inscriptions that refer to Mamluk sultans as the providers for the orphans, the poor, and those who renounced this world are attested to for al-Muʾayyad (1412–21), Barsbay (1422–38), Aynal (1453–61), and most notably Qaytbay (1468–96).

89. Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat al-Aʿyan*, 4:116–17. How Muslim medieval society cared for foundlings is poorly documented. Some of the pious endowments set up by Ghazan Khan in fourteenth-century Persia also provided for foster mothers of children taken off the street. See A.K.S. Lambton, "Awqaf in Persia: 6th–8th/12th–14th Centuries," *Islamic Law and Society* 4 (1997): 317. For the broader aspects of this issue, see

J. Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. The scope of Boswell's study is wider than the subtitle suggests. For his references to Islam, see 185–89.

90. Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat al-A'yan*, 4:117–18. Sibt ibn Jawzi, *Mira't al-Zaman*, vol. 8, pt. 2, 682–83.

91. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 15:104–6.

92. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:422, 426, 428–31, 434–35.

93. For Ibn al-'Adim's biography of Nizam al-Mulk, see S. Zakkar, "Biographie de Nizam al-Mulk," *BEO* 24 (1971): 231, 233.

94. For legitimization of political power through charity and charitable works in the Ottoman period, see H. T. Karateke, "Interpreting Monuments: Charitable Buildings, Monuments, and the Construction of Collective Memory in the Ottoman Empire," *Wiener Zeithschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 91 (2001): 183–201.

Chapter 3. Charity and Pious Endowments

1. The literature dealing with the legal aspects of *waqf* is extensive. I quote only a limited number of studies that bear direct relevance to my work. See M. Hoexter, "Huquq Allah and Huquq al-'Ibad as Reflected in the Waqf Institution," *JSAI* 19 (1995): 133–57; N. D. Anderson, "The Religious Element in Waqf Endowments," *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society* 38 (1951): 292–99; J. Pahlitzsch, "The Concern for Spiritual Salvation and Memoria in Islamic Public Endowments in Jerusalem (XII–XVI C.) as Compared to the Concepts of Christendom," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and J. van Steenbergen, 3:329–35. All three include ample references to sources and studies. See also D. S. Powers, "The Maliki Family Endowments: Legal Norms and Social Practices," *IJMES* 25 (1993): 387–88.

2. For *waqf* documents from the tenth–twelfth centuries, see M. Sharon, "A Waqf Inscription from Ramlah," *Arabica* 13 (1966): 77–78; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:49–51; Cl. Cahen, Y. Ragib, and M. A. Taher, "L'achat et le wakf d'un grand domaine égyptian par le vizir fatimide Tala'i' b. Ruzzik," *AI* 14 (1978): 59–127; N. Abbott, "The Monasteries of the Fayyum," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 53 (1936): 22–23 (text), 31–33 (trans.); Y. Ragib, *Marchand d'étoffes du Fayyoum au III^{e}/IX^{e} siècle*, 1:41–45.

3. For tenth-century epigraphic evidence, see *RCEA*, vol. 3, no. 1031, no. 1131, vol. 4, no. 1385, no. 1478, no. 1541. For Badr al-Jamali and Nur al-Din, see *RCEA*, vol. 7, no. 2762, vol. 9, no. 3216, no. 3262, no. 3308, no. 3309. For Mansur Qalawun, see Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum arabicarum*, Égypte, 126–27. Cf. Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 119–25.

4. R. Peters, "Wakf: In Classical Islamic Law," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d ed., 11:59.

5. Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Égypte, 495–96.

6. For pious endowments at the time of the Prophet and the first caliphs, see M. M. Amin, *Al-Awqaf wa-'l-Hayat al-Ijtima'iyya fi Misr*, 18–21; P. G. Forand, "The Status of the Land and Inhabitants of the Sawad during the Two First Centuries of Islam,"

JESHO 14 (1971): 29–30; M. Gil, "The Earliest Waqf Foundations," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998): 125–40. For Fatima's claim against her father's estate, see D. S. Powers, *Studies in Qur'an and Hadith*, 123–28.

7. For Koranic injunctions, see N. A. Stillman, "Waqf and the Ideology of Charity in Medieval Islam," in *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth*, vol. 1, *The Hunter of the East*, ed. I. R. Netton, 358–59. The connection between pious endowments and the Holy War has been emphasized by J. Schacht, see "Early Doctrines on Waqf," *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, 443–52, esp. 446.

8. For the question of possible Byzantine influences, see Cl. Cahen, "Réflexions sur le Waqf ancien," *Studia Islamica* 14 (1961): 52–53; J. R. Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire*, 11–20.

9. M. Boyce, "On the Sacred Fires of the Zoroastrians," and "The Pious Foundations of the Zoroastrians," in *BSOAS* 31 (1968): 52–68, 270–89; S. A. Arjomand, "Philanthropy, the Law, and Public Policy in the Islamic World before the Modern Era," in *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions*, ed. W. F. Ilchman et al., 110–11.

10. For al-Khassaf's work, see R. van Leeuwen, *Waqfs and Urban Structures: The Case of Ottoman Damascus*, 38–48.

11. In 778/1376–77, e.g., a cadi preferred to resign than to approve a demand for *istibdal* made by an emir. See Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 269.

12. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 519, vol. 4, pt. 2, 636–37, 665, 669. In 832/1428–29, the shops belonging to the endowment of the Mansuri hospital were renovated. See Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 2, 803.

13. L. Fernandes, "Istibdal: The Game of Exchange and Its Impact on the Urbanization of Mamluk Cairo," in *The Cairo Heritage: Essays in Honor of Laila Ali Ibrahim*, ed. D. Behrens-Abouseif, 206–9; M. Hoexter, *Endowments, Rulers, and Community*, 117–18, 129. For *istibdal* in Ottoman Damascus, see Leeuwen, *Waqfs and Urban Structures*, 158–62.

14. Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 9:10–11, 15.

15. See M. Shatzmiller, *The Berbers and the Islamic State*, 107–8.

16. For such cases, see J. H. Escovitz, *The Office of Qadi al-Qudat in Cairo under the Bahri Mamluks*, 148–58.

17. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 245–47, pt. 3, 1090, vol. 4, pt. 2, 939.

18. Kindi, *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, 346; E. Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam*, 380–81.

19. Kindi, *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, 390.

20. Ibid., 394–95; Ibn Hajar, *Raf' al-Isr*, 579.

21. Kindi, *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, 418–19.

22. Ibid., 406–10.

23. Ibid., 383, 395 (both accounts refer to 780s); cf. Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire*, 379, 381.

24. Ibn Hajar, *Raf' al-Isr*, 503–4; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:436–37, 3:138–39.

25. Ibn Hajar, *Raf' al-Isr*, 508–9.

26. Ibid., 540, 549. For cadis in pre-Fatimid Egypt who held wide administrative responsibilities, including pious endowments, see Ibn Hajar, *Raf' al-Isr*, 516. For the separation of judgeship from the supervision of endowments in tenth-century Egypt, see

Ibn Hajar, *Rafʿ al-Isr*, 533, 536, 571, 572, 573, 584; cf. Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire*, 382.

27. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:148, 208, 225, 2:107; D. Behrens-Abouseif, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. "Wakf. In Egypt." In the early tenth-century Abbasid caliphate, an office dealing with charity (*diwan al-birr*) was created and became responsible for the supervision of pious endowments for charitable causes. See Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire*, 383.

28. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:108–9; Khan, *Arabic Legal and Administrative Documents*, doc. 95.

29. Ibn al-Tuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 100–101. For occasional references to the Office of Pious Endowments in the Ayyubid and early Mamluk periods, see Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 1:323, 2:117. In both reports the expression "*diwan al-ahbas bi-Misr*" is used, indicating perhaps the existence of a separate office dealing only with the pious endowments of Cairo. This assumption is based on another report by Maqrizi that refers to an administrator (twelfth–thirteenth centuries) who was in charge of *al-ahbas bi-'l-Qahira wa-diyar Misr*, meaning the pious endowments in Cairo and Egypt. See *Muqaffa*, 3:666.

30. Sawirus Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, ed. and trans. A. S. Atiya, vol. 2, pt. 3, 248–49 (Arabic), 398–99 (English); Khan, *Arabic Legal and Administrative Documents*, doc. 23; Cooper, "Ibn Mammati's Rules," 286.

31. Al-Hakim appointed the cadi ʿAbd al-ʿAziz ibn Muhammad of the Nuʿman family to supervise the endowments of the mosques, and he appointed two of his witnesses to deal with this matter. See Ibn Hajar, *Rafʿ al-Isr*, 601; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:84.

32. Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 36, 215.

33. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 3, 741–42; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 8:47. For the affairs of Damascus in the 1280s, see Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 137–42, esp. 141.

34. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 1:281, 284; Ibn al-Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 7:109, 110; Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 5:265; Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:96, 98, 276, 284–85.

35. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:84–85.

36. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 31:31; cf. J. M. Thayer, "Land and Power in Mamluk Egypt," Ph.D. diss., 76–80; T. Sato, *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam*, 132.

37. Shujaʿi, *Ta'rikh al-Malik al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun*, ed. B. Schäfer, 59–60; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 474–75.

38. For the taxation of *al-rizaq al-ahbasiyya* in 803/1400–1401, 822/1419–20, and 844/1440–41, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 3, 1052–53; vol. 4, pt. 1, 482, pt. 3, 1221.

39. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:85–86.

40. Ibid., 4:86.

41. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:260–61, 278, 280, 320–21. For a comparison between Barsbay and Qaytbay, see 2:171.

42. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 4:14, 53, 109–10, 136, 150.

43. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:112–23; M. Gil, *Documents of the Jewish Pious Foundation from the Cairo Geniza*, 11–12, 105, 109–10, 111–14; M. R. Cohen,

"The Foreign Jewish Poor in Medieval Egypt," in *Poverty and Charity in Middle Eastern Contexts*, ed. M. Bonner et al., 53–72.

44. See Menahem Ben-Sasson, *The Emergence of the Local Jewish Community in the Muslim World: Qayrawan, 800–1057*, 183–86 (in Hebrew).

45. Antaki, *Kitab al-Ta'rikh*, ed. L. Shaykhu, 194, 197, 204, 229.

46. Abu Salih, the Armenian, *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and Some Neighboring Countries*, trans. B.T.A. Evetts, 15, 208. For properties granted as endowments to the Qusayr monastery in the Fatimid period, see 147.

47. This was the case with a richly endowed church in the region of Ludd that was destroyed by Saladin. See Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:71.

48. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 921.

49. M. M. Amin, "Un acte de fondation de wakf par une Chrétienne (X^{e} siècle h., XVI^{e} chr)," *JESHO* 18 (1975): 43–53; R. Shaham, "Christian and Jewish Waqf in Palestine during the Late Ottoman Period," *BSOAS* 54 (1991): 460–72.

Chapter 4. Pious Endowments and the Urban Society

1. Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Bughyat al-Talab fi Ta'rikh Halab*, ed. S. Zakkar, 1:184.

2. Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Bughyat*, 1:184–85; C. E. Bosworth, "Abu ʿAmr ʿUthman al-Tarsusi's Siyar al-Thughur and the Last Years of Arab Rule in Tarsus (Fourth/Tenth Century)," *Graeco-Arabica* 5 (1993): 190–91.

3. C. E. Bosworth, "The City of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine Frontiers in Early and Middle Abbasid Times," *Oriens* 33 (1992): 272–73. Usually tithe-paying lands were held by Muslims as either *iqtaʿ* or *ighar*. For the *ighar* lands in the Muslim-Byzantine frontier zone, see A. Elad, "Two Identical Inscriptions from Jund Filastin from the Reign of the Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtadir," *JESHO* 35 (1992): 313–16.

4. Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:156. For a pious endowment in Damascus for the upkeep of the walls of Homs, see Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:58–59.

5. Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 23, 35, 36, 39; Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 51–52, 225, 258, 283.

6. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:105–6. In twelfth-century Aleppo a *waqf* was set up for "the poor of the Muslims," however, the circumstances behind its establishment were rather unusual. See D. Morray, *An Ayyubid Notable and His World*, 77.

7. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:71–72.

8. Bosworth, "The City of Tarsus," 282–83. For Damascus, see Mouton, *Damas et sa principauté*, 87–88, and for Egypt, see Safadi, *Kitab al-Wafi bi-'l-Wafayat*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 18:345, 379–80.

9. *Masalik al-Absar fi Mamalik al-Amsar*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 49, 50, 128, 138.

10. Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 8:216; Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 1:107–8, 294, 2:120–21, 134.

11. Lambton, "Awqaf in Persia." For the Ottoman period, see M. Shefer, "Hospitals in the Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul, in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," Ph.D. diss., 197 (in Hebrew).

12. *Awqaf wa-Amlak al-Muslimin fi Filastin*, ed. M. Ipsrili and M. D. al-Tamimi, 6, para. 13; 8, para. 21; 14, para. 44.

13. See Hoexter, *Endowments, Rulers, and Community*, 9–10, 90.

14. *Awqaf wa-Amlak al-Muslimin fi Filastin*, 27, para. 19; 68, para. 41.

15. M. Bilge, "Awqaf of a Madrasa in Jerusalem," in *The Third International Conference on Bilad al-Sham*, 1:27–35.

16. Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:288–321; French translation by N. Elisséeff, *La description de Damas d'Ibn ʿAsakir*, 81–177.

17. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:96; Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:72–73; Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Zubdat Halab*, 3:76.

18. *Muqaffa*, 6:495.

19. For mosques that lost their pious endowments, see ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Aʿlaq al-Khatira: Taʾrikh Madinat Dimashq*, ed. S. Dahan, 93, 96, 100, 101, 104, 111, 113, 118. These correspond to Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:289, 290, 293, 294, 296, 300, 301, 304. For endowed mosques, see ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, 100, 107. These correspond to Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:293, 297.

20. For these mosques, see ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. Dahan, 132–33, and Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:308–9.

21. For traditions about water and charity, see Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:376–77, Elisséeff's translation in *Les description*, 256–57; for water canals and pious endowments, see Ibn ʿAsakir, *Taʾrikh Dimashq*, 2:371, 377, trans., 252–53, 257; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 33:265.

22. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 3:220. For a fuller discussion and additional sources, see A. F. Sayyid, *La capitale de l'Égypte jusqu'à l'époque fatimide*, 71–73.

23. Sharon, "Waqf Inscription from Ramla c. 300/912–13," 98–107; Fariqi, *Taʾrikh al-Fariki*, ed. B. ʿAbd Latif ʿAwwad, 164–66.

24. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 16:289.

25. The establishment of drinking fountains in a town reflected urban and demographic changes. One of the best studied cases is that of Ottoman Cairo. See A. Raymond, "Les fontaines publiques (sabil) du Caire à l'époque Ottomane (1517–1798)," *AI* 15 (1979): 235–91; D. Behrens-Abouseif, *Egypt's Adjustment to Ottoman Rule*, 168–69. For Mamluk Cairo, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 123.

26. Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 120–21; Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 70. The history of the water projects in Mecca is outlined by Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 33:207–9.

27. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:390, 3:23–25.

28. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 15:229, 16:262; Ibn al-Mustawafi, *Taʾrikh Irbil*, ed. Kh. al-Sakar, 1:283–84; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil* 9:144; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:300, 424, 459–60; *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 97, pt. 2, 536, 770; Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 4:256.

29. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 3:48.

30. Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Taʾrikh al-Quds waʾl-Khalil*, 1:235; Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 1:428–29; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 11:308.

31. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 4–5, 214, 238; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:166, 31:442.

32. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 1:230–33, 5:61.

33. Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:97; Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 2:106.

34. Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 145; Ibn Fadl Allah al-ʿUmari, *Masalik al-Absar*, ed. A. Zaky Pasha, 100–101.

35. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 17:199; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Taʾrikh al-Bahir*, 11.

36. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:115–16.

37. For a description of the Kaaba sanctuary's interior and the fabrics used for its decoration, see Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 76–78. For Nur al-Din and Saladin, see Lev, *Saladin*, 133–34.

38. *Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Ashraf Shaʿban*, ed. S. R. al-Qahtani, in *Awqaf al-Sultan al-Ashraf Shaʿban ʿala Haramayn*, 229–30, lines 854–66.

39. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 28:52–53, quoting Musabbihi, who provides some details about the composition of this endowment.

40. Other pious endowments in Egypt provided for olive oil for lighting the mosques in the Holy Cities. See Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:147; Ibn Furat, *Taʾrikh al-Duwal waʾl-Muluk*, 9:301. For the *waqf* for the eunuch corps at the tomb of the Prophet in Medina and its supervision, see Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 3:112; *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 633.

41. Hoexter, *Endowments, Rulers, and Community*, 145, 147, 151–52.

42. S. J. Shaw, *The Financial and Administrative Organization and Development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517–1798*, 90–91, 239, 240, 241, 245; J. Hathaway, *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt*, 147–48.

43. Shaw, *Financial and Administrative Organization*, 240, 258–59, 260; S. Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans, 1517–1683*, esp. chap. 4. For references to the pious endowment for the *kiswa* in the Mamluk period, see Ibn Taghribirdi, *Al-Nujum*, 15:382.

44. For Qaytbay's pilgrimage, motives, and the properties endowed for the Dashisha in Medina, see Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:160–61, 165, 329. For Qaytbay's visit to Jerusalem and Hebron, see Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:112; D. Behrens-Abouseif, "Sultan Qaytbay's Foundation in Medina, the Madrasah, the Ribat, and the Dashishah," *MSR* 2 (1998): 65–67.

45. Shaw, 269; Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans*, 80–88; Hathaway, *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt*, 150.

46. For the operation of ships belonging to *waqf* foundations on the Red Sea, see M. ʿAfifi, "Al-Awqaf waʾl-Milaha al-Bahriyya fi ʾl-Bahr al-Ahmar fi ʾl-ʿAsr al-ʿUthmani," in *Le waqf dans l'espace islamique outil de pouvoir socio-politique*, ed. R. Deguilhem, 87–100. It seems that during the Mamluk period the grain to Arabia, including for Qaytbay's Dhashisha, was shipped on privately owned ships. See Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 4:103.

47. In 445/1053–54, the Marwanid ruler Nasr al-Dawla established a pious endowment that consisted of two houses that were designated for people arriving from the Diyarbakr region to Jerusalem. See M. H. Burgoyne, "A Recently Discovered Marwanid Inscription in Jerusalem," *Levant* 14 (1982): 118–21.

48. M. Gil, "Dhimmi Donations and Foundations for Jerusalem (638–1099)," *JESHO* 27 (1984): 156–70; D. Bahat, "Hospices and Hospitals in Mamluk Jerusalem," in *Towns and Material Culture in the Medieval Middle East*, ed. Lev, 73–89.

49. Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 27, 28, 29–30; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:198.

50. Tankiz also improved the water supply system in Damascus. In 682/1283–84, a reservoir financed through the poll tax paid by the non-Muslims in Jerusalem and its environs was constructed for the benefit of the pilgrims in Hebron. See Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 7:259; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 289, 302; vol. 3, pt. 2, 510. For Khushqadam's works, see Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:92, 99, 284–85.

51. Y. Frenkel, "Political and Social Aspects of Islamic Religious Endowments (Awqaf): Saladin in Cairo (1169–73) and Jerusalem (1187–93)," *BSOAS* 62 (1999): 5, 8–10.

52. ʿImad al-Din, 142, 151; Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, 3:398, 400, 415, 4:332, 338

53. Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 108.

54. For Qaytbay's works in Jerusalem, see A. M. Newhall, "The Patronage of the Mamluk Sultan Qaitbay, 872–901/1468–96," Ph.D. diss., 247–51.

55. Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:96–97, 99, 277–78, 279, 285, 286–87, 318, 321. For visits of Mamluk sultans to Jerusalem and Hebron in 820/1417–18 and 880/1475–76, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 421; Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:112.

56. Nasir Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 35–37; *RCEA*, vol. 10, no. 3752.

Chapter 5. Pious Endowments, Learning, and Mysticism

1. For the cadi's role in the supervision of the orphans, see Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire*, 366–67, 372–73; Y. Lev, "The Cadi and the Urban Society: The Case Study of Medieval Egypt, 9th–12th Centuries," in *Towns and Material Culture in the Medieval Middle East*, ed. Lev, 89–103; M. Yazbak, "Muslim Orphans and the Shariʿa in Ottoman Palestine according to Sijjil Records," *JESHO* 44 (2001): 123–40. For the Jewish society, see Ben-Sasson, *The Emergence of a Local Jewish Community in the Muslim World: Qayrawan, 800–1057*, 333–34; M. R. Cohen, "Halacha and Reality in Matters of Charity during the Geniza Period," in *The Intertwined Worlds of Islam*, ed. N. Ilan, 328–33 (in Hebrew).

2. For al-Hakam's policies, see Ibn al-ʿIdhari, *al-Bayan al-Mughrib*, ed. G. S. Colin and Levi-Provençal, 1:240, 249. For al-Hakam's learning and patronage of scholars, see Ibn al-Abbar, *Hulla al-Siyara'*, ed. R.P.A. Dozy in *Notices sur quelques manuscrits Arabes*, 101–5; Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 1:284; Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa* (Beirut ed.), 8; Amin, *Al-Awqaf*, 261–62. For Fez, see M. Shatzmiller, "Islamic Institutions and Property Rights: The Case of the 'Public Good Waqf,'" *JESHO* 44 (2001): 53–54.

3. For a Koranic school in Jerusalem attributed to Saladin, see Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Jérusalem "Ville," 110–11. For

an endowed Koranic school for orphans and poor boys in Jerusalem of 595/1198–99, see *RCEA*, vol. 9, no. 3514. For Nur al-Din, see Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Ta'rikh al-Bahir*, 172.

4. Ibn al-Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jami'a* (Beirut ed.), 35, 46.

5. Al-Makin, *La chronique des Ayyoubides*, 135.

6. Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:26, 33.

7. Safadi, *A'yan*, 2:120–21.

8. For Baybars and Mansur Qalawun's Koranic schools, see Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:93, 31:112; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 8:10. For Barsbay's foundations, see *Hujjat Waqf al-Ashraf Barsbay (L'Acte de waqf de Barsbay)*, ed. A. Darrag, 3–4, 30–31, 53.

9. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:199, 201, 232, 236, 240, 251, 260; Lev, *Saladin*, 24, 128.

10. *Hujjat [Waqf] al-Ashraf Qaytbay*, ed. L. A. Mayer, as *The Buildings of Qaytbay as Described in His Endowment Deed*, 1–3.

11. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 60; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 9:85; Ibn Ayas, *Bada'i' al-Zuhur*, 3:43, 329; J. Dobrowolski, "The Funerary Complex of Amir Kabir Qurqumas in Cairo," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and d. De Smet, 2:271, 281. For the Koranic schools of the sultan al-Nasir Hasan in Gaza, Jerusalem, and Damascus, see Howyda N. al-Harithy, "The Complex of Sultan Hasan in Cairo: Reading between the Lines," *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 74, 76. For the restoration of Hisn al-Akrad in the 1310s, including a Koranic school, see *RCEA*, vol. 9, no. 3512.

12. *Poverty and Charity*, 80–83.

13. *Awqaf wa-Amlak al-Muslimin fi Filastin*, 26, para. 18; 29, para. 24; 38, para. 48; 46, para. 66; 53, para. 88; M. Ipsirli, "A Preliminary Study of the Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs in the Sixteenth Century," *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations* 1 (1986): 147.

14. For Ottoman period, see N. Itzkowitz, "Health, Education, and Welfare—Ottoman Style," *Midway*, 1968, 59–68, esp. 67. For Koranic schools in Ottoman Egypt, see Behrens-Abouseif, *Egypt's Adjustment to Ottoman Rule*, 184, 186, 187, 195, 201, 202, 213, 216. For other Koranic schools, see I. M. Kunt, "The Waqf as an Instrument of Public Policy: Notes on the Köprülü Family Endowments," in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honor of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. C. Heywood and C. Imber, 195–96.

15. For the Mamluk period, see S. Z. Mostafa, "The Cairene Sabil: Form and Meaning," *Muqarnas* 6 (1989): 33–43. He discusses the *sabil* in a wider religious and architectural context. A full list of *sabil kuttabs* in Ottoman Cairo is given by Raymond, "Les fontaines publiques," 235–86; Behrens-Abouseif, *Egypt's Adjustment*, 179, 180.

16. Nu'aymi, *Al-Daris fi Ta'rikh al-Madaris*, ed. J. al-Husni, 2:135; 'Izz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-A'laq al-Khatira: Ta'rikh Madinat Dimashq*, ed. S. Dahan, 82, 85.

17. Nu'aymi, *Dur al-Qur'an fi Dimashq*, ed. S. al-Din al-Munajjid, 31–34, 43.

18. The teaching of the Koran is always mentioned, but other subjects are occasionally referred to, including literature, writing, and arithmetic. See Amin, *Al-Awqaf*, 269–70; U. Haarmann, "Mamluk Endowment Deeds as a Source for the History of Education in Late Medieval Egypt," *Abhath* 28 (1980): 43, 45–46.

19. Ibn al-Hajj, *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:323, 328. Ibn al-Hajj's writings have been used by Mahmud 'Abd al-'Ati in his book *Al-Ta'lim fi Misr Zaman al-Ayyubiyyin wa-'l-*

Mamalik. However, he draws a distinction between Koranic school and Koranic school for orphans. I beg to differ.

20. Ibn al-Hajj, *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:331, 323.

21. Ibid., 2:316, 325–26, 327; D. P. Little, "Notes on the Mamluk Madrasahs," *MSR* 6 (2002): 13. The distinction drawn by Malake Abiad between "*kuttab* pour l'enseignement de l'écriture" and "*kuttab* coraniques" seems tenuous at best. See *Culture et éducation Arabo-Islamiques au Sham*, 214–19.

22. Ibn al-Hajj, *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:324–25.

23. Ibid., 2:322, 324, 328, 329–30.

24. Ibn Saʿi, *Al-Jamiʿ al-Mukhtasar*, 38, 121.

25. Ibn al-Hajj, *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:330, 331; Ibn Tulun, *Mutʿat al-Adhhan*, ed. Kh. al-Mawsili, 1:159, 538, 565, 2:592, 638, 711, 732, 734 (I owe the reference to Ibn Tulun's work to the kindness of Hayyim Nisim of Tel Aviv University); S. D. Goitein, *Jewish Education in Muslim Countries*, chap. 4 (in Hebrew); *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:188–89; Anne-Marie Eddé, *La principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep (579/1183–658/1260)*, 394–95. For Khatib al-Baghdadi, see Munir-ud-Din Ahmed, *Muslim Education and the Scholar's Social Status*, 44–47.

26. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:178–79; J. Olszowy-Schlanger, "Learning to Read and Write in Medieval Egypt: Children's Exercise Books from the Cairo Geniza," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 48 (2003): 55. For the spiritual powers of the Koranic text, see A. Giladi, "The Individual in Early Islamic Thought and Education," in *The Intertwined Worlds of Islam*, 176 (in Hebrew).

27. Amin, *Al-Awqaf*, 270–71; al-ʿAti, *Al-Taʿlim fi Misr Zaman al-Ayyubiyyin wa-ʾl-Mamalik*, 109–11. For how the art of writing should be taught to young children, see Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 9:218–19.

28. For teaching of arithmetic in Koranic schools and Ibn al-Hajj's warnings, see *Kitab al-Madkhal*, 2:316, 327, 336, 338–39, 340, 344. The teaching of arithmetic is mentioned as a recommendation in ninth-century Qayrawan. See M. Talbi, "Everyday Life in the Cities of Islam," in *The Different Aspects of Islamic Culture*, ed. A. Bouhdiba and M. M. Dawalibi, 412–13; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:177–78.

29. Ibn al-Furat, *Taʾrikh al-Duwal wa-ʾl-Muluk*, 9:25; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 574.

30. E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, 59–63.

31. For Muslim attitudes, see A. Giladi, "Gender Differences in Child Rearing and Education," *Al-Qantara* 16 (1995): 301–2; Lane, *Manner and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, 63. For the Jewish world, see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:186–87; Olszowy-Schlanger, "Learning to Read and Write," 53–54; Ben-Sasson, *Emergence of a Local Jewish Community*, 136–37.

32. R. S. Mackensen, "Moslem Libraries and Sectarian Propaganda," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 21 (1934–35): 88–97.

33. O. Pinto, "The Libraries of the Arabs during the Time of the Abbasids," *Islamic Culture* 3 (1929): 213. For the rich Arabic nomenclature designating libraries, see Y. Eche, *Les bibliothèques Arabes*, 1–6.

34. Maqrizi, *Musawwadat Kitab al-Mawaʿiz*, ed. Sayyid, 300–305. For the pious

endowment created by al-Hakim for the *dar al-hikma* and other institutions, see Sayyid, *Al-Dawla al-Fatimiyya fi Misr*, 586–87; Eche, *Les bibliothèques Arabes*, 77–97, 361–64. For another institution, the Fatimid royal library and its long and eventful history, see Sayyid, *Al-Dawla al-Fatimiyya*, 594–601. Less well known is the library (*dar al-ʿilm*) that existed in Baghdad between 381/991 and 450/1058. It was an endowed institution with 10,000 books. See Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 15:172.

35. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira* (historical topography), ed. Dahan, 107. For English and French translations of the accounts, concerning the fate of the library in Tripoli, see Pinto, "Libraries of the Arabs," 235–36; Eche, *Les bibliothèques Arabes*, 120–21.

36. The same is true for sixteenth-century Istanbul. See F. Bilici, "Les bibliothèques vakif-s à Istanbul au XVI[e] siècle, prémices de grandes bibliothèques publiques," *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 87–88 (1998): 39–59.

37. For Eche's characterization of *dar al-ʿilm*, see *Les bibliothèques Arabes*, 143–50, and its link with the *madrasa*, 154–61.

38. Eche, *Les bibliothèques Arabes*, 155; G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West*, 308–11. Makdisi's critic of Eche follows a lengthy exposition of his views, 305–8.

39. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges*, 311.

40. Ibid., 223, 231; R. W. Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 48, 73–74, 249–55; H. Halm, "Die Anfänge der Madrasa," 438–48; R. P. Mottahedeh, "The Transmission of Learning: The Role of the Islamic Northeast," in *Madrasa*, ed. N. Grandin and M. Gaborieau, 65, 66–67.

41. For George Makdisi's views on the political utility of Nizam al-Mulk's law colleges, see "Muslim Institutions of Learning in Eleventh-Century Baghdad," *BSOAS* 24 (1961): 55.

42. For Nur al-Din and Saladin's religious policies in Aleppo, see Eddé, *La principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep*, 36–37; Lev, *Saladin*, 6, 131–32.

43. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 16:117, 17:304; cf. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges*, 302–3.

44. M. Khader, "Deux actes waqf d'un Qarahanides d'Asie Centrale," *Journal Asiatique* 255 (1967): 324–30.

45. Ibid., 328, 329.

46. See J. Berkey, "Mamluks and the World of Higher Islamic Education in Medieval Cairo, 1250–1517," in *Modes de transmission de la culture religieuse en Islam*, ed. H. Elboudrari, 98.

47. M. Sobernheim, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Syrie du Nord, 115–16.

48. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 32:60–74.

49. Ibid., 32:64, lines 18–19, 67, line 1.

50. Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Zubdat Halab*, 2:314–15.

51. *Awqaf al-Sultan al-Ashraf Shaʿban*, ed. Qahtani, 231–32, lines 878–91.

52. Ibid., 233, lines 905–6.

53. Ibid., 234, lines 919–20, 235, lines 929–31.

54. Ibid., 239, line 982; 246, lines 1059–60, 1066.

55. Pahlitzsch, "Concern for Spiritual Salvation," 335–44; R. D. McChesney, "Waqf and Public Policy: The Waqfs of Shah ʿAbbas 1011–1023/1602–1614," *Asian and African Studies* (Haifa) 15 (1981): 167, 185.

56. This point is emphasized by J. Berkey in chapter 3 of *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo*.

57. The technical term for classes in mosques is *zawiya*, meaning a corner where the teacher taught. The essence of the foundation was that the teacher was maintained by a pious endowment, implying that he need not charge tuition fees. See ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira fi Dhikr Umaraʾ al-Sham wa-ʾl-Jazira*, ed. Y. Z. ʿAbbara, 1:286. Abu Shama says that he saw Saladin's pious endowment deed. See *Rawdatayn*, 2:430.

58. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:20.

59. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 4:211–12.

60. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Taʾrikh al-Bahir*, 171, 174.

61. Al-Fasi, *Shifaʾ al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 1:330. Cf. R. T. Mortel, "Ribats in Mecca during the Medieval Period: A Descriptive Study Based on Literary Sources," *BSOAS* 61 (1998): 29–35.

62. Al-Fasi, *Shifaʾ al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 331.

63. Ibid., 333, 335, 336.

64. For the pious endowment deeds of the *ribats* established by Saladin and Tankiz, see *Watha'iq Muqaddasiyya Ta'rikhiyya*, ed. K. J. al-ʿAsli, 1:93–94, 116. For Saladin's pious endowments, see Frenkel, "Political and Social Aspects of Islamic Religious Endowments," 7–8.

65. Here the term *fuqaraʾ* must be understood as meaning mystics and is synonymous with *sufiyya*. The juxtaposition of both words is for the sake of emphasis as in other expressions of this kind. These two *waqf* documents have been edited and published by Hayat Nasir al-Hajji. See *Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus*, Jumada II 725H, in *al-Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun*, 282–83, lines 1071–75. The district of Siryaqus was developed by al-Nasir Muhammad into a small urban center. See J. A. Williams, "The Khanqah of Siryaqus: A Mamluk Royal Religious Foundation," in *In Quest of an Islamic Humanism: Arabic and Islamic Studies in Memory of Mohamed al-Nowaihi*, ed. A. H. Green, 109–19.

66. *Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus*, 725H, 284, lines 1083–91.

67. The large *ribat* was designated for a permanent and transient population of mystics, referred to as *fuqaraʾ* and *sufiyya*, not the poor.

68. *Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus*, 725H, 284–85, lines 1091–94, 288, lines 1126–30, 386, lines 103–8.

69. *Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus*, 725H, 288–92, lines 1126–80, 293–94, lines 1180–94.

70. *Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus*, 12 Jumada II 726H, 386, lines 99–108; 387, lines 108–14; 389, lines 141–42.

71. For a comprehensive study of this institution, see L. Fernandes, "The Foundation of Baybars al-Janshakir: Its Waqf, History, and Architecture," *Muqarnas* 4 (1987): 21–43.

72. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:276–77; A. Arazi, "Al-Risala al-Baybarsiyya d'al-Suyuti: Un

document sur les problèmes d'un waqf sultanien sous les derniers mamluks," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): 329–54.

73. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:273–75; *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 834–35; L. Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khanqah*, 23–24.

74. Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*, Jérusalem "Ville," 214–15.

75. *Wathiqat Waqf al-Sultan Qaytbay ʿala al-Madrasa al-Ashrafiyya wa-Qaʿa al-Silah bi-Dimiyat*, ed. M. M. Amin in *Majjala al-Ta'rikhiyya al-Misriyya*, 22 (1975): 356, lines 40–41; 358, lines 57–58, 64–65; 359, lines 75–76; 360, lines 78–79; 362, lines 107–9.

76. H. Hallenberg, "The Sultan Who Loved Sufis: How Qaytbay Established a Shrine Complex in Dasuq," *MSR* 4 (2000): 147–66, esp. 166.

77. D. Behrens-Abouseif, "Change in Function and Form of Mamluk Religious Institutions," *AI* 21 (1985): 84.

78. L. Fernandes, "Three Sufi Foundations in a Fifteenth-Century Waqfiyya," *AI* 17 (1981): 156.

79. St. H. Stephan, "An Endowment Deed of Khasseki Sultan, Dated the 24th May 1552," *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 10 (1944): 182, 183.

80. The research literature dealing with chantries is vast. My references go only to the most recent publications in a leading journal. See H. Colvin, "The Origin of Chantries," *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000): 163–73; D. Crouch, "The Origin of Chantries: Some Further Anglo-Norman Evidence," *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 159–81. For chantries in association with charitable institutions, see M. Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*, 184, 190.

Chapter 6. Charitable Institutions and Causes

1. Y. Ashkenazi, "Curing and Nursing in the Church of Jerusalem during the Byzantine Period," in *Medicine in Jerusalem throughout the Ages*, ed. Z. Amar and E. Lev, 33–51 (in Hebrew); D. J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, chaps. 11 and 13, esp. 173, 188.

2. See M. W. Dols, *Majnun: The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*, ed. D. E. Immisch, 456.

3. T. S. Miller, *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire*, 5, 69–71, 113–33; "The Orphanothropheion of Constantinople," in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, ed. E. A. Hanawalt and C. Lindberg, 83–104.

4. The term *dar* (house) is used by Ibn Wasil in *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 5:55. Abu Shama says that Nur al-Din built places (*maqarr*) for strangers and the poor Muslims (see *Rawdatayan*, 1:71). His statement is uncorroborated, and the term *maqarr* can be understood as meaning a hospice. Without going into details, Carl F. Petry says that pious endowments in the Mamluk period were also created for orphanages (*rubut al-aytam*). See "The Military Institutions and Innovations in the Late Mamluk Period," in *The Cambridge History of Egypt*, vol. 1, *Islamic Egypt, 640–1517*, ed. C. F. Petry, 473.

5. Al-Fasi, *Shifa' al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 331, 333, 334–35.

6. *RCEA*, vol. 12, no. 4787, no. 4809; Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jami'a*, ed. Jawwad, 308, 417–18.

7. Al-Fasi, *Shifa' al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 334; *RCEA*, vol. 14, no. 5207.

8. D. P. Little, "The Nature of Khanqahs, Ribats, and Zawiyas under the Mamluks," in *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, ed. W. B. Hallaq and D. P. Little, 94, 97, 101, 102. He understands and translates the term *fuqara'* as meaning the poor. Th. E. Homerin, "Saving Muslim Souls: The Khanqah and the Sufi Duty in Mamluk Lands," *MSR* 3 (1999): 67–68; "Sufis and Detractors in Mamluk Egypt: A Survey of Protagonists and Institutional Settings," in *Islamic Mysticism Contested*, ed. F. de Jong and B. Radtke, 229–30. In some cases modern studies continue to reflect the ambiguity of the medieval Arabic terminology, and *zawiyas*, *khanqas*, *khans*, and *ribats* are lumped together as hospices. See H. Lutfi, *Al-Quds al-Mamlukiyya*, 40.

9. *The History of Bukhara*, trans. Richard N. Frye, 15; Lev, *Saladin*, 122–23; A. Cohen, *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem*, 71.

10. Al-Fasi, *Shifa' al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 331; Ibn Hajar, *Inba'*, ed. M. Khan, 3:226–27; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:293–94. The term *mawda'* is frequently used in connection with the box in which the money of the orphans fund was kept at the cadi's office. For charitable *ribats* in pre-Fatimid and Fatimid Egypt, see Lev, *Saladin*, 122–23.

11. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 17:247; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:293–94; al-Fasi, *Shifa' al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*, 335, 339. In other cases it is difficult to ascertain the exact nature of *ribats* designated for women. See Safadi *A'yan*, 2:387, 403. For *ribats* for women in thirteenth-century Damascus, see L. Pouzet, *Damas au VII^e/XIII^e siècle: Vie et structures religieuses dans une métropole islamique*, 211. For Aleppo, see Eddé, *La principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep*, 652; *RCEA*, vol. 12, no. 4428.

12. *RCEA*, vol. 12, no. 4427; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:245. For pious endowments set up for freedmen by their former masters in the Iranian world, see A.K.S. Lambton, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia*, 313. For sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Istanbul and Egypt, see G. Baer, "The Waqf as a Prop for the Social System (Sixteenth–Twentieth Centuries)," *Islamic Law and Society* 4 (1997): 275–76. The most comprehensive treatment of this subject is by R. Shaham, "Masters, Their Freed Slaves, and Waqf in Egypt (Eighteenth–Twentieth Centuries)," *JESHO* 43 (2000): 162–88.

13. E. S. Wolper, "The Politics of Patronage: Political Change and the Construction of Dervishes' Lodges in Sivas," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 40.

14. Ibn Hawqal, *Kitab Surat al-Ard*, ed. J. H. Kramers, 454.

15. Muqaddasi, *Kitab Ahsan al-Taqasim fi Ma'rifat al-Aqalim*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, 333.

16. Ibn Hawqal, *Kitab Surat al-Ard*, 401, 404, 466–67; Muqaddasi, *Ahsan al-Taqasim*, 333–34.

17. L. Fernandes, "Two Variations on the Same Theme: The Zawiya of Hasan al-Rumi, the Takiyya of Ibrahim al-Gulšani," *AI* 21 (1985): 95–106, esp. 101.

18. Th. Emil Homerin, "Saving Muslim Souls," 67–68; Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:45–46.

19. For *zawiyas* in Mamluk Egypt as Sufi and charitable institutions, see L. Fernandes, "The Zawiya in Cairo," *AI* 18 (1982): 116–21; L. Fernandes, "Three Sufi Foundations in a Fifteenth-Century Waqfiyya," *AI* 17 (1981): 149–50; L. Fernandes, "Some Aspects of the Zawiya in Egypt at the Eve of the Ottoman Conquest," *AI* 19 (1983): 11, 12, 14.

20. Ipsirli, "Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs," 135, 136. For *zawiyas* in North Africa, see F. Rodríguez-Mañas, "Charity and Deceit: The Practice of itʿam al-taʿam in Moroccan Sufism," *Studia Islamica* 91 (2000): 59–91.

21. ʿAbd al-Qadir al-Rihawi and É. E. Ouéchek, "Les deux Takiyya de Damas," *BEO* 28 (1975): 223, 225.

22. Rodríguez-Mañas, "Charity and Deceit," 59–90.

23. See Ibn al-Mustawafi, *Taʾrikh Irbil*, ed. Kh. Sakar, 1:72, 107, 214, 357.

24. T. S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*, 24–29.

25. Ibid., 151; T. S. Miller, "The Sampson Hospital of Constantinople," *Byzantinishe Forschungen* 15 (1990): 101.

26. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, 118, 141.

27. Ibid., 144–45, 153.

28. See M. W. Dols, "The Origins of the Islamic Hospital: Myth and Reality," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61 (1987): 370, 371. See also Lawrence I. Conrad, "Did al-Walid I Found the First Islamic Hospital?" *Aram* 6 (1994): 225–44.

29. Dols, "Origins of the Islamic Hospital," 371; N. Allan, "Hospice to Hospital in the Near East: An Instance of Continuity and Change in the Late Antiquity," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990): 447, 452–53; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "*xenodocheion*," 3:2208.

30. See Orme and Webster, *The English Hospital, 1070–1570*, 39. For the definition of the inmates of the Hospital of St. John in Cambridge as the poor or sick, see Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*, 103, 159.

31. In scholarly writings this distinction is not always maintained. Very clear distinctions are made by Jean Imbert (see "Les conciles et les hôpitaux [IX^{e} siècle]") and Magdalena Santo Tomás Pérez and Ruth González Santo Tomás (see "Les soins donnés aux malades dans la Castille du Bas Moyen Âge: l'hôpital royal de Burgos, prototype de l'hôpital castillan"), both in *Fondations et oeuvres charitables au Moyen Âge*, ed. J. Dufour and H. Platelle, 40–41, 283. For looser and sometimes more confusing usage of the term *hospital*, see M. Amouroux, "Colonization and the Creation of Hospitals: The Eastern Extension of Western Hospitality in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (1999): 33, 35.

32. M. R. McVaugh, *Medicine before the Plague: Practitioners and Their Patients in the Crown of Aragon, 1285–1345*, 228–29; J. W. Brodman, *Charity and Welfare: Hospitals and the Poor in Medieval Catalonia*, 93–99, esp. 98.

33. C. Jones, *Charity and Bienfaisance: The Treatment of the Poor in the Montpellier Region, 1740–1815*, 121, 126; C. Jones, *The Charitable Imperative: Hospitals and Nursing in Ancien Regime and Revolutionary France*, chaps. 1 and 6.

34. S. B. Edgington, "The Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem," in *Medicine in Jerusalem throughout the Ages*, ed. Z. Amar and E. Lev, 21, 22; S. B. Edgington, "Medical Care in the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem," in *The Military Orders: Welfare and*

Warfare, ed. H. Nicholson, 27–35. See also B. Z. Kedar, "A Twelfth-Century Description of the Jerusalem Hospital," in *The Military Orders*, 2:3–13. For other institutions that offered care in the Outremer, see Jean Richard, "Hospitals and Hospital Congregations in the Latin Kingdom during the First Period of the Frankish Conquest," in *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B. Z. Kedar et al., 89–101. He uses the term *hospital* in the meaning of a lodge or hospice that offered hospitality to pilgrims and travelers. When a medical institution that treated the sick is referred to, he uses the word *infirmary*. See 90, 97, 98–99.

35. *RCEA*, vol. 10, no. 3809, vol. 11, no. 4001, vol. 14, no. 5238, vol. 16, no. 6285. The complex built by Mujahid al-Din, the ruler of Mosul, included a mosque, a law college, a *ribat* for the mystics, and a hospital for the sick. See Ibn Saʿi, *Al-Jamiʿ al-Mukhtasar*, 8.

36. For a discussion of medieval Islamic hospitals, see U. Hazan, "Medical, Administrative, and Financial Aspects of Hospitals in Medieval Islam, 8th–15th Centuries," Ph.D. diss., 10–86 (in Hebrew); S. Hamarneh, "Development of Hospitals in Islam," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 17 (1962): 366–84.

37. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:258–59 (quoting Balawi and Kindi); Sayyid, *La capitale*, 57–58.

38. Nisaburi, *ʻUqala' al-Majanin*, ed. W. F. al-Kilani, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 145, 147, 151. This work has been studied in detail by K. Zakharia, "Le statut du fou dans le Kitab ʻUqala' al-Maganin d'al-Nisaburi, modalités d'une exclusion," *BEO* 49 (1997): 269–87. For wards for the mentally ill in Islamic medieval hospitals, see M. W. Dols, "Insanity and Its Treatment in Islamic Society," *Medical History* 31 (1987): 3.

39. Ibn Zulaq, *Akhbar al-Sibawayhi al-Misri*, ed. M. I. Saʿd and H. al-Dib, 26–27, 28, 30. Cf. Y. Lev, "Aspects of the Egyptian Society in the Fatimid Period," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen, 3:1–9.

40. Ibn Duqmaq, *Kitab al-Intisar,* 4:98–99; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 6:137–38.

41. For the foundation of the ʻAdudi hospital, see Ibn Qifti, *Ta'rikh al-Hukama'*, ed. J. Lippert, 235–36; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 14:10, 289; Hazan, "Medical, Administrative, and Financial Aspects," 22–26.

42. For the events of 1228–29, see Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. Jawwad, 3–4. A slightly different account appears in a later edition of Ibn al-Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa* (Beirut ed.), 7, which suggests that the reason for the visit to the hospital was the hospitalization of a eunuch at the mentally ill ward of the hospital. The examination of the drug stock was a by-product, not the reason, for the visit. See also Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 16:109, 240; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:58.

43. Khader, "Deux actes waqf d'un Qarahanides d'Asie Centrale," 318–19.

44. Ibid., 316; Maqrizi, *Musawwadat Kitab al-Mawaʿiz*, 319.

45. Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, 15:153, 269; Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. Jawwad 33, 180–81.

46. Ipsirli, "Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs," 131–32, 136–37.

47. Safadi, *A'yan*, 3:150; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 2:251. The pious endowment deed of

the Mansuri hospital is discussed by Hazan, "Medical, Administrative, and Financial Aspects," chap. 4.

48. Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 42, 51–52, 225, 283; Broadhurst, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, 33–34, 43–44, 234–35, 296; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Ta'rikh al-Bahir*, 170–71.

49. Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 159; al-Nuʿaymi, *Al-Daris*, 2:127–28, 133–34; Ibn al-Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. Jawwad, 181.

50. A. Qalqashandi, *Subh al-Aʿsha fi Sinaʿat al-Insha'*, ed. M. H. Shams al-Din, 11:249–50.

51. For Mansur Qalawun's arguments, quoting contemporary documentary sources, see Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 120; L. Fernandes, "Mamluk Architecture and the Question of Patronage," *MSR* 1 (1997): 112. Late literary sources provide different explanations. See Sabra, *Poverty and Charity*, 76.

52. ʿUmari, *Masalik al-Absar*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 50.

53. For surgeons, see D. Behrens-Abouseif, *Fath Allah and Abu Zakariyya: Physicians under the Mamluks*, 3, 21–22.

54. Safadi, *Aʿyan*, 2:74; al-Harithy, "The Complex of Sultan Hasan in Cairo," 75–76; Behrens-Abouseif, *Fath Allah*, 3.

55. O. R. Constable, *Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World*, 3–37; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 3:57; Baybars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-Fikra fi Ta'rikh al-Hijra*, 106.

56. Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, 2:87; ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. ʿAbbar, 1:165. For the shrine of Husayn in Aleppo, its history, inscriptions, and architecture, see Y. Tabbaa, *Constructions of Power and Piety in Medieval Aleppo*, 110–21. For Baybars's *khan*, see Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:111; D. S. Powers, "Revenues of Public Waqfs in Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 8 (1984): 171n22.

57. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira* (North Syria), ed. Anne-Marie Eddé, in *BEO* 32–33 (1980–81): 292, 369, 374; Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:248, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 521; Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 4:263–64.

58. Ipsirli, "Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs," 143. For Aleppo, see ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. ʿAbbara, 1:350.

59. Y. Sauvan, "Une liste de fondations pieuses (waqfiyya) au temps de Sélim II," *BEO* 28 (1975): 249, 252, 253. For foundation inscriptions of charitable *khans*, see *RCEA*, vol. 13, no. 4946, vol. 14, no. 5235, no. 5368, vol. 17, no. 773005. For additional references to charitable caravansaries in literary sources, see Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Bughyat*, 1:270; Ibn al-Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. Jawwad, 156.

60. Ibn ʿUthman al-Ansari, 52–53; Musabbihi, *Akhbar Misr*, 90–112, esp. 92, 93, 111.

61. *Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Nasir Hasan ibn Muhammad*, 15 Rabiʿ II 760H, ed. M. M. Amin as an appendix to his edition of Ibn Habib, *Tadhkirat al-Nabih fi Ayyam al-Mansur wa-Banih*, 3:385, line 1175.

62. Ibid., 3:404, 405.

63. Ibid., 3:414, 417, 418.

64. Ibid., 3:410.

65. *Hujjat [Waqf] al-Ashraf Qaytbay*, ed. L. A. Mayer, as *The Buildings of Qaytbay as Described in His Endowment Deed*, 2, lines 1–12, 3, lines 9–10, 19–22. For the

concept of *waqf* as *sadaqa jariya*, see Stillman, "Waqf and the Ideology of Charity," 361–62.

66. English translation by Sheila S. Blair, "The Mongol Capital of Sultaniyya, 'the Imperial,'" *Iran* 24 (1986): 148.

67. Sheila S. Blair, "Ilkhanid Architecture and Society: An Analysis of the Endowment Deed of the Rabʿ-i Rashid," *Iran* 22 (1984): 67–91. For Rashid al-Din's motivation in setting up his funerary complex, see B. Hoffmann, "Rasidaddin Fadlallah as the Perfect Organizer: The Case of the Endowment Slaves and Gardens of the Rabʿ-i Rasidi," in *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies*, 288. For Rashid al-Din's views about the relationship between charitable deeds, especially the establishment of endowed institutions that functioned as continuous charity, and heavenly rewards, see B. Hoffmann, "The Gates of Piety and Charity: Rasid al-Din Fadl Allah as Founder of Pious Endowments," in *L'Iran face à la domination Mongole*, 197–98 (I owe the references to Birgitt Hoffmann's articles to the kindness of Reuven Amitai-Preiss of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem).

68. M. Haneda, "The Pastoral City and the Mausoleum City," in *Islam and Urbanism*, ed. T. Sato, 148–49. For the pious endowments of Rashid al-Din and other Ilkhanid rulers, see Lambton, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia*, 154–55, 324.

69. M. E. Subtelny, "A Timurid Educational and Charitable Foundation: The Ikhlasiyya Complex of ʿAli ShirNavaʾi in Fifteenth-Century Herat and Its Endowment," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111 (1991): 38–62.

70. Ibn Saʿid, ed. Nassar, 29. For the fluctuations in the price of bread, see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 4:237–41.

71. Ibn Tuwayr, *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. F. Sayyid, 138–40, 143–46, 211–16. The Royal Guesthouse was not a charitable institution, since it was designated for officials visiting the court. See Ibn al-Maʾmun, *Akhbar Misr*, 53. For the Royal Guesthouse and Dar al-Fitra, see Sayyid, *La capitale*, index, s.v. "*dar al-diyafa*" and "*dar al-fitra*." For Baybars's Royal Guesthouse, see ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, 355–56.

72. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 3:22; ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. ʿAbbara, 1:154–55; Ipsirli, "Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs," 142, 145–46.

73. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, 303; Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 24, 103.

74. Kindi, *Governors and Judges of Egypt*, 469; Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:89, 102, 103.

75. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:36–37, 38.

76. Ibn Saʿid al-Maghribi, *Kitab al-Mughrib fi Hula al-Maghrib*, ed. K. L. Tallqvist, 16, 31, 35.

77. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 3:11.

78. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, 302.

79. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 639–40.

80. Ibid., vol. 3, pt. 2, 944, 945.

81. Sabra, *Poverty and Charity*, 85–94.

82. *Awqaf wa-Amlak al-Muslimin fi Filastin*, 21, para. 2; 33, para. 30; 70, para. 48.

83. Ibid., 20, para. 1; 68, para. 41; Sabra, *Poverty and Charity*, 139.

84. For Ottoman Damascus, see T.Kh.M. el-Zawahreh, *Religious Endowments and Social Life in the Ottoman Provinces of Damascus in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 251–53, 255–57. For Ottoman public kitchens, see D. Myres, "Al-ʿImara al-ʿAmira, the Charitable Foundation of Khassaki Sultan (959/1152)," in *Ottoman Jerusalem*, ed. S. Auld and R. Hillenbrand, 541–42, 546; H. Gerber, "The Waqf Institution in Early Ottoman Edirne," in *Studies in Islamic Society*, ed. G. R. Warburg and G. G. Gilbar, 34–35, 44–45; Singer, *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence*, 58–65.

85. Nasri Khusraw, *Book of Travels*, 36–37; Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Taʾrikh al-Quds waʾl-Khalil*, 1:49, 2:94, 270; Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Bughyat*, 1:459.

86. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:138, 169; ʿUmari, *Masalik al-Absar*, ed. A. Zaki Pasha, 170–71; *RCEA*, vol. 6, no. 2148, vol. 13, no. 4943, vol. 14, no. 5205.

87. Miskawayh, *Tajarib al-Umam*, 2:8; Ibn Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Taʾrikh al-Umam waʾl-Muluk*, 16:5.

88. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 2:93; *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 156; *Ighathat*, 31; Ibn Zayyat, *Kitab Al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*, 149; Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 108 (Arabic), 181 (English); Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 19, 111. (Maqrizi's information in *Suluk* and *Ighathat*, concerning al-ʿAdil's handling of the 1200–1201 crisis, is not congruous).

89. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 188–89.

90. Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli, *Kitab Husn*, 74.

91. Ibn Furat, *Taʾrikh al-Duwal waʾl-Muluk*, 9:432, 434, 436; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 853–54, 855–57.

92. Baybars al-Mansuri, *Zubdat al-Fikra fi Taʾrikh al-Hijra*, 306, 312 (who according to his own testimony provided for people in need while serving in Alexandria); M. Chapoutot-Remadi, "Une grande crise à la fin du XIIIe siècle en Egypte," *JESHO* 26 (1983): 238.

93. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 638; M. W. Dols, *The Black Death in the Middle East*, 176, 238–39.

94. Ibn Ayas, *Badaʾiʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:126, 173, 4:56.

95. Ibn Duqmaq, *Kitab al-Intisar*, 4:99; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 6:137–38.

96. Khader, "Deux actes waqf d'un Qarahanides d'Asie Centrale," 318; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 31:107.

97. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 772, 782–83.

98. Abu ʿUbayd, *Kitab al-Amwal*, 157, 158, 172–73, 189–90, 191, 201. For Shaybani, see M. Khadduri's translation, *The Islamic Law of Nations: Shaybani's Siyar*, 91, 98, 100, 101, 257–58. For the conduct of the Prophet, see M. J. Kister, "The Massacre of the Banu Qurayza," *JSAI* 8 (1986): 61–97; M. Lecker, "On Arabs of the Banu Kilab Executed Together with the Jewish Banu Qurayza," *JSAI* 19 (1995): 66–73.

99. Abu ʿUbayd, *Kitab al-Amwal*, 177–78, 184–85; Khadduri, *The Islamic Law of Nations*, 80, 258.

100. Abu ʿUbayd, *Kitab al-Amwal*, 187.

101. Ibn Saʿid, ed. Tallqvist, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23.

102. Miskawayh, *Tajarib al-Umam*, 1:54–55.

103. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. Eddé, 389; Abu Shama, *ʿUyun*

al-Rawdatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn, ed. A. Baysumi, 2:148, 150, 154, 155; ʿImad al-Din, 151.

104. Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 233.

105. Ibid., 118, 280, 290, 383, 461–62; Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli, *Kitab Husn*, 47, 121, 124, 133, 134; Maqrizi, *Muqaffa*, 3:815.

106. Ibn Wasil, *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, 3:201; Ibn Furat, *Ta'rikh al-Duwal wa-'l-Muluk*, 5:1:51–52, 104–5, 7:40.

107. Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 33:241–42; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 289.

108. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 300.

109. Ibid., vol. 3, pt. 1, 107.

110. Muqaddasi, *Ahsan al-Taqasim*, 177; Abu Shama, *Tarajim*, 159, 204.

111. For Qadi al-Fadil's pious endowment, see Y. Lev, "Prisoners of War during the Fatimid-Ayyibid Wars with the Crusaders," in *Tolerance and Intolerance: Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. M. Gervers and J. M. Powell, 27; S. H. Abdel Wahab, "Captives Waqfs in Syria and Egypt (491–589 H/1097–1193 A.D.)," in *La liberazione dei 'Captivi' Tra Christianità e Islam*, ed. G. Cipollone, 565–67.

112. Qalqashandi, *Subh al-Aʿsha fi Sinaʿat al-Insha'*, 12:389–91. For a *waqf* dedicated for the ransom of Muslim prisoners in twelfth-century Syria, see C. Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspective*, 551.

113. There is extensive literature dealing with this topic. See, e.g., M. R. Cohen, "Halacha and Reality," 325–27, with references to sources and studies.

114. Nuʿaymi, *Al-Daris*, 2:126.

115. Ibn Hajar, *Inba'*, ed. Khan, 1:265. For management of these endowments, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 456, 503; vol. 4, pt. 2, 566, 644, 841.

116. For example, the notorious finance minister al-Nashw nullified a pious endowment set for the *ashraf* in Cairo. However, following his downfall, the Mamluk regime took over as their patron and paid them stipends from the treasury. See Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 3, 552.

117. Nuʿaymi, *Al-Daris*, 2:126.

118. See D. Sourdel, "Deux documents relatifs à la communauté hanabalite de Damas," *BEO* 25 (1972): 147, 149. For the Salihiyya and its Hanbali law colleges, see T. Miura, "The Salihiyya Quarter in the Suburbs of Damascus," *BEO* 47 (1995): 140–41.

119. For Shafiʿi endowments, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 2, 443; Ibn Ayas, *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur*, 3:241.

120. See I. M. Lapidus, "Ayyubid Religious Policy and the Development of the Schools of Law in Cairo," in *Colloque international sur l'histoire du Caire, 1969*, 279.

121. See, e.g., the endowment for Hanafi law students in *RCEA*, vol. 9, no. 3596; L. Fernandes, "Mamluk Politics and Education: The Evidence from Two Fourteenth-Century Waqfiyya," *AI* 23 (1987): 87–98.

122. For the tenth-century events, see Ibn Zayyat, *Kitab al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*, 190–91. For the Hanafi–Shafiʿi rivalry, see Ibn Hajar, *Inba'*, ed. Khan, 1:12, 302–3; Escovitz, *The Office of Qadi al-Qudat in Cairo under the Bahri Mamluks*,

24–25; M. Winter, "Inter-Madhhab Competition in Mamluk Damascus," *JSAI* 25 (2001): 195–212.

123. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 40, pt. 3, 1117. For women as patrons of pious endowments, see M. Hoexter, "Waqf Studies in the Twentieth Century: The State of the Art," *JESHO* 41 (1998): 481–82.

124. D. S. Richards, "Arabic Documents from the Karaite Community in Cairo," *JESHO* 15 (1972): 110–11, 125, 137, 141; Amin, "Un acte de fondation," 47–48.

125. Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli, *Kitab Husn*, 87; Ibn ʿAbd al-Zahir, *Al-Rawd al-Zahir*, 107; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 30:111.

126. Ibn Furat, *Taʾrikh al-Duwal wa-ʾl-Muluk*, 8:104, 9:210; Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 31:185.

127. Ibn Hajar, *Inbaʾ*, ed. Khan, 1:190.

128. *Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn al-Mansur Qalawun*, 10 Jumada II 724H, ed. M. M. Amin as an appendix to Ibn Habib, *Tadhkirat al-Nabih*, 2:379.

129. Maqrizi, *Ittiʿaz*, 1:148.

Chapter 7. The Wider Context of Islamic Charity

1. One can say that the influence, if any, of the Arabic pre-Islamic practices on the ethics of Islamic charity was insignificant. See M. M. Bravmann, "'The Surplus of Property': An Early Arab Social Concept," in his *Spiritual Background of Early Islam*, 229–54.

2. For the Koranic ethics of charity and belief, see T. Izutsu, *The Structure of the Ethical Terms in the Koran*, 205–12, 220–21, 228–30; M. Fakhry, *Ethical Theories in Islam*, 12–14.

3. See P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, 33–36. For Justinian's legislation, see J. L. Boojamra, "Christian Philanthropia: A Study of Justinian's Welfare Policy and the Church," *Byzantina* 7 (1975): 347, 354–55, 357–58.

4. Flynn, *Sacred Charity*, chap. 2; J. Herrin, "Ideals of Charity, Realities of Welfare," in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. R. Morris, 151–52. For Islam, see N. A. Stillman, "Charity and Social Services in Medieval Islam," *Sociates* 5 (1975): 105–15.

5. Lane, *Manner and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, 56, 284, 288–89; A. Russell, *Natural History of Aleppo*, 1:232.

6. See A. Bareket, *Fustat on the Nile: The Jewish Elite in Medieval Egypt*, 45.

7. Leslie S. B. MacCoull, "Three Cultures under Arab Rule: The Fate of Coptic" and "The Strange Death of Coptic Culture," both in her *Coptic Perspectives on Late Antiquity*.

8. See R. C. Jennings, "Pious Foundations in the Society and Economy of Ottoman Trabzon, 1565–1640," *JESHO* 33 (1990): 313–34.

9. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 289, vol. 3, pt. 2, 445.

10. Ibid., vol. 1, pt. 3, 865.

11. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:283. Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 1, 210.

12. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:52–55.

13. Ibid., 4:56–57.

14. Ibid., 4:38, 40–42; Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 1, pt. 3, 827.

15. The most comprehensive study of the Ayyubid law colleges in Egypt and their teachers is by G.L.V. Leiser, "The Restoration of Sunnism in Egypt," Ph.D. diss., 2 vols. For the Salahiyya college in the thirteenth century, see Nuwayri, *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, 31:95–96. For the Qamhiyya in the 1420s, see Maqrizi, *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 2, 616.

16. Most of Maqrizi's, *Suluk*, vol. 3, pt. 3, is devoted to the description of the 806–7/1403–4 crisis; see esp. 1117, 1127, 1156. For the grave consequences of this crisis, see *Suluk*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 67, 68–69.

17. Maqrizi, *Khitat*, 4:285–86, 287, 289, 293–94.

18. ʿIzz al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira*, ed. Dahan, 199–264.

19. Mujir al-Din, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Taʾrikh al-Quds waʾl-Khalil*, 2:42.

20. Ibn Futi, *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. Jawwad, 492–93.

21. Orme and Webster, *The English Hospital*, 92.

22. Wolper, "The Politics of Patronage," 39–40.

23. See J. Garcin and M. Taher, "Enquéte sur le financement d'un waqf Égyptien du XV^{e} siècle: les comptes de Jawhar al-Lala," *JESHO* 38 (1995): 301–2. For Jawhar al-Lala's biography and the creation of his numerous pious endowments, see "Un ensemble de waqfs du IX^{e}/XV^{e} siècle en Égypte: les actes de Jawhar al-Lala," in *Intinéraires d'Orient: Hommages à Claude Cahen*, ed. R. Curiel and R. Gyselen, 309–23; "Les waqfs d'une madrasa du Caire au XV^{e} siècle: Les propriétés urbaines de Gawhar al-Lala," in *Le waqf dans l'espace Islamique*, ed. Deguilhem, 151–86.

24. See C. F. Petry, "A Geniza for Mamluk Studies? Charitable Trust (Waqf) Documents as a Source for Economic and Social History," *MSR* 2 (1998): 56.

25. Ibid., 57–58; C. F. Petry, *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamluk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power*, chap. 7.

26. Al-Asadi, *Al-Taysir waʾl-Iʿtibar*, ed. A. Tolaymat, 82–83.

27. J. Matuz, "The Nature and Stages of Ottoman Feudalism," *Asian and African Studies* (Haifa) 16 (1982): 287; W. J. Griswold, "A Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Pious Endowment," *JESHO* 27 (1984): 177–78; G. Kàldy-Nagy, "The First Centuries of the Ottoman Military Organization," *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest) 30 (1977): 151–52.

28. J. Haldon, "The Army and the Economy: The Allocation and Redistribution of Surplus Wealth in the Byzantine State," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 7 (1992): 146–49; W. Treadgold, *Byzantium and Its Army*, 171–79.

29. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:91.

30. H. Inalcik and D. Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, 45–48; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 2:91.

31. William R. Jones points out that *ahli* pious endowments probably arose from the desire to evade Koranic laws of inheritance; see Jones, "Pious Endowments in Medieval Christianity and Islam," *Diogenes* 109 (1980): 27.

32. See S. Roberts, "Contexts of Charity in the Middle Ages: Religious, Social, and Civic," in *Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy*, ed. J. B. Schneewind, 24.

33. Orme and Webster, *The English Hospital*, 20–22.

34. See the detailed study of B. Rivlin, *Mutual Responsibility in the Italian Ghetto: Holy Societies, 1516–1789* (in Hebrew).

35. M. Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Commeni, 1081–1261*, 388.

36. Russell, *Natural History of Aleppo*, 1:204, 206. For broader treatment of poverty and charity, see A. Marcus, *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century*, 212–18.

37. See M. Hoexter, "The Idea of Charity—A Case Study in Continuity and Flexibility of an Islamic Institution," *Wissenschaftskolleg*, Institute for Advance Study zu Berlin, 1985/86, 179–89, esp. 187–88.

38. See Shatzmiller, "Islamic Institutions and Property Rights," 44–74.

39. For these aspects, see J. E. Mandaville, "Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the Ottoman Empire," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 10 (1979): 289–308; M. Çizakça, "Cash Waqfs of Bursa, 1555–1823," *JESHO* 38 (1995): 313–54; R. Deguilhem-Schoem, "The Loan of Mursad on the Waqf Properties," in *A Way Prepared: Essays on Islamic Culture in Honor of Richard Bayly Winder*, ed. F. Kazemi and R. D. McChesney, 68–80.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

AI	*Annales Islamologiques*
BEO	*Bulletin des Études Orientales*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
JESHO	*Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*
JSAI	*Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*
MSR	*Mamluk Studies Review*

Documentary Sources

Abbott, N. "The Monasteries of the Fayyum." *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 53 (1936): 13–33.

Amin, M. M. "Un acte de fondation de wakf par une Chrétienne (X^{e} siècle h., XVI chr.)." *JESHO* 18 (1975): 43–53.

Arazi, A. "Al-Risala al-Baybarsiyya d'al-Suyuti: Un document sur les problèmes d'un waqf sultanien sous les derniers mamluks." *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): 329–54.

Awqaf wa-Amlak al-Muslimin fi Filastin, ed. M. Ipsrili and M. D. al-Tamimi. Istanbul, 1982.

Bareket, A. "'Thou Shalt Surely Open Thy Hand unto Thy Poor and Needy Brother': Letters Requesting Financial Aid from the Geniza." *Te'uda* 16–17 (2001): 359–91 (in Hebrew).

Cahen, Cl., Y. Ragib, and M. A. Taher. "L'achat et le wakf d'un grand domaine égyptian par le vizir fatimide Tala'i'b. Ruzzik." *AI* 14 (1978): 59–127.

Cohen, M. "Four Judaeo-Arabic Petitions of the Poor from the Cairo Geniza." *JSAI* 24 (2000): 446–72.

Gil, M. *Documents of the Jewish Pious Foundation from the Cairo Geniza*. Leiden, 1976.

Haarmann, U. "Mamluk Endowment Deeds as a Source for the History of Education in Late Medieval Egypt." *Abhath* 28 (1980): 31–49.

Hujjat Waqf al-Ashraf Barsbay (L'Act de waqf de Barsbay), ed. A. Darrag. Cairo, 1963.

Hujjat [Waqf] al-Malik al-Ashraf Qaytbay, ed. L. A. Mayer, as *The Buildings of Qaytbay as Described in His Endowment Deed*. London, 1938.

Khader, M. "Deux actes waqf d'un Qarahanides d'Asie Centrale." *Journal Asiatique* 255 (1967): 305–34.

Khan, G., ed. and trans. *Arabic Legal and Administrative Documents in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*. Cambridge, 1993.

———. *Arabic Papyri from the Khalili Collection*. Oxford, 1992.
Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'ban, ed. S. R. al-Qahtani, in *Awqaf al-Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'ban 'ala Haramayn*. Riyad, 1994.
Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Nasir Hasan ibn Muhammad, 15 Rabi' II 760H, ed. M. M. Amin, as an appendix to his edition of Ibn Habib, *Tadhkirat al-Nabih fi Ayyam al-Mansur wa-Banih*, 3:385–426. Cairo, 1976–82.
Kitab Waqf al-Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn al-Mansur Qalawun, 10 Jumada II 724H, ed. M. M. Amin as an appendix to his edition of Ibn Habib, *Tadhkirat al-Nabih fi Ayyam al-Mansur wa-Banih,* 2:369–80. Cairo, 1976–82.
Ragib, Y. *Marchands d'étoffes du Fayyoum au III^e/IX^e siècle*. Vol. 1. Cairo, 1982.
Richards, D. S. "Arabic Documents from the Karaite Community in Cairo." *JESHO* 15 (1972): 105–51.
Shaw, S. J. *The Financial and Administrative Organization and Development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517–1798*. Princeton, 1962.
Sourdel, D. "Deux documents relatifs à la communauté hanbalite de Damas." *BEO* 25 (1972): 141–51.
Stephan, St. H. "An Endowment Deed of Khasseki Sultan, Dated the 24th May 1552." *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 10 (1944): 170–94.
Watha'iq Muqaddasiyya Ta'rikhiyya, ed. K. J. al-'Asli. Amman, 1983.
Wathiqat Waqf Siryaqus, Jumada II 725H; 12 Jumada II 726H, ed. H. N. Hajji in *Al-Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun*. Kuwait, 1983.
Wathiqat Waqf al-Sultan Qaytbay 'ala al-Madrasa al-Ashrafiyya wa-Qa'a al-Silah bi-Dimiyat, ed. M. M. Amin in *Majjala al- Ta'rikhiyya al-Misriyya*, 22 (1975): 353–90.

Epigraphy

Berchem, Max van. *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*. Égypte. Paris, 1894–1903.
———. *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*. Jérusalem "Ville." Cairo, 1920–22.
Burgoyne, M. H. "A Recently Discovered Marwanid Inscription in Jerusalem." *Levant* 14 (1982): 118–21.
Elad, A. "Two Identical Inscriptions from Jund Filastin from the Reign of the Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtadir." *JESHO* 35 (1992): 301–60.
Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, ed. Ét. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet. 16 vols. Cairo, 1931–56.
Sharon, M. "A Waqf Inscription from Ramlah." *Arabica* 13 (1966): 77–84.
———. "Waqf Inscription from Ramla c.300/912–13." *BSOAS* 60 (1997): 98–108.
Sobernheim, M., *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum*. Cairo, 1909.

Literary Sources and Studies

Abbott, N. *Two Queens of Baghdad*. Chicago, 1946.
'Abd al-'Ati, M. *Al-Ta'lim fi Misr Zaman al-Ayyubiyyin wa-'l-Mamalik*. Cairo, 1984.
Abiad, M. *Culture et éducation Arabo-Islamiques au Sham*. Damascus, 1981.

Abu Salih, the Armenian. *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and Some Neighboring Countries*, English trans. B.T.A. Evetts. Oxford, 1895.

Abu Shama. *Kitab al-Rawdatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. I. al-Zaybaq. 5 vols. Beirut, 1997.

———. *Tarajim Rijal al-Qarnayn al-Sadis wa-'l-Sabi*. Beirut, n.d.

———. *'Uyun al-Rawdatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. Baysumi. 2 vols. Damascus, 1992.

Abu 'Ubayd. *Kitab al-Amwal*, ed. M. Kh. Hiras. Cairo, 1928.

Abu Yusuf. *Kitab al-Kharaj*, English trans. A. Ben Shemesh, *Taxation in Islam*. Vol. 3. Leiden, 1969.

'Afifi, M. "Al-Awqaf wa-'l-Milaha al-Bahriyya fi 'l-Bahr al-Ahmar fi 'l-'Asr al-'Uthmani." In *Le waqf dans l'espace islamique outil de pouvoir socio-politique*, ed. R. Deguilhem, 87–100. Damascus, 1995.

Ahmed, Munir-ud-Din. *Muslim Education and the Scholar's Social Status*. Zurich, 1968.

Allan, N. "Hospice to Hospital in the Near East: An Instance of Continuity and Change in the Late Antiquity." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990): 446–62.

Allouche, A. *Mamluk Economics: A Study and Translation of al-Maqrizi's Ighathat*. Salt Lake City, 1994.

Amin, M. M. *Al-Awqaf wa-'l-Hayat al-Ijtima'iyya fi Misr*. Cairo, 1980.

Amouroux, M. "Colonization and the Creation of Hospitals: The Eastern Extension of Western Hospitality in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (1999): 31–43.

Anderson, N. D. "The Religious Element in Waqf Endowments." *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society* 38 (1951): 292–99.

Angold, M. *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Commeni, 1081–1261*. Cambridge, 1995.

Antaki, Yahya ibn Sa'id. *Kitab al-Ta'rikh*, ed. L. Shaykhu. Beirut, 1909.

'Aql, M. "The Abbasid State under Mutawakkil (232–247/847–861)." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., Bar Ilan University, 1988 (in Hebrew).

Arjomand, S. A. "Philanthropy, the Law, and Public Policy in the Islamic World before the Modern Era." In *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions*, ed. W. F. Ilchman et al., 109–32. Bloomington, Ind. 1998.

al-Asadi, Muhammad ibn Khalil. *Al-Taysir wa-'l-I'tibar*, ed. A. Tolaymat. Cairo, 1967.

Ashkenazi, Y. "Curing and Nursing in the Church of Jerusalem during the Byzantine Period." In *Medicine in Jerusalem throughout the Ages*, ed. Z. Amar and E. Lev, 33–51. Tel Aviv, 1999 (in Hebrew).

'Athamina, Kh. "Arab and Muhajirun in the Environment of Amsar." *Studia Islamica* 66 (1988): 5–25.

———."Some Administrative, Military, and Socio-Political Aspects of Early Muslim Egypt." In *War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean, 7th–15th Centuries*, ed. Y. Lev, 101–15. Leiden, 1997.

Baer, G. "The Waqf as a Prop for the Social System (Sixteenth–Twentieth Centuries)." *Islamic Law and Society* 4 (1997): 264–97.

Bahat, D. "Hospices and Hospitals in Mamluk Jerusalem." In *Towns and Material Culture in the Medieval Middle East*, ed. Y. Lev, 73–89. Leiden, 2002.

Balawi. *Sirat Ahmad ibn Tulun*, ed. M. K. ʿAli. Damascus, 1939.

Bareket, A. *Fustat on the Nile: The Jewish Elite in Medieval Egypt*. Leiden, 1999.

Barnes, J. R. *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire*. Leiden, 1987.

Bashear, S. "On the Origins and Development of the Meaning of Zakat in Early Islam." *Arabica* 40 (1993): 84–113.

Baybars al-Mansuri, al-Dawadar. *Zubdat al-Fikra fi Ta'rikh al-Hijra*, ed. D. S. Richards. Beirut, 1998.

Behrens-Abouseif, D. "Change in Function and Form of Mamluk Religious Institutions." *AI* 21 (1985): 73–93.

———. *Egypt's Adjustment to Ottoman Rule*. Leiden, 1994.

———. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Wakf. In Egypt."

———. *Fath Allah and Abu Zakariyya: Physicians under the Mamluks*. Cairo, 1987.

———. "Sultan Qaytbay's Foundation in Medina, the Madrasah, the Ribat, and the Dashishah." *MSR* 2 (1998): 61–73.

Ben-Sasson, M., *The Emergence of a Local Jewish Community in the Muslim World. Qayrawan, 800–1057*. Jerusalem, 1996 (in Hebrew).

Ben Shemesh, A. *Taxation in Islam*. 3 vols. Leiden, 1958–86.

Berkey, J. "Mamluks and the World of Higher Education in Medieval Cairo, 1250–1517." In *Modes de transmission de la culture religieuse en Islam*, ed. H. Elboudrari, 93–119. Cairo, 1993.

———. *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo: A Social History of Islamic Education*. Princeton, 1992.

Bilge, M. "Awqaf of a Madrasa in Jerusalem." In *The Third International Conference on Bilad al-Sham,* 1:27–35. Jerusalem, 1983.

Bilici, F. "Les bibliothèques vakif-s à Istanbul au XVI[e] siècle, prémices de grandes bibliothèques publiques." *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 87–88 (1998): 39–59.

Blair, S. S. "Ilkhanid Architecture and Society: An Analysis of the Endowment Deed of the Rabʿ-i Rashid." *Iran* 22 (1984): 67–91.

———. "The Mongol Capital of Sultaniyya 'The Imperial.'" *Iran* 24 (1986): 139–51.

Bonner, M. "Definitions of Poverty and the Rise of the Muslim Urban Poor." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6 (1996): 335–44.

———. "The Kitab al-Kasb Attributed to al-Shaybani: Poverty, Surplus, and the Circulation of Wealth." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 121 (2001): 410–28.

Boojamra, J. L. "Christian Philanthropia: A Study of Justinian's Welfare Policy and the Church." *Byzantina* 7 (1975): 347–73.

Boswell, J. *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. New York, 1990.

Bosworth, C. E. "Abu ʿAmr ʿUthman al-Tarsusi's Siyar al-Thughur and the Last Years of Arab Rule in Tarsus (Fourth/Tenth Century)." *Graeco-Arabica* 5 (1993): 183–97.

———. "The City of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine Frontiers in Early and Middle Abbasid Times." *Oriens* 33 (1992): 268–86.

———. *The Islamic Mediaeval Underworld.* 2 vols. Leiden, 1976.
Boyce, M., "On the Sacred Fires of the Zoroastrians." *BSOAS* 31 (1968): 52–68.
———. "The Pious Foundations of the Zoroastrians." *BSOAS* 31 (1968): 270–89.
Bravmann, M. M. "'The Surplus of Property': An Early Arab Social Concept." In his *Spiritual Background of Early Islam,* 229–54. Leiden, 1972.
Broadhurst, R.J.C. *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr.* London, 1952.
Brodman, J. W. *Charity and Welfare: Hospitals and the Poor in Medieval Catalonia.* Philadelphia, 1998.
Brown, P. *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire.* Hanover, 2002.
Bulliet, R. W. *The Patricians of Nishapur.* Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
Cahen, Cl. "Réflexions sur le waqf ancien." *Studia Islamica* 14 (1961): 37–57.
Calder, N. "Exploring God's Law: Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abi Sahl al-Sarakhsi on Zakat." In *Law and the Islamic World Past and Present*, ed. C. Toll and J. Skovgaard-Petersen, 57–75. Copenhagen, 1995.
———. "Zakat in Imami Shi'i Jurisprudence, from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century, A.D." *BSOAS* 44 (1981): 268–80.
Chapoutot-Remadi, M. "Une grande crise à la fin du XIII[e] siècle en Egypte." *JESHO* 26 (1983): 217–46.
Çizakça, M. "Cash Waqfs of Bursa, 1555–1823." *JESHO* 38 (1995): 313–54.
Cohen, A. *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem.* Cambridge, 1989.
Cohen, M. R. "The Foreign Jewish Poor in Medieval Egypt." In *Poverty and Charity in Middle Eastern Contexts*, ed. M. Bonner et al., 53–72. New York, 2003.
———. "Halacha and Reality in Matters of Charity during the Geniza Period." In *The Intertwined Worlds of Islam: Essays in Memory of Hava Lazarus-Yafeh*, ed. N. Ilan, 328–33. Jerusalem, 2002 (in Hebrew).
———. "The Voice of the Jewish Poor in the Cairo Genizah." In *Semitic Papyrology in Context*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, 239–55. Leiden, 2003.
Colvin, H. "The Origin of Chantries." *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000): 163–73.
Conrad, L. I. "Did al-Walid I Found the First Islamic Hospital?" *Aram* 6 (1994): 225–44.
Constable, O. R. *Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World.* Cambridge, 2003.
Constantelos, D. J. *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare.* 2nd rev. ed. New Rochelle, 1991.
Cooper, R. S. "Ibn Mammati's Rules for the Ministries." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1973. (See Ibn Mammati.)
Crouch, D. "The Origin of Chantries: Some Further Anglo-Norman Evidence." *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 159–81.
Décobert, C. *Le mendiant et le combattant. L'institution de l'Islam.* Paris, 1991.
Deguilhem-Schoem, R. "The Loan of Mursad on the Waqf Properties." In *A Way Prepared: Essays on Islamic Culture in Honor of Richard Bayly Winder*, ed. F. Kazemi and R. D. McChesney, 68–80. New York, 1988.
Dobrowolski, J. "The Funerary Complex of Amir Kabir Qurqumas in Cairo." In *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and D. De Smet, 2:265–82. Leuven, 1998.
Dols, M. W. *The Black Death in the Middle East.* Princeton, 1977.

———. "Insanity and Its Treatment in Islamic Society." *Medical History* 31 (1987): 1–14.

———. *Majnun: The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*, ed. D. E. Immisch. Oxford, 1992.

———. "The Origins of the Islamic Hospital: Myth and Reality." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61 (1987): 367–90.

Eche, Y. *Les bibliothèques Arabes*. Damascus, 1967.

Eddé, Anne-Marie. *La principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep (579/1183–658/1260)*. Stuttgart, 1999.

Edgington, S. B. "The Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem." In *Medicine in Jerusalem throughout the Ages*, ed. Z. Amar and E. Lev, 9–25. Tel Aviv, 1999.

———. "Medical Care in the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem." In *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare*, ed. H. Nicholson, 27–35. Ashgate, 1998.

Elisséeff, N. *La description de Damas d'Ibn ʿAsakir.* Damascus, 1959.

———. "Un document contemporain de Nur al-Din." *BEO* 25 (1972): 125–40.

Escovitz, J. H. *The Office of Qadi al-Qudat in Cairo under the Bahri Mamluks*. Berlin, 1984.

Fakhry, M. *Ethical Theories in Islam*. Leiden, 1991.

Fariqi, ʿAli ibn al-Azraq, *Ta'rikh al-Fariqi*, ed. B. ʿAbd Latif ʿAwwad. Beirut, 1974.

Faroqhi, S. *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans, 1517–1683*. London, 1990.

al-Fasi, Ahmad ibn ʿAli. *Shifa' al-Gharam bi-Akhbar al-Balad al-Haram*. Vol. 1. Beirut, n.d.

Fernandes, L. *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khanqah*. Berlin, 1988.

———. "The Foundation of Baybars al-Janshakir: Its Waqf, History, and Architecture." *Muqarnas* 4 (1987): 21–43.

———. "Istibdal: The Game of Exchange and Its Impact on the Urbanization of Mamluk Cairo." In *The Cairo Heritage: Essays in Honor of Laila Ali Ibrahim,* ed. D. Behrens-Abouseif, 203–23. Cairo, 2000.

———. "Mamluk Architecture and the Question of Patronage." *MSR* 1 (1997): 107–20.

———. "Mamluk Politics and Education: The Evidence from Two Fourteenth-Century Waqfiyya." *AI* 23 (1987): 87–98.

———. "Some Aspects of the Zawiya in Egypt at the Eve of the Ottoman Conquest." *AI* 19 (1983): 9–17.

———. "Three Sufi Foundations in a Fifteenth-Century Waqfiyya." *AI* 17 (1981): 141–56.

———. "Two Variations on the Same Theme: The Zawiya of Hasan al-Rumi, the Takiyya of Ibrahim al-Gulšani." *AI* 21 (1985): 95–101.

———. "The Zawiya in Cairo." *AI* 18 (1982): 116–21.

Fierro, M. "Caliphal Legitimacy and Expiation in al-Andalus." In *Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and Their Fatwas,* ed. M. K. Masud et al., 55–63. Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

Flynn, M. *Sacred Charity: Confraternities and Social Welfare in Spain, 1400–1700*. Ithaca, 1989.

Forand, P. G. "The Status of the Land and Inhabitants of the Sawad during the Two First Centuries of Islam." *JESHO* 14 (1971): 25–63.

Frenkel, Y. "Political and Social Aspects of Islamic Religious Endowments (Awqaf): Saladin in Cairo (1169–73) and Jerusalem (1187–93)." *BSOAS* 62 (1999): 1–21.

Garcin, J.-C. and M. A. Taher. "Enquéte sur le financement d'un waqf Égyptien du XV[e] siècle: les comptes de Jawhar al-Lala." *JESHO* 38 (1995): 262–304.

———. "Un ensemble de waqfs du IX[e]/XV[e] siècle en Égypte: les actes de Jawhar al-Lala." In *Itinéraires d'Orient: Hommages à Claude Cahen*, ed. R. Curiel and R. Gyselen, 309–23. Burres-sur-Yvette, 1994.

———. "Les waqfs d'une madrasa du Caire au XV[e] siècle: Les propriétés urbaines de Gawhar al-Lala." In *Le waqf dans l'espace Islamique outil pouvoir socio-politique*, ed. R. Deguilhem, 151–86. Damascus, 1995.

Gerber, H. "The Waqf Institution in Early Ottoman Edirne." In *Studies in Islamic Society: Contributions in Memory of Gabriel Baer,* ed. G. R. Warburg and G. G. Gilbar, 29–47. Haifa, 1984.

Ghazzali. *Ihya 'Ulum al-Din*. 5 vols. Cairo, n.d.

Gibb, H.A.R. "The Fiscal Rescript of 'Umar II." *Arabica* 2 (1955): 1–16.

Gil, M. "Dhimmi Donations and Foundations for Jerusalem (638–1099)." *JESHO* 27 (1984): 156–70.

———. "The Earliest Waqf Foundations." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998): 125–40.

Giladi, A. "Gender Differences in Child Rearing and Education." *Al-Qantara* 16 (1995): 291–308.

———. "The Individual in Early Islamic Thought and Education." In *The Intertwined Worlds of Islam: Essays in Memory of Hava Lazarus-Yafeh,* ed. N. Ilan, 171–91. Jerusalem, 2002 (in Hebrew).

Goitein, S. D. *Jewish Education in Muslim Countries*. Jerusalem, 1962 (in Hebrew).

———. *A Mediterranean Society*. 5 vols. Berkeley, 1967–88.

Griswold, W. J. "A Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Pious Endowment." *JESHO* 27 (1984): 175–98.

Haldon, J. "The Army and the Economy: The Allocation and Redistribution of Surplus Wealth in the Byzantine State." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 7 (1992): 133–53.

Hallenberg, H. "The Sultan Who Loved Sufis: How Qaytbay Established a Shrine Complex in Dasuq." *MSR* 4 (2000): 147–66.

Halm, H. "Die Anfänge der Madrasa." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III, 1, XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag (Wiesbaden, 1977), 438–48.

Hamarneh, S. "Development of Hospitals in Islam." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 17 (1962): 366–84.

Haneda, M. "The Pastoral City and the Mausoleum City." In *Islam and Urbanism*, ed. T. Sato, 142–71. London, 1997.

Al-Harithy, H. N. "The Complex of Sultan Hasan in Cairo: Reading between the Lines." *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 68–80.

Hathaway, J. *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt*. Cambridge, 1997.
Hazan, U. "Medical, Administrative, and Financial Aspects of Hospitals in Medieval Islam, Eighth through Fifteenth Centuries." Ph.D. diss., Bar-Ilan University, 2004 (in Hebrew with English summary).
Hellinger, M. "Charity in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature." Ph.D. diss., Bar-Ilan University, 1999 (in Hebrew with extensive English summery).
Henderson, J. *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence*. Oxford, 1994.
Herrin, J. "Ideals of Charity, Realities of Welfare." In *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. R. Morris, 151–64. Birmingham, 1990.
Hilal al-Sabi. *Kitab Tuhfat al-Umara' fi Ta'rikh al-Wuzara'*, ed. H. F. Amedroz. Leiden, 1904.
Hillenbrand, C. *The Crusades: Islamic Perspective*. Edinburgh, 1999.
———. "Seljuq Women." In *The Balance of Truth: Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, ed. C. Balim-Harding and C. Imber, 145–63. Istanbul, 2000.
The History of Bukhara. English trans. R. N. Frye, from a Persian abridgment of Arabic original by Narshakhi. Cambridge, Mass., 1954.
Hoexter, M. *Endowments, Rulers, and Community: Waqf al-Haramayn in Ottoman Algiers*. Leiden, 1998.
———. "Huquq Allah and Huquq al-'Ibad as Reflected in the Waqf Institution." *JSAI* 19 (1995): 133–57.
———. "The Idea of Charity—A Case Study in Continuity and Flexibility of an Islamic Institution." *Wissenschaftskolleg*, Institute for Advance Study zu Berlin, 1985/1986, 179–89.
———. "Waqf Studies in the Twentieth Century: The State of the Art." *JESHO* 41 (1998): 474–95.
Hoffmann, B. "The Gates of Piety and Charity: Rasid al-Din Fadl Allah as Founder of Pious Endowments." In *L'Iran face à la domination Mongole*, 189–201. Teheran, 1997.
———. "Rasidaddin Fadlallah as the Perfect Organizer: The Case of the Endowment Slaves and Gardens of the Rab'-i Rasidi." *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies*, 287–96. Rome, 1995.
Homerin, Th. E. "Ibn Taimiya's al-Sufiyah wa-al-Fuqara'." *Arabica* 32 (1985): 219–45.
———. "Saving Muslim Souls: The Khanqah and the Sufi Duty in Mamluk Lands." *MSR* 3 (1999): 59–82.
———. "Sufis and Detractors in Mamluk Egypt: A Survey of Protagonists and Institutional Settings." In *Islamic Mysticism Contested*, ed. F. de Jong and B. Radtke, 225–48. Leiden, 1999.
Humphreys, R. S. "Women as Patrons of Religious Architecture in Ayyubid Damascus." *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 35–55.
Ibn al-Abbar. *Hulla al-Siyara'*, ed. R.P.A. Dozy in *Notices sur quelques manuscrits Arabes*. Leiden, 1847–51.
Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir. *Al-Rawd al-Zahir fi Sirat al-Malik al-Zahir*, ed. 'Abd al-'Aziz Khuwaytir. Riyadh, 1976.
Ibn al-'Adim. *Bughyat al-Talab fi Ta'rikh Halab*, ed. S. Zakkar. 14 vols. Damascus, 1988.

———. *Zubdat Halab min Ta'rikh Halab*, ed. S. Dahan. 3 vols. Damascus, 1951–68.
Ibn ʿAli al-Husayni. *Akhbar al-Dawla al-Saljukiyya*, ed. M. Iqbal. Lahore, 1930.
Ibn ʿAsakir. *Ta'rikh Dimashq*, ed. ʿUmar ibn Gharama al-ʿAmrawi. Vols. 2, 41. Beirut, 1997.
Ibn al-Athir. *Al-Kamil fi 'l-Ta'rikh*. 13 vols. Leiden, 1867; repr., Beirut, n.d.
———. *Al-Ta'rikh al-Bahir fi 'l-Dawla al-Atabekiyya*, ed. A. A. Tolaymat. Baghdad, 1963.
Ibn Ayas. *Bada'iʿ al-Zuhur fi Waqa'iʿ al-Duhur*, ed. M. Mustafa. 5 vols. Cairo, 1960–75.
Ibn Duqmaq. *Kitab al-Intisar*, ed. K. Vollers. Vol. 4. Bulaq, 1891–92.
Ibn Furat. *Ta'rikh Ibn al-Furat*, ed. Q. Zurayq and N. ʿIzz al-Din. 9 vols. Beirut, 1939–42.
Ibn al-Futi. *Al-Hawadith al-Jamiʿa*, ed. M. Jawwad. Baghdad, n.d.; Beirut, 1987.
Ibn Hajar, al-ʿAsqalani. *Inba' al-Ghumr bi-Abna' al-ʿUmr*. Vols. 2–3 edited by H. Hubashi (Cairo, 1971); vols. 1–9 edited by M. Khan (Beirut, 1986).
———. *Rafʿ al-Isr ʿan Qudat Misr*, ed. R. Guest, as an appendix to his edition of Kindi's *Governors and Judges of Egypt*. Leiden, 1912.
Ibn al-Hajj, al-ʿAbdari. *Kitab al-Madkhal*. 4 vols. Beirut, 1972.
Ibn Hawqal. *Kitab Surat al-Ard*, ed. J. H. Kramers. Leiden, 1938.
Ibn al-ʿIdhari. *Al-Bayan al-Mughrib*, ed. G. S. Colin and Levi-Provançal. 2 vols. Leiden, 1948.
Ibn Jawzi. *Al-Muntazam fi Ta'rikh al-Umam wa-'l-Muluk*, ed. Muhammad and Mustafa ʿAbd al-Qadir ʿAta. 19 vols. Beirut, 1992.
Ibn Jawzi, Sibt. *Mira't al-Zaman*. Vol. 8, pts. 1 and 2. Hyderbad, 1951–52.
Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, ed. W. Wright. Rev. ed. M. J. De Goeje. 2nd ed. Leiden, 1907. (For English translation, see R.J.C. Broadhurst.)
Ibn Khallikan. *Wafayat al-Aʿyan*, ed. I. ʿAbbas. 8 vols. Beirut, 1968–71.
Ibn Mammati. *Kitab Qawanin al-Dawanin*, ed. A. S. Atiya. Cairo, 1943. (For partial English translation, see R. S. Cooper.)
Ibn al-Ma'mun, al-Bata'ihi. *Akhbar Misr*, ed. A. F. Sayyid. Cairo, 1983.
Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, Sawirus. *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, ed. and trans. A. S. Atiya et al. into English. Vol. 2, pts. 2, 3. Cairo, 1948–59.
Ibn al-Mustawafi. *Ta'rikh Irbil*, ed. Kh. Sakar. 2 vols. Baghdad, n.d.
Ibn al-Qalanisi. *Dhayl Ta'rikh Dimashq*, ed. H. F. Amedroz. Leiden, 1908.
Ibn Qifti. *Ta'rikh al-Hukama'*, ed. J. Lippert. Leipzig, 1903.
Ibn Saʿi. *Al-Jamiʿ al-Mukhtasar*, ed. M. Jawwad. Baghdad, 1934.
———. *Jihat al-A'imma al-Kulafa' min al-Hara'ir wa-'l-Ima'*, ed. M. Jawwad. Cairo, n.d.
Ibn Saʿid al-Maghribi. *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Hula Hadrat al-Qahira*, ed. H. Nassar. Cairo, 1970.
———. *Kitab al-Mughrib fi Hula al-Maghrib*, ed. K. L. Tallqvist. Leiden, 1899.
Ibn Shaddad, ʿIzz al-Din. "Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira," ed. A.-M. Eddé. *BEO* 32–33 (1980–81): 265–402.
———. *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira: Ta'rikh Madinat Dimashq*, ed. S. Dahan. 2 vols. Damascus, 1956–63.

———. *Al-Aʿlaq al-Khatira fi Dhikr Umaraʾ al-Sham wa-ʾl-Jazira*, ed. Y. Z. ʿAbbara. 2 vols. Damascus, 1991.

———. *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Zahir*, ed. A. Hutait. Beirut, 1983.

Ibn Taghribirdi. *Al-Nujum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wa-ʾl-Qahira*, ed. J. al-Din Shayyal and F. M. Shaltut. Vols. 15, 16. Cairo, 1972.

Ibn Tulun, Shams al-Din. *Mutʿat al-Adhhan*, ed. Kh. al-Mawsili. 2 vols. Beirut, 1999.

Ibn Tuwayr. *Nuzhat al-Muqlatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn*, ed. A. F. Sayyid. Cairo, 1990.

Ibn ʿUthman, al-Ansari Muwaffaq al-Din. *Murshid al-Zuwwar ila Qubur al-Abrar*, ed. M. F. Abu Bakr. Cairo, 1995.

Ibn Wasil. *Mufarrij al-Kurub fi Akhbar Bani Ayyub*, ed. J. al-Din al-Shayyal, S. A. ʿAshur, and H. Rabie. 5 vols. Cairo, 1953–77.

Ibn al-Zayyat, Shams al-Din. *Kitab al-Kawakib al-Sayyara fi Tartib al-Ziyara*. Reprint, Baghdad, n.d.

Ibn Zulaq. *Akhbar al-Sibawayhi al-Misri*, ed. M. I. Saʿd and H. al-Dib. Cairo, 1933.

Idris ʿImad al-Din. *ʿUyun al-Akhbar*, ed. M. Yalaoui, under the title *Taʾrikh al-Hulafaʾ al-Fatimiyyin bi-ʾl-Maghrib*. Beirut, 1985.

ʿImad al-Din, al-Isfahani. *Al-Fath al-Qussi fi ʾl-Fath al-Qudsi*, ed. M. M. Sabuh. N.p., n.d.

Imbert, J. "Les conciles et les hôpitaux (IXe siècle)." In *Fondations et oeuvres charitables au moyen âge,* ed. J. Dufour and H. Platelle, 39–49. Paris, 1999.

Inalcik, H., and D. Quataert, eds. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge, 1994.

Ipsirli, M. "A Preliminary Study of the Public Waqfs of Hama and Homs in the Sixteenth Century." *Studies on Turkish-Arab Relations* 1 (1986): 119–47.

Itzkowitz, N. "Health, Education and Welfare—Ottoman Style." *Midway*, 1968, 59–68.

Izutsu, T. *The Structure of the Ethical Terms in the Koran*. Tokyo, 1959.

Jennings, R. C. "Pious Foundations in the Society and Economy of Ottoman Trabzon, 1565–1640." *JESHO* 33 (1990): 271–336.

Johansen, B. "Amwal Zahira and Amwal Batina." In *Festschrift for Ihsan Abbas,* ed. W. al-Qadi, 247–65. Beirut, 1981.

Jones, C. *The Charitable Imperative: Hospitals and Nursing in Ancien Regime and Revolutionary France*. London, 1989.

———. *Charity and Bienfaisance: The Treatment of the Poor in the Montpellier Region, 1740–1815*. Cambridge, 1982.

Jones, W. R. "Pious Endowments in Medieval Christianity and Islam." *Diogenes* 109 (1980): 23–36.

Kàldy-Nagy, G. "The First Centuries of the Ottoman Military Organization." *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest) 30 (1977): 147–83.

Karamustafa, A. T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period*. Salt Lake City, 1994.

Karateke, H. T. "Interpreting Monuments: Charitable Buildings, Monuments, and the Construction of Collective Memory in the Ottoman Empire." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 91 (2001): 183–201.

Kedar, B. Z. "A Twelfth-Century Description of the Jerusalem Hospital." In *The Military Orders: Welfare and Warfare,* ed. H. Nicholson, 3–13. Aldershot, 1998.
Khadduri, M., trans. *The Islamic Law of Nations: Shaybani's Siyar.* Baltimore, 1966.
Kindi. *The Governors and Judges of Egypt*, ed. R. Guest. Leiden, 1912.
Kister, M. J. "The Massacre of the Banu Qurayza." *JSAI* 8 (1986): 61–97.
———. "The Social and Political Implications of Three Traditions in the Kitab al-Kharadj of Yahya B. Adam." *JESHO* 3 (1960): 326–34.
———. "Social and Religious Concepts of Authority in Islam." *JSAI* 18 (1994): 84–128.
Kraemer, J. L. *Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam.* Leiden, 1986.
Kunt, I. M. "The Waqf as an Instrument of Public Policy: Notes on the Köprülü Family Endowments." In *Studies in Ottoman History in Honor of Professor V. L. Ménage,* ed. C. Heywood and C. Imber, 189–99. Istanbul, 1994.
Lambton, A.K.S. "Awqaf in Persia: 6th–8th/12th–14th Centuries." *Islamic Law and Society* 4 (1997): 298–318.
———. *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia.* New York, 1988.
Lane, E. W. *An Account of the Manner and Customs of the Modern Egyptians.* Reprint, New York, 1973.
Lapidus, I. M. "Ayyubid Religious Policy and the Development of the Schools of Law in Cairo." In *Colloque international sur l'histoire du Caire, 1969*, 279–87. Leipzig, 1974.
Lecker, M. "On Arabs of the Banu Kilab Executed Together with the Jewish Banu Qurayza." *JSAI* 19 (1995): 66–73.
Leeuwen, R. van. *Waqfs and Urban Structures: The Case of Ottoman Damascus.* Leiden, 1999.
Leiser, G.L.V. "The Restoration of Sunnism in Egypt." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1976, 2 vols.
Lev, Y. "Aspects of the Egyptian Society in the Fatimid Period." In *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras,* ed. U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen, 1–33. Leuven, 2001.
———. "The Cadi and the Urban Society: The Case Study of Medieval Egypt, 9th–12th Centuries." In *Towns and Material Culture in the Medieval Middle East,* ed. Y. Lev, 89–103. Leiden, 2002.
———. "Prisoners of War during the Fatimid-Ayyubid Wars with the Crusaders." In *Tolerance and Intolerance; Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades,* ed. M. Gervers and J. M. Powell, 11–28. Syracuse, 2001.
———. *Saladin in Egypt.* Leiden, 1999.
Little, D. P. "The Nature of Khanqahs, Ribats, and Zawiyas under the Mamluks." In *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, ed. W. B. Hallaq and D. P. Little, 91–105. Leiden, 1992.
———. "Notes on the Mamluk Madrasahs." *MSR* 6 (2002): 9–21.
Løkkegaard, F. *Islamic Taxation in the Classical Period.* Copenhagen, 1950.
Lutfi, H. *Al-Quds al-Mamlukiyya.* Berlin, 1985.
MacCoull, L.S.B. *Coptic Perspectives on Late Antiquity.* Aldershot, 1993.

Mackensen, R. S. "Moslem Libraries and Sectarian Propaganda." *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 21 (1934–35): 83–114.

Makdisi, G. "Autograph Diary of an Eleventh-Century Historian of Baghdad [Ibn Banna']." *BSOAS* 18 (1956): 9–31, 239–60; 19 (1957): 13–48, 281–303.

———. "Muslim Institutions of Learning in Eleventh-Century Baghdad." *BSOAS* 24 (1961): 1–56.

———. *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West.* Edinburgh, 1981.

Al-Makin, Ibn al-ʿAmid. "La chronique des Ayyoubides," ed. Cl. Cahen. *BEO* 15 (1955–57): 109–84.

Mandaville, J. E. "Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the Ottoman Empire." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 10 (1979): 289–308.

Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din. *Ighathat al-Umma bi-Kashf al-Ghumma*, ed. M. M. Ziyad and M. al-Shayyal. Cairo, 1940. (For French trans., see G. Wiet; for English trans., see A. Allouche.)

———. *Ittiʿaz al-Hunafa' bi-Akhbar al-A'imma al-Fatimiyyin al-Khulafa'*, ed. J. al-Din al-Shayyal and M. H. M. Ahmad. 3 vols. Cairo, 1967–73.

———. *Kitab al-Mawaʿiz wa-'l-Iʿtibar bi-Dhikr al-Khitat wa-'l-Athar.* 4 vols. Bulaq, 1325 H.

———. *Kitab al-Muqaffa al-Kabir*, ed. M. Yalaoui. 8 vols. Beirut, 1991.

———. *Kitab al-Suluk li-Maʿrifat Duwal al-Muluk*, ed. M. M. Ziyada and S. A. ʿAshur. 4 vols. Cairo, 1943–72.

———. *Musawwadat Kitab al-Mawaʿiz wa-'l-Iʿtibar fi Dhikr al-Khitat wa-'l-Athar*, ed. A. F. Sayyid. London, 1995.

Marcus, A. *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century.* New York, 1989.

Martel-Thoumian, B. *Les civils et l'administration dans l'état militaire mamluk (IXe/XVe siécle).* Damascus, 1992.

Matuz, J. "The Nature and Stages of Ottoman Feudalism." *Asian and African Studies* (Haifa) 16 (1982): 281–92.

McVaugh, M. R. *Medicine before the Plague: Practitioners and Their Patients in the Crown of Aragon, 1285–1345.* Cambridge, 1993.

Michel, N. "Les rizak ihbasiyya, terres agricoles en mainmorte dans l'Égypte mamelouke et ottomane." *AI* 30 (1996): 105–89.

Miller, T. S. *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire.* Baltimore, 1997.

———. "The Orphanothropheion of Constantinople." In *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare,* ed. E. A. Hanawalt and C. Lindberg, 83–104. Kirksville, Mo., 1994.

———. *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire.* Washington, D.C., 2003.

———. "The Sampson Hospital of Constantinople." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 15 (1990): 101–37.

Miskawayh. *Tajarib al-Umam*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth. 4 vols. Baghdad, 1965.

Miura, T. "The Salahiyya Quarter in the Suburbs of Damascus." *BEO* 47 (1995): 129–81.

Mollat, M. *The Poor in the Middle Ages*, English trans. A. Goldhammer. New Haven, 1986.

Morisot, C. "Patrimoine des commerçants à l'époque mamelouke d'après les archives conservées au Caire." In *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras,* ed. U. Vermeulen and J. van Steenbergen, 309–29. Leuven, 2001.

Morony, M. G. *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest*. Princeton, 1984.

Morray, D. *An Ayyubid Notable and His World*. Leiden, 1994.

Mortel, R. T. "Madrasas in Mecca during the Medieval Period." *BSOAS* 60 (1997): 236–52.

———. "Ribats in Mecca during the Medieval Period: A Descriptive Study Based on Literary Sources." *BSOAS* 61 (1998): 29–50.

Mostafa, S. L. "The Cairene Sabil: Form and Meaning." *Muqarnas* 6 (1989): 33–43.

Mottahedeh, R. P. "The Transmission of Learning: The Role of the Islamic Northeast." In *Madrasa: La transmission du savoir dans le monde musulman,* ed. N. Grandin and M. Gaborieau, 63–72. Paris, 1997.

Mouton, J.-M. *Damas et sa principauté sous les Saljoukides et les Bourides, 468–549/ 1076–1154*. Cairo, 1994.

Mujir al-Din. *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Ta'rikh al-Quds wa-'l-Khalil*, ed. M. B. al-ʿUlum. 2 vols. Najaf, 1928.

Muqaddasi, Muhammad ibn Ahmad. *Kitab Ahsan al-Taqasim fi Maʿrifat al-Aqalim*, ed. M. J. de Goeje. Leiden, 1909.

Musabbihi. *Akhbar Misr*, ed. A. F. Sayyid and Th. Bianquis. Cairo, 1978.

Myres, D. "Al-ʿImara al-ʿAmira, the Charitable Foundation of Khassaki Sultan (959/ 1152)." In *Ottoman Jerusalem,* ed. S. Auld and R. Hillenbrand, 539–82. London, 2000.

Al-Nabulsi. "Kitab al-Lumaʿ al-Qawanin al-Mudiyya fi Dawanin al-Diyar al-Misriyya," ed. C. Becker and Cl. Cahen. *BEO* 16 (1958–60): 3–120.

Nanji, A. *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, s.v. "Almsgiving."

Nasir Khusraw. *Book of Travels (Safarnama)*, trans. W. M. Thackston. Albany, N.Y., 1986.

Newhall, A. M. "The Patronage of the Mamluk Sultan Qaitbay, 872–901/1468–1496." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1987.

Nisaburi. *ʿUqala' al-Majanin*, ed. W. F. al-Kilani. Cairo, 1924.

Northrup, L. S. *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of al-Mansur Qalawun and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678–689 AH/1279–1290 AD)*. Stuttgart, 1998.

Nuʿaymi, ʿAbd al-Qadir ibn Muhammad. *Dur al-Qur'an fi Dimashq*, ed. S. al-Din al-Munajjid. Damascus, 1946.

———. *Al-Daris fi Ta'rikh al-Madaris*, ed. J. al-Husayni. 2 vols. Damascus, 1948.

Nuwayri, Shihab al-Din Ahmad. *Nihayat al-Arab fi Funun al-Adab*, ed. S. A. ʿAshur et al. 33 vols. Cairo, 1923–98.

Olszowy-Schlanger, J. "Learning to Read and Write in Medieval Egypt: Children's Exercise Books from the Cairo Geniza." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 48 (2003): 47–69.

Orme, N., and M. Webster. *The English Hospital, 1070–1570*. New Haven, 1995.

Pahlitzsch, J. "The Concern for Spiritual Salvation and Memoria in Islamic Public En-

dowments in Jerusalem (XII–XVI C.) as Compared to the Concepts of Christendom." In *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras*, ed. U. Vermeulen and J. van Steenbergen, 329–44. Leuven, 2001.

Peirce, L. P. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York, 1993.

Pérez, M.S.T., and R.G.S.T. Pérez. "Les soins donnés aux malades dans la Castille du Bas Moyen Âge: l'hôpital royal de Burgos, prototype de l'hôpital castillan." In *Fondations et oeuvres charitables au moyen âge*, ed. J. Dufour and H. Platelle, 281–93. Paris 1999.

Peters, R. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Wakf: In Classical Islamic Law."

Petry, C. F. "A Geniza for Mamluk Studies? Charitable Trust (Waqf) Documents as a Source for Economic and Social History." *MSR* 2 (1998): 51–61.

———. "The Military Institutions and Innovations in the Late Mamluk Period." In *The Cambridge History of Egypt*, vol. 1, *Islamic Egypt, 640–1517*, ed. C. F. Petry, 462–90. Cambridge, 1998.

———. *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamluk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power.* Albany, 1994.

Pinto, O. "The Libraries of the Arabs during the Time of the Abbasids." *Islamic Culture* 3 (1929): 210–43.

Poliak, A. N. *Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250–1900*. London, 1939.

Pouzet, L. *Damas au VII^e^/XIII^e^ siècle: Vie et structures religieuses dans une métropole islamique*. Beirut, 1988.

Powers, D. S. *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, s.v. "Alms Tax, Islamic."

———. "The Maliki Family Endowments: Legal Norms and Social Practices." *IJMES* 25 (1993): 379–406.

———. "Revenues of Public Waqfs in Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 8 (1984): 163–202.

———. *Studies in Qur'an and Hadith*. Berkeley, 1986.

Qalqashandi, Ahmad ibn ʿAli. *Subh al-Aʿsha fi Sinaʿat al-Insha'*, ed. by M. H. Shams al-Din. 15 vols. Beirut, 1988.

Qudama ibn Jaʿfar. *Kitab al-Kharaj wa-Sinaʿat al-Kitaba*. Facsimile ed. published by F. Sezgin. Frankfurt, 1986.

Rabie, H. *Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564–741/A.D. 1169–1341*. London, 1972.

Raymond, A. "Les fontaines publiques (*sabil*) du Caire à l'époque Ottomane (1517–1798)." *AI* 15 (1979): 235–91.

Richard, J. "Hospitals and Hospital Congregations in the Latin Kingdom during the First Period of the Frankish Conquest." In *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B. Z. Kedar et al., 89–101. Jerusalem, 1982.

Al-Rihawi, ʿAbd al-Qadir, and É. E. Ouéchek. "Les deux Takiyya de Damas." *BEO* 28 (1975): 217–25.

Rivlin, B. *Mutual Responsibility in the Italian Ghetto: Holy Societies, 1516–1789*. Jerusalem, 1991 (in Hebrew).

Roberts, S. "Contexts of Charity in the Middle Ages: Religious, Social, and Civic." In

Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy, ed. J. B. Schneewind, 1–24. Bloomington, 1996.

Rodriguez-Mañas, F. "Charity and Deceit: The Practice of itʿam al-taʿam in Moroccan Sufism." *Studia Islamica* 91 (2000): 59–91.

———. "Encore sur la controverse entre soufis et juristes au moyen âge." *Arabica* 43 (1996): 406–21.

Rosenthal, F. "Sedaka, Charity." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950–51): 411–31.

Rubin, M. *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*. Cambridge, 1987.

Russell, A. *The Natural History of Aleppo*. 2 vols. London, 1794.

Sabra, A. *Poverty and Charity in Medieval Islam: Mamluk Egypt, 1250–1517*. Cambridge, 2000.

Safadi, Khalil ibn Aybak. *Aʿyan al-ʿAsr wa-Aʿwan al-Nasr*, ed. ʿAli ibn Zayd et al. 5 vols. Beirut, 1998.

———. *Kitab al-Wafi bi-'l-Wafayat*, ed. A. F. Sayyid. Vol. 18. Beirut, 1988.

———. *Al-Wafi bi-'l-Wafayat*, ed. B. Radke. Vol. 15. Beirut, 1979.

Sato, T. *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam*. Leiden, 1997.

Sauvan, Y. "Une liste de fondations pieuses (waqfiyya) au temps de Sélim II." *BEO* 28 (1975): 231–66.

Sayyid, A. F. *La capitale de l'Égypte jusqu'à l'époque fatimide*. Stuttgart, 1998.

———. *Al-Dawla al-Fatimiyya fi Misr: Tafsir Jadid*. 2nd ed. Cairo, 2000.

Schacht, J. "Early Doctrines on Waqf." In *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, 443–52. Istanbul, 1953.

Shafiʿi ibn ʿAli. *Kitab Husn al-Manaqib al-Sirriyya al-Muntazaʿ min al-sira al-Zahariyya*, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz al-Khuwaytir. Riyadh, 1976.

Shaham, R. "Masters, Their Freed Slaves, and the Waqf in Egypt (Eighteenth–Twentieth Centuries)." *JESHO* 43 (2000): 162–88.

———. "Christian and Jewish Waqf in Palestine during the Late Ottoman Period." *BSOAS* 54 (1991): 460–72.

Shatzmiller, M. *The Berbers and the Islamic State*. Princeton, 2000.

———. "Islamic Institutions and Property Rights: The Case of the 'Public Good Waqf.'" *JESHO* 44 (2001): 44–71.

Shefer, M. "Hospitals in the Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University, 2001 (in Hebrew).

Shujaʿi, Shams al-Din. *Taʾrikh al-Malik al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun*, ed. B. Schäfer. Wiesbaden, 1977.

Simonsen, J. B. *Studies in the Genesis and Early Development of the Caliphal Taxation System*. Copenhagen, 1988.

Singer, A. *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence*. New York, 2002.

Sourdel, D. "Fragments d'al-Suli sur d'histoire des vizirs abbasides." *BEO* 15 (1955–57): 99–108.

Spicciani, A. "The 'Poveri Vergognosi' in Fifteenth-Century Florence." In *Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe,* ed. T. Riis, 119–83. Florence, 1981.

Stillman, N. A. "Charity and Social Services in Medieval Islam." *Sociates* 5 (1975): 105–15.

———. "Waqf and the Ideology of Charity in Medieval Islam." In *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth,* vol. 1, *Hunter of the East*, ed. I. R. Netton, 357–75. Leiden, 2000.

Subtelny, M. E. "A Tumurid Educational and Charitable Foundation: The Ikhlasiyya Comlex of ʿAli ShirNava'i in Fifteenth-Century Herat and Its Endowment." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111 (1991): 38–62.

Tabbaa, Y. *Constructions of Power and Piety in Medieval Aleppo*. University Park, Pa., 1997.

Talbi, M. "Everyday Life in the Cities of Islam." In *The Different Aspects of Islamic Culture,* ed. A. Bouhdiba and M. M. Dawalibi, 379–461. Paris, 1998.

Taylor, C. S. "Saints, Ziyara, Qissa, and the Squocial Construction of Moral Imagination in Late Medieval Egypt." *Studia Islamica* 88 (1998): 103–21.

Thayer, J. M. "Land and Power in Mamluk Egypt." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1993.

Treadgold, W. *Byzantium and Its Army.* Stanford, 1995.

Tyan, E. *Histoire de l'oganisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam*. Leiden, 1960.

ʿUmari, Ibn Fadl Allah. *Masalik al-Absar fi Mamalik al-Amsar*, ed. A. Zaky Pasha (Cairo, 1924); ed. A. F. Sayyid (Cairo, 1985).

Vryonis, S. "Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor." *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 29 (1975): 60–61.

Wahab, A.S.H. "Captives Waqfs in Syria and Egypt (491–589 H./1097–1193 A.D.)." In *La Liberazione dei 'Captivi' Tra Christianità e Islam,* ed. G. Cipollone, 559–71. Vatican City, 2000.

Wakiʿ. *Akhbar al-Qudat*, ed. M. Maraghi. 2 vols. Cairo, 1947–50.

Weir, T. H. (A. Zysow). *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Sadaka."

Wiet, G. "Le traité des famines de Maqrizi." *JESHO* 5 (1962): 1–90.

Williams, J. A. "The Khanqah of Siryaqus: A Mamluk Royal Religious Foundation." In *In Quest of an Islamic Humanism. Arabic and Islamic Studies in Memory of Mohamed al-Nowaihi,* ed. A. H. Green, 109–19. Cairo, 1986.

Winter, M. "Inter-Madhhab Competition in Mamluk Damascus." *JSAI* 25 (2001): 195–212.

Wolper, E. S. "The Politics of Patronage: Political Change and the Construction of Dervishes' Lodges in Sivas." *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 39–48.

Yahya ibn Adam. *Kitab al-Kharaj*. Vol. 1 of *Taxation in Islam,* trans. A. Ben Shemesh. Leiden, 1958.

Yazbak, M. "Muslim Orphans and the Shariʿa in Ottoman Palestine according to Sijjil Records." *JESHO* 44 (2001): 123–40.

Zakharia, K. "Le statut du fou dans le Kitab ʿUqala' al-Maganin d'al-Nisaburi, modalités d'une exclusion." *BEO* 49 (1997): 269–87.

Zakkar, S. "Biographie de Nizam al-Mulk." *BEO* 24 (1971): 227–49.

Zaman, M. Q. *Religion and Politics under the Early Abbasids*. Leiden, 1997.

el-Zawahreh, T.Kh.M. *Religious Endowments and Social Life in the Ottoman Provinces of Damascus in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Karak, 1992.

Index

Yaacov Lev is associate professor of Islamic medieval history at Bar-Ilan University. He is the author of *Saladin in Egypt* and editor of *War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean, 7th to 15th Centuries*.