Th. Emil Homerin
University of Rochester

Saving Muslim Souls: The *Khānqāh* and the Sufi Duty in Mamluk Lands

I

Elements of community and ritual are embedded in the Persian term *khānqāh* with its etymology of ″place of the table″ or ″place of recitation.″ Whatever these pre-Islamic origins, the Muslim *khānqāh* seems to have first appeared in Khurasan in northeastern Iran. There, it sometimes served as a *madrasah*, or law school and, increasingly, as a meeting place for the mystically inclined.[1] In this latter function, the *khānqāh* is linked to Abū Sa'īd ibn Abī al-Khayr (357-440/967-1049), who is believed to have established a rule for Muslim men seeking to live a communal life devoted to the worship of God. According to the *Asrār al-Tawḥīd*, a late sixth/twelfth century hagiography of the mystic, Abū Sa'īd founded or visited hundreds of *khānqāh*s in this region. Abū Sa'īd would travel from one *khānqāh* to the next, lecturing and teaching, and he authorized chosen disciples to establish *khānqāh*s to spread his rule.[2]

The *khānqāh*s mentioned in the *Asrār* were usually named for their location or for a shaykh who resided and taught there. Several large establishments accommodating as many as forty dervishes were endowed by members of the ruling elite, but most of these early *khānqāh*s appear to have consisted of a house with a common gathering room for mystics, a room serving as a mosque, and a

[1]See Jacqueline Chabbi, ″Khānḳāh,″ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 4:1025-26; Richard Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 250-51; and Muḥsin Kiyānī, *Tārīkh-i Khānqāh dar Īrān* (Tehran, 1990), 123-60. For a brief survey of the *khānqāh* and early Sufi communities, see J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders of Islam* (Oxford, 1971), esp. 5-11, 17-23, 168-72; also see Bruce B. Lawrence, ″Khānagāh,″ *Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York, 1987), 8:278-79, and Marcia K. Hermansen, ″Khānqāh,″ *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World* (Oxford, 1995), 2:415-17.

[2]For a study and translation of the *Asrār*, see John O′Kane, *The Secrets of God′s Mystical Oneness* (New York, 1992). For more on Abū Sa'īd and his rule see R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism* (1921; reprint, Cambridge, 1967), 1-76, esp. 46, and Kiyānī, *Īrān*, 187-93. Also see H. Ritter, ″Abū Sa'īd,″ *EI*^{2} 1:145-47, and Fritz Meier, *Abū Sa'īd-i-Abī l-Hayr (357-440/967-1049): Wirklichkeit und Legende* (Leiden, 1976).

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

few rooms for residents and guests.[3] The *Asrār*, unfortunately, does not give us a detailed account of the living arrangements in any specific *khānqāh*. A Sufi master probably resided there in most cases, perhaps with some of his students and disciples, but we have little information regarding the average size of such communities, whether or not they were strictly celibate, or the extent of family members and lay affiliates attached to them.[4] The *Asrār*, however, explicitly describes these early Sufi *khānqāh*s as centers for study, spiritual contemplation, and communal worship; frequently they were gathering places for Quranic recitations and, in at least one instance, a *khānqāh* also contained a holy relic. Abū Sa'īd had given his green woolen jacket to a disciple to serve as a ″banner″ in a new *khānqāh*, and, over time, people came to pay their respects to this garment which they believed protected them from pestilence and other impending disasters.[5]

Nevertheless, as the *Asrār* attests, not all *khānqāh*s at this time revolved around mysticism; some legal scholars and theologians, too, had their own *khānqāh*s.[6] Further, parallel institutions known as *khān*s were constructed in this period near mosques where important teachers held their classes, to serve as hostels and places of residence for out of town students. These structures were gradually incorporated into separate *madrasah* complexes focusing on legal studies, and into the *khānqāh*s, with their increasing emphasis on Sufism.[7] But whatever their size and major focus, the *khānqāh*s were to accommodate travellers, though some guests did not receive the gracious hospitality given to Abū Sa'īd. The celebrated Persian Sufi 'Alī al-Hujwīrī (d. ca. 465/1072) had a rather different experience in Khurasan, and he reminds us that not everyone residing in a *khānqāh* was a pious Sufi:

> One night I arrived in a village in the country where there was a convent (*khānqāh*) inhabited by a number of aspirants to Ṣûfism. I was wearing a dark-blue frock . . . such as is prescribed by the Sunna, but I had with me nothing of the Ṣûfî′s regular equipment . . . except a staff and a leathern water-bottle. . . . I appeared very contemptible in the eyes of these Ṣûfîs, who did not know me.

---

[3] O′Kane, *Secrets*, 89, 111, 191, 230, 253, 276, 280, 308, 336, 345.

[4] The *Asrār* quotes Abū Sa'īd as saying that his era was in such decline that a ″time is coming when no one will be able to reside in the k̲ânqâh for more than a year. . . .″ O′Kane, *Secrets*, 336. Regarding the controversial practice of celibacy among the Sufis of this period see 'Alī al-Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, ed. and translated by R. A. Nicholson, 2nd ed. (London, 1936), 360-66.

[5] O′Kane, *Secrets*, 227-28, and also see 111, 191-92, 230-31, 253, 336, 345.

[6] Ibid., 410-11, and Bulliet, *Patricians*, 250-51.

[7] J. Pedersen and George Makdisi, ″Madrasa,″ *EI*^{2}, 5:1123-34, esp. 1124-25, and Makdisi′s *The Rise of Colleges* (Edinburgh, 1981), 23-24.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

> They regarded only my external habit and said to one another, ″This fellow is not one of us.″ And so in truth it was: I was not one of them, but I had to pass the night in that place. They lodged me on the roof, while they themselves went up to a roof above mine, and set before me dry bread which had turned green, while I was drawing into my nostrils the savour of the viands with which they regaled themselves. All the time they were addressing derisive remarks to me from the roof. When they finished the food, they began to pelt me with the skins of melons which they had eaten, by way of showing how pleased they were with themselves and how lightly they thought of me. I said in my heart: ″O Lord God, were it not that they are wearing the dress of Thy friends, I would not have borne this from them.″[8]

During the fifth-sixth/eleventh-twelfth centuries, the *khānqāh* spread throughout Iran and westward to Baghdad where, designated by the Arabic term *ribāṭ*, it became a prominent institution under the Saljuq sultans.[9] The Saljuqs vigorously promoted Sunni interpretations of Islam, and the ruling elite created *waqf*s, or pious endowments, for Quran and *ḥadīth* schools, *madrasah*s, and *ribāṭ*s. These institutions were undoubtedly intended to curb politico-religious movements, including Ismā'īlī Shi'ism and the Karrāmīyah, which might threaten Sunni Islam, its caliphate, and the Saljuq sultanate.[10] But the *madrasah*s and *ribāṭ*s, in particular, also served the Saljuqs as sources for patronage in their continual struggle with the Abbasid caliphs for political supremacy. Since the caliphs controlled the congregational mosques of Baghdad, the Saljuqs turned to the newer institutions of the *madrasah* and *ribāṭ* to support members of the religious establishment who espoused and legitimized their cause as the caliph's ″protector,″ and, so, de facto ruler.[11]

Not surprisingly, then, the three earliest *ribāṭ*s in Baghdad were founded for popular pro-Saljuq preachers arriving from Khurasan, and, subsequently, *ribāṭ*s

---

[8]Translated by R. A. Nicholson, *Kashf*, 69.

[9]Jacqueline Chabbi, ″La fonction du *ribāṭ* à Baghdad du cinque siècle au debut du septieme siècle,″ *Revue des études islamiques* 42 (1974):101-21, and Kiyānī, *Īrān*, 162-250.

[10]C. E. Bosworth, ″Saldjūḳids,″ *EI*^{2}, 8:936-59, esp. 951-52, and his ″Karrāmiyya,″ *EI*^{2}, 4:667-69. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 6-8, 16-17.

[11]Pedersen and Makdisi, ″Madrasa,″ 1128; Makdisi, *Colleges*, 10-14, 27-34; and Chabbi, ″Fonction,″ 107-9. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 7-8, and Carl W. Ernst, *Eternal Garden* (Albany, 1992), 14-15.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

were often directed by Sufi shaykhs who backed the Saljuq cause.[12] While many of these *ribāṭ*s had been established specifically for Sufis and their rituals, the directors and focuses of other *ribāṭ*s were not primarily mystical in orientation, and so during the mid-sixth/twelfth century, the *ribāṭ* was still not exclusively for Sufis. This stemmed from the fact that the *ribāṭ*s could be used to reward not only mystics, but preachers and other men of religion who were not scholars of law or jurisprudence and so not qualified for a lucrative *madrasah* position. Therefore, even as Saljuq central control and dominance declined late in the century, the *ribāṭ*s continued to be supported. Similar to other endowed institutions, the *ribāṭ*s sheltered the wealth of the ruling elite and so preserved a source of patronage, of whatever cause, especially in times of political instability.[13]

Reasserting control in Baghdad, the Abbasid caliphs became major patrons of these institutions, as did the Zangids and, subsequently, the Ayyubids. Successors to the Saljuqs in Syria and Palestine, the Zangids and Ayyubids continued to champion Sunni Islam, especially in the face of Crusader attempts to reclaim Jerusalem and the Holy Land for Christianity. This underscores another compelling motive for supporting the *ribāṭ*s in addition to acquiring political legitimation and preserving personal wealth and patronage, namely, access to spiritual power. Tales abound of saintly Muslims miraculously defeating infidel foes, and while this became the stuff of legend, Muslim ascetics, mystics, and saints were often sought out for spiritual aid in times of crisis. According to one historian, advisors to the Zangid sultan Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd (r. 541-69/1146-74) once urged him to appropriate funds set aside for ascetics, Sufis, and other men of religion in order to bolster his badly depleted Muslim forces prior to a battle with the Crusaders. But Nūr al-Dīn rebuked his aides, declaring:

> By God, I can′t hope for victory save by means of them, for they sustain and assist the weak among you. How can I cut off the pensions of a folk who, while I′m asleep in my bed, fight for me with arrows that never miss, and then turn around and spend their money on someone whose arrows are hit or miss?[14]

---

[12]Chabbi, ″Fonction,″ 101-12. Likewise, the Ash‘arī theologian and major ideologue for the Saljuq sultanate, Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), was rewarded with a major position at the Niẓāmīyah *madrasah*; see Bosworth, ″Saldjūḳids,″ 950, and Ernst, *Garden*, 15.

[13]Chabbi, ″Fonction,″ 112-16. Also see Jacqueline Chabbi, ″Ribāṭ,″ *EI*^{2}, 8:493-506, and Pedersen and Makdisi, ″Madrasa,″ 1128.

[14]Muḥammad Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī Akhbār Banī Ayyūb*, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1957), 1:136. For more on Nūr al-Dīn′s patronage of the religious classes, including the Sufis and their *khānqāh*s, see ibid., 263-86, esp. 281-84, and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad Ibn Kathīr, *al-Kāmil fī al-Ta’rīkh* (Beirut, 1979), 11:404-5. Also see ‘Abd al-Laṭīf Ḥamzah, *al-Ḥarakah*

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Nūr al-Dīn and other rulers may well have regarded the Sufis as spiritual reinforcements, a kind of mystical cohort in their holy war efforts. From this perspective, the term *ribāṭ* in the sense of a ″guard against danger″ or a ″frontier garrison″ seems appropriate for a Sufi residence, though there is no evidence that these *ribāṭ*s were ever convents for Sufi soldiers.[15] In fact, the Zangid and Ayyubid *ribāṭ*s were generally located in urban areas, and, far from Spartan quarters, they could be grand affairs, as noted by the traveller Ibn Jubayr (539-613/1144-1217) when he passed through Damascus in 580/1184:

> As for the *ribāṭ*s, which are called *khānqāh*s [here in Damascus], they are many and intended for the Sufis. They are lavish palaces with water flowing through them all, a most lovely sight to behold. The Sufis associated with these institutions are the kings of this country, for God has provided for their worldly needs and more, thus freeing their minds from the worries of making a living so that they can worship Him; He has lodged them in palaces that remind them of the palaces of Paradise! So by God′s favor these fortunate and favored Sufis receive the grace of both this world and the next.[16]

Ibn Jubayr added that the most sumptuous *khānqāh* that he had personally seen had, in fact, been a former palace with an attached garden, bequeathed by Nūr al-Dīn to the Sufis. In such *khānqāh*s the Sufis would hold stirring audition sessions (*samā'*) in which sensitive souls would achieve mystical ecstasy. Ibn Jubayr further described these Sufis as following a noble path and an admirable way of life dedicated to religious service.[17]

Though Ibn Jubayr thought highly of the Sufis and their *khānqāh*s, other, more conservative Muslims took a dim view of such opulent quarters and the happenings that went on there. A contemporary of Ibn Jubayr, the Ḥanbalī scholar Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200) denounced the *ribāṭ* as a harmful innovation encouraging celibacy, which aped the Christians and ran counter to prophetic custom in favor of marriage. But this was not all:

---

al-Fikrīyah fī Miṣr fī al-'Aṣrayn al-Ayyūbī wa-al-Mamlūkī al-Awwal (Cairo, 1945?), 104-10, and P. M. Holt, *The Age of the Crusades* (London, 1986), 80.

[15]See Chabbi, ″Ribāṭ,″ 493-506.

[16]Muḥammad Ibn Jubayr, *Riḥlat Ibn Jubayr* (Beirut, 1979), 256-57. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 9-10.

[17]Ibn Jubayr, *Riḥlah*, 257. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 169, for a description of another *khānqāh* established by Nūr al-Dīn, this one in Aleppo, founded in 543/1148.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

> We have seen a horde of more recent Sufis lounging around in the *ribāṭ*s so as to avoid working for a living, occupied by eating and drinking, song and dance; they seek the things of the world from any tyrant, not hesitating to accept the gift of even the tax-collector! Most of their *ribāṭ*s have been built by despots who have endowed them with illegal properties. . . . The Sufis′ concern revolves around the kitchen, food, and ice water . . . while they spend most of their time in amusing conversation and visiting the nobility. . . .[18]

Despite an obvious difference of opinion regarding the reputation of the *ribāṭ*s and their residents, both Ibn al-Jawzī and Ibn Jubayr linked this institution almost exclusively to Sufism in the late sixth/twelfth century. This had resulted in part from the determined efforts of the Abbasid caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (r. 575-622/1180-1225), who sponsored chivalric associations (*futūwah*) and Sufi brotherhoods (*ṭuruq*) to legitimate and extend the power of a weakened caliphate. Attempting to re-unify Sunni and Shi'i Muslims under a single ruler, al-Nāṣir invoked mystical concepts and analogies to project himself as a divinely appointed ″mediator″ (*wāsiṭah*) between God and humanity. A major proponent and propagandist of these doctrines was al-Nāṣir′s advisor and envoy, the renowned Sufi 'Umar al-Suhrawardī (539-632/1145-1234).[19]

'Umar′s family had long been involved with Sufism, particularly in its institutional aspects; a great uncle had been the director of an early *ribāṭ* in Baghdad, while his uncle and spiritual guide Abū Najīb (ca. 490-563/1097-1168) had founded his own *ribāṭ* and enjoyed Saljuq patronage in exchange for his support. By contrast, during the Saljuq decline 'Umar pledged his loyalty to his caliphal patron al-Nāṣir, who rewarded him with a *ribāṭ*, complete with a garden and bath-house. 'Umar′s extensive experience with *khānqāh* life made him keenly aware of the need for regulating the Sufi communities in order to enhance mystical training and worship while, at the same time, curbing abuses such as those noted by al-Hujwīrī and Ibn al-Jawzī.[20]

---

[18]'Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī, *Talbīs al-Iblīs* (Cairo, n.d.), 169-70. Also see Leonor Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khanqah* (Berlin, 1988), 10-12, and Ernst, *Garden*, 16-17.

[19]Angelika Hartmann, ″al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh,″ *EI*^{2}, 7:996-1003, esp. 998-1000, and Chabbi, ″Fonction,″ 116-21. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 7-14; Julian Baldick, *Mystical Islam* (New York, 1989), 72-75; and Ernst, *Garden*, 15.

[20]See Menahem Milson′s introduction to Abū Najīb al-Suhrawardī′s *A Sufi Rule for Novices* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), 10-16, and Trimingham, *Orders*, 33-37.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Building, then, on his uncle's brief "Rules for Novices," 'Umar composed his famous Sufi manual, *'Awārif al-Ma'ārif*, which specifically addressed issues relating to Sufi communal life, including *ribāṭ* residence. Drawing an analogy to the Muslim holy warriors of the frontiers, 'Umar praised the pious Sufis of the *ribāṭ*s for using their prayers and obedience to God as weapons in the fight against strife and affliction on behalf of all believers; by means of their exemplary behavior and good works, the *ribāṭ* Sufis had brought spiritual blessings (*barakah*) to Muslim lands once again.[21]

However, in the *'Awārif*, 'Umar does not dwell on these benefits despite his belief in the efficacy of the *ribāṭ* Sufis for fending off the enemies of Islam, something which clearly attracted rulers including the Zangid Nūr al-Dīn. Rather, 'Umar turns instead to a foundational tenet of Islamic mysticism: the Sufi's interior holy war against his own selfish nature. With this struggle in mind, 'Umar instructs his followers on a variety of essential matters, including the spiritual guide's qualifications, various mystical states and stages, and the practice of mystical audition (*samā'*) and invocations (*dhikr*). But throughout his discussion of these and other topics, 'Umar never loses sight of the centrality of the community for nurturing Muslim spirituality, and advancing the mystical life.[22]

'Umar al-Suhrawardī's attentiveness to the Sufi path and community is evident in the success of his brotherhood, which spread and flourished throughout the Islamic world, especially eastward in Iran and the Indian sub-continent. There, based in large part on the *'Awārif*'s guidelines and instructions, *khānqāh*s were founded and organized usually to advance the teachings of a specific Sufi brotherhood, often 'Umar's own Suhrawardīyah, but other brotherhoods too, such as the Chishtīyah. While the brotherhoods often differed on the legality of accepting a regime's support, nearly all of them established *khānqāh*s based on their own rules and under the leadership of their senior members.[23] Yet, the *khānqāh* in Mamluk lands would take a different path, one sponsored almost exclusively by sultans and powerful amirs who, in turn, set the criteria for *khānqāh* life.

II

The Mamluks followed the precedent of *khānqāh* patronage set by their former Ayyubid masters, and a model of particular importance was Cairo's Dār Sa'īd

---

[21]'Umar al-Suhrawardī, *'Awārif al-Ma'ārif* (Cairo, 1973), 99-101.

[22]Ibid., esp. 99-159, 364-400. Also see Trimingham, *Orders*, 13-14, and Baldick, *Mystical Islam*, 71-75.

[23]See K. A. Nizami, "Some Aspects of *Khānqāh* Life in Medieval India," *Studia Islamica* 7 (1957): 51-69; Trimingham, *Orders*, 64-65, 21-23; and Ernst, *Garden*, 15-17, 89, 132.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

al-Su‘adā’, or al-Ṣalāḥīyah. Established in 569/1174 by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), the founder of the Ayyubid dynasty, this lavish *khānqāh* was Egypt´s first, being designated as a hostel for as many as three hundred Sufis, with preference given to those arriving from foreign lands.[24] Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn likewise founded several *madrasah*s to support Cairo´s Sunni religious establishment and its legal scholars, though here too he favored non-Egyptians to fill the highest posts.[25] This preference for foreign Sunni scholars may have fostered a religious elite loyal to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and his Ayyubid successors. Further, their support of *khānqāh*s and *madrasah*s nurtured a Sunni ideology free of Shī‘ī and Christian elements, so prevalent in sixth/twelfth century Egypt and Syria. For the *madrasah*s aimed to re-establish Sunni law and doctrine, while the *khānqāh*s functioned as devotional centers for the dissemination of correct beliefs, rituals, and spiritual exercises.[26]

As conscious heirs to the Ayyubids, the early Mamluk sultans Baybars I (r. 658-76/1260-77) and Qalāwūn (r. 678-89/1279-90) actively supported the existing *khānqāh-madrasah* system, and they appointed the Shaykh al-Shuyūkh, or ″Shaykh of Shaykhs,″ who was in charge of the prestigious Dār Sa‘īd al-Su‘adā’. These shaykhs were usually learned men of some distinction, including the Persian Sufi and legal scholar, Shams al-Dīn al-Aykī (631-97/1234-98), and the chief judge and vizier to Qalāwūn, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Bint al-A‘azz (d. 695/1296), who succeeded al-Aykī in 687/1288. As Shaykh al-Shuyūkh, they were to appoint ″upright and knowledgeable″ Sufis to be in residence there, lead the weekly processions of Sufis to perform the Friday prayer, and oversee the prayers, Quran readings, and *dhikr* ritual, which formed a large part of their daily routine.[27]

---

[24]Aḥmad al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā‘iẓ wa-al-I‘tibār bi-Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār* (Baghdad, 1970), 2:415-16; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 21-25; ‘Āṣim Muḥammad Rizq, *Khānqāwāt al-Ṣūfīyah fī Miṣr* (Cairo, 1997), 1:127-58; and Trimingham, *Orders*, 18-20.

[25]In 566/1171, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn named the jurist Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Hadhabānī, a fellow Kurd, chief Sunni judge of Egypt; P. M. Holt, *Crusades*, 50-51; also see Michael Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190-1350* (Cambridge, 1994), 54.

[26]R. Stephen Humphreys, ″The Expressive Intent of Mamluk Architecture in Cairo,″ *Studia Islamica* 35 (1972): 69-119, esp. 78-87, 93-94; Jonathan Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo* (Princeton, 1992), 130-32; and Muḥammad M. Amīn, *al-Awqāf wa-al-Ḥayāh al-Ijtimā‘īyah fī Miṣr, 648-923 H./1250-1517 M*. (Cairo, 1980), 204. Also see Chamberlain, *Knowledge*, 54-57; Holt, *Crusades*, 78-81; Ḥamzah, *al-Ḥarakah*, 104-7; Chabbi, ″Khānḳāh,″ 1025-26; and Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 20-22.

[27]Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:415, and for these and other Sufis there see his *al-Muqaffá al-Kabīr*, ed. Muḥammad Ya‘lāwī (Beirut, 1991), 5:99, 105, 173, 447, 450-51, 573, 660, 694; 6:39, 130, 365, 466; 7:109-10, 236, 529; also see Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:139-41. For Qāytbāy´s decree appointing al-Aykī as Shaykh al-Shuyūkh of the Dār Sa‘īd al-Su‘adā’ in 684/1285, see Muḥammad Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh Ibn al-Furāt*, ed. Qusṭanṭīn Zurayq and Najlā’ ‘Izz al-Dīn (Beirut, 1939), 8:29-32.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Further, Baybars I, Qalāwūn, and their amirs established additional *madrasah*s, *ribāṭ*s, and *zāwiyah*s. The *zāwiyah*s were generally of more modest size and endowments than the *ribāṭ*s, and they often served as a meeting place for students and a teacher in residence. Several *zāwiyah*s were attached to saints′ shrines, where novices and more experienced Sufis might study, practice seclusion, and participate in communal rituals such as *dhikr* and *samā'*. The *zāwiyah*s were frequently named for a specific resident saint or Sufi master, such as Khiḍr al-Mihrānī (d. 676/1277), Baybars I′s spiritual advisor. However, just as Sufi masters taught in mosques and *madrasah*s, *zāwiyah*s were also residences for Sunni scholars of jurisprudence, *ḥadīth*, and other subjects, which were also studied there.[28]

A number of *zāwiyah*s from the Mamluk period functioned primarily as hospices for the needy, in one case for Abyssinian eunuchs, but more often for foreign Sufis and ascetics and, increasingly, the *zāwiyah*s became centers for specific Sufi brotherhoods. Similarly, the early Mamluk *ribāṭ*s were often larger hostels accommodating both resident and itinerant Sufis with provisions and individual cells adjoining space for communal worship. At least eight *ribāṭ*s in Egypt were specifically endowed to provide for elderly women and pious widows, and two of them, including one founded by a daughter of Baybars I, were established for women shaykhs who were charged with preaching, and teaching women of good character regarding religious matters.[29] The early Mamluk *ribāṭ*s and *khānqāh*s, then, like their Zangid and Ayyubid predecessors, were primarily Sufi institutions, which along with the *madrasah*s, and *zāwiyah*s, were intended to support Sunni Islam in its spiritual, doctrinal, and ritual aspects.[30]

---

[28]Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:230-35. Based on al-Maqrīzī′s accounts, the Mamluk *zāwiyah* closely resembled the early *khānqāh*s of Khurasan. Also see Leonor Fernandes, ″The Zāwiya in Cairo,″ *Annales islamologiques* 18 (1982): 116-21, and her *Khanqah*, 13-16; Holt, *Crusades*, 151-52; Laylá 'Alī Ibrāhīm, ″The Zāwiya of Šaiẖ Zain ad-Dīn Yūsuf in Cairo,″ *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 34 (1978): 79-110; Sheila S. Blair, ″Sufi Saints and Shrine Architecture in the Early Fourteenth Century,″ *Muqarnas* 7 (1990): 35-49; Th. Emil Homerin, ″'Umar Ibn al-Fāriḍ, A Saint of Mamluk and Ottoman Egypt,″ in *Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam*, ed. Grace Martin Smith and Carl W. Ernst (Istanbul, 1993), 85-94; and Berkey, *Knowledge*, 56-60.

[29]Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:427-28, 454, and see Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 10-16; idem, ″Zāwiya″; and Berkey, *Knowledge*, 174. For *ribāṭ*s established for women in Damascus see 'Abd al-Qādir al-Nu'aymī, *al-Dāris fī Ta'rīkh al-Madāris*, ed. Ja'far al-Ḥasanī (reprint, Cairo, 1988), 2:193 (no. 188), 194 (nos. 197-98, 203-4), and Louis Pouzet, *Damas au vii^e/xiii^e siècle: Vie et structures religieuses d′une métropole islamique* (Beirut, 1991), 211.

[30]Especially see Donald P. Little, ″The Nature of *Khānqāhs, Ribāṭs*, and *Zāwiyahs* under the Mamlūks,″ in *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, ed. Wael B. Hallaq and Donald P. Little (Leiden, 1991), 91-105, esp. 99-104; also see Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:159-207, and Éric Geoffroy, *Le Soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie* (Damascus, 1995), 165-75. For these institutions in Damascus see al-Nu'aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:139-91 (*khānqāh*s), 192-96 (*ribāṭ*s), 196-221 (*zāwiyah*s), and Pouzet,

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

However, the term *ribāṭ* as used in Mamluk documents soon came to denote a residence for the destitute and elderly, whereas the larger establishments housing Sufis would generally be termed *khānqāh*s.[31] This increasing specificity in terminology is apparent in the endowment deed of Baybars II (r. 708-9/1309-10), who briefly usurped the sultanate from Qalāwūn's son al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Baybars II donated funds to establish a *ribāṭ* for one hundred needy people, with special preference given to retired Mamluk soldiers formerly in his service. As for the *khānqāh*, which was among the first founded by the Mamluks, Baybars II modeled it on Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's Dār Sa'īd al-Su'adā', providing for up to four hundred Sufis, of whom one hundred were to be unmarried men in residence. Though foreigners were again preferred, Egyptians were also eligible provided they, too, were in accord with Sunni Islam and conformed to the Sufi rules of conduct and the brotherhoods (*ṭuruq*).[32]

Baybars II's *khānqāh*, however, differed from that of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in one very fundamental feature: the *khānqāh* enclosed the mausoleum of its founder. Earlier during the Ayyubid period, a founder's grave was sometimes placed in or near his endowed religious institution, whether a *khānqāh*, *ribāṭ*, *madrasah*, or a school teaching *ḥadīth* or Quran.[33] Similarly, a number of the Mamluk ruling elite bequeathed funds to their tombs to support a *madrasah*, Quran school or, more modestly, Quran readers, so that pious acts performed on the site would bring divine favor upon the deceased.[34] For this reason, too, burial on the premises likewise became a regular and defining feature of the Mamluk *khānqāh*, where

---

Damas, 208-11, 446-47; for Jerusalem and Hebron see Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns al-Jalīl bi-Ta'rīkh al-Quds wa-al-Khalīl* (Amman, 1973), 2:23-48, 79, 89, 294, 325-27, 377-81.

[31]See Little, *"Khānqāhs,"* 91-105; Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 219-22; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, esp. 10-19; and Chabbi, "Khānḳāh," 433-34.

[32]Leonor Fernandes, "The Foundation of Baybars al-Jashankir: Its Waqf, History, and Architecture," *Muqarnas* 4 (1987): 21-42, esp. 24-34, with excerpts from the *waqf* text, 39-40; also see her *Khanqah*, 25-29, and Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:211-46.

[33]E.g., in Damascus, al-Nu'aymī, *al-Dāris*, 1:97 (no. 19), 530-31 (no. 109); 2:150 (no. 165), 164-65 (no. 172), 169 (no. 177), 178 (no. 181), 243 (no. 259), 268 (no. 284), 277 (no. 297). For examples in Cairo see Doris Behrens-Abouseif, "The *Maḥmal* Legend and the Pilgrimage of the Ladies of the Mamluk Court," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 1 (1997): 87-96, esp. 87-89, regarding the funerary complex of the sultan al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb (d. 647/1249) and that of his wife Shajarat al-Durr (d. 655/1257). Although Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was not buried in his Dār Sa'īd al-Su'adā', the Sufis there recited daily prayers on his behalf; see al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:415. Also see Humphreys, "Expressive Intent," 114-15.

[34]Humphreys, "Expressive Intent," 112-19; John Alden Williams, "Urbanization and Monument Construction in Mamluk Cairo," *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 33-46, esp. 38-40; Berkey, *Knowledge*, 143-46; Chamberlain, *Knowledge*, 55-56; and al-Nu'aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:223 (no. 234), 240 (no. 254), 258 (nos. 278-79), 260-61 (nos. 282, 284), 274-75 (no. 294), 287-88 (nos. 298-99), 291-92 (no. 304).

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

the founder often placed his tomb together with the graves of his relatives; by generously funding Sufis and their religious activities near the graves, the *khānqāh* founders hoped to secure blessings and spiritual power (*barakah*) for themselves and their loved ones. As a result, over the next two hundred years, the Mamluk elite established more than thirty-five *khānqāh*s in or near their capitals of Cairo and Damascus, and though not all of them were operating at the same time, the *khānqāh*s must have supported hundreds of Sufis during the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries.[35]

According to endowment deeds, the Sufis′ terms of employment could be quite generous, with Sufis in residence earning lodging and food, including ample portions of bread and meat daily.[36] Along with the non-resident Sufis affiliated with the institution, resident Sufis normally received monthly money stipends and, on holidays and special occasions, gifts of food, cash, and clothes. The Sufis residing in the *khānqāh* could earn additional money by assuming specific religious duties at the *khānqāh*, including reciting the Quran and leading prayers, or by performing more worldly tasks such as cooking or cleaning. Employment as a Sufi could certainly earn a man enough to support a family, which might even have lived nearby, if rarely in the *khānqāh* proper.[37]

Further, a number of Mamluk *khānqāh*s, such as that of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (r. 693-741/1293-1341, with interruptions) at Siryāqūs, and those of the sultans Barqūq (r. 784-801/1382-99), Barsbāy (r. 824-41/1421-37), and Qāytbāy (r. 872-901/1468-96) north of Cairo, were part of larger complexes often containing a mosque, *madrasah*, Quran school, *ribāṭ*, and/or a *zāwiyah*. So in addition to creating hundreds of religious positions, these foundations also employed a

---

[35]See al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:416-27; al-Nu‘aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:141-43 (no. 161), 161-63 (no. 167), 166-69 (nos. 173, 174, 176), 173-74 (no. 179), 188-95 (nos. 183-85); and Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 20. Several Mamluk *ribāṭ*s also contained their founder′s tomb; for Cairo see al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:428 (Ribāṭ al-Khāzin) and 430 (Ribāṭ al-‘Alā’ī); for Jerusalem see Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns*, 2:42 (Ribāṭ ‘Alā’ al-Dīn), and for Damascus see al-Nu‘aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:193 (no. 187).

[36]For published partial texts of some of these endowments see Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn, *Wathā’iq Waqf al-Sultān al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn* (Cairo, 1982), esp. 58-120 for Siryāqūs; Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 210-16 (with excerpts from Baybars al-Jāshankīr, Qāytbāy, al-Ghawrī, and others); Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 168-72 (Mughultāy al-Jamālī), 173-85 (Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ustādār), 186-91 (Barsbāy); her ″Baybars al-Jashankir,″ 39-40; and Felicitas Jaritz, ″Auszüge aus der Stiftungsurkunde des Sultans Barqūq,″ *Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Islamische Reihe* 4 (1982): 117-29.

[37]Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 20-68, and Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 204-8, 216. Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad′s *waqf* for Siryāqūs made accommodations for the Shaykh al-Shuyūkh′s family to live on the premises, as well as provided for the needs of married Sufis; see Amīn, *Wathā’iq*, 75, 78, and John Alden Williams, ″The Khanqah of Siryāqūs: A Mamluk Royal Religious Foundation,″ in *In Quest of an Islamic Humanism*, ed. Arnold H. Green (Cairo, 1984), 111-14. Also see Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, *Riḥlat Ibn Baṭṭūṭah* (Beirut, 1987), 56.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

significant number of support personnel, including engineers, laborers, physicians, water-carriers, grocers, and butchers, who worked to meet the physical needs of the complex, which then became the center of a thriving population both inside and outside of the *khānqāh*'s walls.[38]

The endowments of even modest *khānqāh*s could be quite substantial, and so the top administrative position of endowment supervisor (*nāẓir*) often went to a relative or close friend of the founder; similarly, the lucrative senior positions of Shaykh and Shaykh al-Shuyūkh were often assigned to a patron's favorites. These coveted positions became objects of competition among members of the religious elite who vied with one another in supporting their patrons. The Mamluks were praised for their defense and support of sound religion, thereby giving religious legitimacy to their right to rule, and the sultans, in turn, held receptions and banquets at their *khānqāh*s to honor their religious officials. Thus, Mamluk patronage of the *khānqāh*s clearly had political dimensions as sultans and amirs sought to win influence among the Sufis and other members of the religious establishment who might profit from the endowments.[39] In addition, sultans sometimes retreated to their *khānqāh*s during times of revolt or strife among the Mamluk factions. Since the residents and personnel of the larger *ribāṭ*s and *khānqāh*s could be several hundred strong, they were a large contingent for a show of support on their founder's behalf.[40]

Despite such political and economic motives, however, the Mamluk elite frequently attended the *khānqāh*s for spiritual and aesthetic reasons as well, praying with the congregation, listening to readings of the Quran and *ḥadīth*, and participating in Sufi rituals of chant and dance. In times of plague, sultans and amirs also sought out the *khānqāh*s as places of spiritual power and refuge, particularly those *khānqāh*s outside of Cairo in the desert.[41] The Mamluks certainly intended these imposing desert *khānqāh*s to serve as architectural witnesses to Islam's power and their own authority, yet the deadly plague epidemics probably provided another

---

[38]Amīn, *Wathā'iq*, 58-120; Williams, "Siryāqūs," 109-19; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, esp. 47-94; her "Three Ṣūfī Foundations in a 15th Century Waqfiyya," *Annales islamologiques* 18 (1981): 141-56, 216; and Doris Behrens-Abouseif, "Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and al-Ashraf Qāytbāy—Patrons of Urbanism," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, ed. Urbain Vermeulen and Daniel De Smet (Leuven, 1995), 267-84; also see Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, esp. vol. 2.

[39]Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 69-98, 204-8; Carl F. Petry, "A Paradox of Patronage during the Later Mamluk Period," *Muslim World* 73 (1983): 182-207, esp. 190-95; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 4-9, 20, 51-54, 60-63, 103-4; Williams, "Urbanization," 40; and Berkey, *Knowledge*, 134-42. Also see Th. Emil Homerin, *From Arab Poet to Muslim Saint* (Columbia, South Carolina, 1994), 39-44.

[40]See Fernandes, "Baybars al-Jashankir," 38; her *Khanqah*, 104-5; and Boaz Shoshan, *Popular Culture in Medieval Cairo* (Cambridge, 1993), 9-22, esp. 16-19.

[41]Michael W. Dols, *The Black Death in the Middle East* (1977; 2nd printing with corrections, Princeton, 1979), 157, 167, 248-50, and Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 104-8.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

incentive for Mamluk construction in the desert outside of Cairo. The sultan Barsbāy, for example, began his desert *khānqāh* complex following an outbreak of plague in 832/1429 although he already possessed a *khānqāh* in central Cairo.[42]

These many *khānqāh* functions, however, were subordinate to the major task assigned by the endowment deeds to the Sufis: the *waẓīfat al-taṣawwuf*. This ″Sufi duty″ or ″Sufi office″ was the *ḥuḍūr*, the daily gathering of Sufis to perform communal prayers and readings from the Quran. This task was so central that teaching and other activities supported by the endowments were to be scheduled around the *ḥuḍūr* session, which each Sufi was required to attend, with absences duly recorded.[43] The *ḥuḍūr*′s importance was directly linked to the founder′s desire to earn divine favor by supporting religious institutions and activities. But in addition to the blessings derived from these endowments, in general, the author received, in a focused and regularized fashion, benefits from the *ḥuḍūr*. In fact, many *khānqāh* endowment deeds not only stipulate *ḥuḍūr* performance, but they also set its appointed time, as well as some of the prayers and Quranic passages to be recited.

Almost invariably, the sessions began after one of the five daily canonical prayers. Quranic passages required for recitation included the ″Sūrat al-Fātiḥah″ (1), the beginning and end of ″al-Baqarah″ (2) along with its ″Āyat al-Kursī,″ or ″Throne Verse″ (2:256), ″al-Ikhlāṣ″ (112), and the final two *sūrah*s known as the ″al-Mu‘awwidhatān″ (113 and 114), i.e., the two requests for refuge with God. The prayers were repetitions, called *dhikr*, combining praise of God (*tamḥīd*) with declarations of His greatness (*takbīr*), glory (*tasbīḥ*), and oneness (*tahlīl*), followed by prayers for the Prophet Muḥammad, and petitions for God′s forgiveness (*istighfār*). These prayers and the Quran readings were to be recited on behalf of the donor and his family, whether living or dead, who were named as major beneficiaries of the religious merits and divine blessings accruing from each session.[44]

---

[42]Humphreys, ″Expressive Intent,″ 83, 90-91, 117-19, esp. 91, n. 2. Leonor Fernandes has suggested that Barsbāy′s desert *khānqāh* was part of a conscious policy to relieve urban congestion (Fernandes, ″Three Ṣūfī Foundations,″ 144-45). It should be noted, however, that Cairo′s population had dramatically declined a century earlier following the Black Death, which presumably alleviated some of the city′s crowded conditions since the population did not recover until the tenth/sixteenth century; see Williams, ″Urbanization,″ 40-42, and Dols, *Black Death*, esp. 183-85.

[43]Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 208-10; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 18, 54-58, 119 n. 37; Little, *″Khānqāhs,″* 101-2; and Berkey, *Knowledge*, 59-60, 79-81, 84-85. While these and other scholars have mentioned the *ḥuḍūr* as ″the Sufis′ duty,″ the *ḥuḍūr*′s function and relevance to Mamluk religious life have, to my knowledge, never been explored beyond several brief descriptions of the ceremonies.

[44]For descriptions of the *ḥuḍūr* in Arabic *waqf* texts, see n. 36, especially Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 211-16, and idem, *Wathā’iq*, 75, 78-79, 110-11. Also see Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, *Riḥlah*, 56-57; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 54-58; Little, *″Khānqāhs,″* 98; and Berkey, *Knowledge*, 60, n. 37. Concerning some of

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

The careful attention given by the endowment deeds to the *ḥuḍūr* session, and the consistency of its ritual, indicate that these recitations and prayers were not random selections, but established supererogatory invocations and appeals (*du'ā'*).[45] This is confirmed by several manuals on dying, death, and the afterlife popular in the Mamluk period, as they cite the exact Quranic passages and prayers specified in the endowment deeds as being the most efficacious for assisting the dead. These prayers and Quranic recitations, when said on behalf of the dead, were believed to ease their agony in the grave, and to atone for past misdeeds, so that the deceased would arise on the Judgment Day ready for Paradise.[46]

But the *ḥuḍūr* was not only for the dead; the living, too, shared in the blessings. The *ḥuḍūr* was to benefit its founding sponsor and his relatives both in this life and the next, while a portion of the blessings was also dedicated daily to all Muslims, whether living or dead. Further, in addition to the *khānqāh* mausoleums, the *ḥuḍūr* was held in other religious establishments, as were similar sessions for the recitation of the Quran, *ḥadīth*, and prayers, whose merits were likewise offered, first, to the founder, then his relatives, and, finally, to all Muslims. These latter types of ritual performance were to be carried out by professional reciters of the Quran and *ḥadīth*, who need not be Sufis, and it should also be emphasized that neither the contents nor the ritual of the *ḥuḍūr*, itself, were of a particularly mystical character requiring Sufi involvement.[47] Nevertheless, the *ḥuḍūr* was closely linked to Sufism, for it was an explicit duty of the *khānqāh* Sufis, who were widely considered to be channels for God's blessings due to their piety and mystical practices, which included training in recitations and prayers.[48]

---

these prayers and recitations composing the *ḥuḍūr*, and their significance to Muslim worship in general, see Constance E. Padwick, *Muslim Devotions* (London, 1961), esp. xxiv-xxvii, 12-22, 33-36, 65-93, 108-17, 126-36, 198-207.

[45]Further evidence that these *ḥuḍūr* recitations, prayers, and related activities were standard may be found in Muḥammad al-Asyūṭī's (b. 813/1410) notarial manual *Jawāhir al-'Uqūd*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī (Cairo, 1955), 1:356-59, where he cites them in his formulary for *khānqāh* endowment deeds for both men and women; also see Little, "*Khānqāhs*," 98-102. For more on *du'ā'* see Padwick, *Devotions*, esp. 12-13, and Louis Gardet, "Du'ā'," *EI*^{2}, 2:617-18.

[46]Muḥammad al-Qurṭubī (d. 681/1273), *al-Tadhkirah fī Aḥwāl al-Mawtá wa-Umūr al-Ākhirah* (Cairo, 1986), 1:118-31; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (839-911/1445-1505), *Sharḥ al-Ṣudūr bi-Sharḥ Ḥāl al-Mawtá wa-al-Qubūr*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Ḥimṣī (Beirut, 1986), 406, 409, 411-12, 416-21, 424.

[47]Al-Asyūṭī mentions such daily sessions involving the Quran, *ḥadīth*, and prayers as being a standard part of a variety of endowments; *Jawāhir*, 1:330-31, 335 (congregational mosques), 1:348 (Quran schools), 1:367 (endowed Quran readings at mosques), 1:367-68 (endowed Quran readings for the Prophet's birthday), 1:370 (endowed *ḥadīth* readings); also see Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 2:587.

[48]Al-Asyūṭī, *Jawāhir*, 1:357-61, 365-66. Also see Berkey, *Knowledge*, 59-60, and al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:426 (Ṭaybars) for instances of the *ḥuḍūr* ritual in *madrasah*s, and Amīn, *Wathā'iq*, for

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Moreover, in addition to their daily *ḥuḍūr*, the Sufis also gathered outside of their *khānqāh*s with other members of the religious establishment to hold special services and prayers in trying times including those of famine and plague, disasters which help to account for the demise of a number of *khānqāh*s.[49] First the Black Death of 749/1348-49, then successive waves of plague and famine over the next two centuries, ravaged the population and economy of Egypt and Syria. Sultans were forced to levy heavy taxes in efforts to replenish their supply of slave soldiers killed by the plagues, and to ward off the increasing threat of foreign invasion, particularly to the north in Syria and Anatolia where the Ottomans were consolidating and expanding their empire.[50] As a result, salaries for the religious occupations were sometimes cut or in arrears, and many religious establishments fell to ruin. Still, several Mamluk sultans founded new and architecturally impressive *khānqāh* complexes in the ninth/fifteenth century, occasionally at the expense of earlier *khānqāh*s, whose endowments had been appropriated to finance the new projects. While many of the older *khānqāh*s continued in operation, they were substantially reduced in size and services, or combined with *madrasah*s. Of course, the religiously essential *ḥuḍūr* continued to be performed throughout the empire, whether in the *madrasah-khānqāh*s, mosques, or other religious institutions established by the later Mamluks. Often Sufis were paid for this service, but they did not necessarily receive room and board.[51] This may also help to account for an apparent increase at this time in the *zāwiyah*s with their specific brotherhood and ethnic affiliations, as Sufis sought a mystical communal life and residence elsewhere than in the diminished *khānqāh*s.[52]

---

its performance in a mosque; Sufis were participants on many of these occasions as well.

[49]E.g., Dols, *Black Death*, 236-55, esp. 248-53; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 42, 106-8; and Carl F. Petry, *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamlūk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power* (Albany, 1994), 105. Also see Aḥmad al-Maqrīzī's account of these prayers during the low Nile and devastating drought of 806/1404, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk*, ed. Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Āshūr (Cairo, 1970-73), 3:3:1110.

[50]Dols, *Black Death*, 178-231, 261-80; Williams, "Urbanization," 41-44; Carl F. Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1981), 19-36; and idem, *Protectors*, esp. 102-30.

[51]For the fate of several specific *khānqāh*s in Cairo, see al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:416 (Sa'īd al-Su'adā'), 417 (Baybars II), 421 (Shaykhū and al-Jaybughā), 422 (al-Bunduqdārīyah), 423-24 (Baktimur), 425 (Qawṣūn), and 426 (the *khānqāh* of 'Alā' al-Dīn Ṭaybars [d. 719/1319] where the *ḥuḍūr* had been performed since the *khānqāh*'s founding in 707/1307. However, following the disastrous drought of 806/1404 the *khānqāh* fell into ruin, and the *ḥuḍūr* was eventually moved to the amir's *madrasah* in 814/1412). Also see Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 2:748-49, 774-75.

[52]Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 37-46, 111-13, and her "Some Aspects of the Zāwiya in Egypt at the Eve of the Ottoman Conquest," *Annales islamologiques* 19 (1983): 9-17; Doris Behrens-Abouseif, "The Takiyyat Ibrahim al-Kulshani in Cairo," *Muqarnas* 5 (1988): 43-60, esp. 44-45, 51-54, 57-58; and her "Change in Function and Form of Mamluk Religious Institutions," *Annales islamologiques*

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

III

During the Crusades, the Arab poet and holy warrior Usāmah ibn Munqidh (488-584/1095-1188) chanced upon a group of Christian monks. Their piety and dedication to Christianity unsettled him, but later he was relieved to find a similar Muslim devotion among the Sufis of a *khānqāh*. Usāmah′s brief record of these two encounters contains one of the earliest comparisons made between the Christian monastery and Sufi *khānqāh*.[53] Both communities were often organized around a founding saintly figure or his disciples, and they enabled individuals to participate in a common religious life away from worldly affairs. The monasteries and *khānqāh*s also encouraged prayer, meditation, and study which contributed to the larger society in the forms of education, and prayers for all believers. As a result, many monasteries and *khānqāh*s received the generous favor of the ruling class who sought spiritual support and political influence in exchange. Nevertheless, the monks and Sufis generally set the rules and, accordingly, administered their establishments.[54]

Yet the Mamluk *khānqāh*s did not conform to this model, for the founding sultan or amir set the rule for his *khānqāh* within the rather broad legal parameters established for pious endowments. The foundation deeds specified not only the architectural and financial details of the *khānqāh*, but also such important religious matters as the appointment of shaykhs, the number of Sufis to be employed, their assigned religious and non-religious tasks, required attendance and permissible leaves, and other restrictions involving marital status, place of origin, and prohibitions against employment outside of the *khānqāh*. Further, these rules were not those of a specific brotherhood, though the endowment deeds explicitly state that qualified Sufis must adhere to traditional Sufi rules (*ādāb*), and belong to one of the four major Sunni law schools.[55]

---

21 (1985): 73-93, esp. 81-93; Doris Behrens-Abouseif and Leonor Fernandes, ″Sufi Architecture in the Early Ottoman Period,″ *Annales islamologiques* 20 (1984): 103-14; and Geoffroy, *Soufisme*, 170-75.

[53]Francesco Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades* (Berkeley, 1957; 1984 reprint ed.), 83-84.

[54]See F. E. Peters, *Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton, 1990), 3:123-85, who elaborates on Usāmah Ibn Munqidh′s comparison of monastic lives with quotations from al-Hujwīrī, Ibn Jubayr, Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, and others. Also see Bernard McGinn, ″Monasticism,″ *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York, 1987), 10:44-50; Trimingham, *Orders*, 166-72; and Baldick, *Mystical Islam*, 59-60, 72-75.

[55]Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 210-18, and Fernandes, ″Baybars al-Jashankir,″ 39. Also see al-Asyūṭī, *Jawāhir*, 1:357; Little, ″*Khānqāhs*,″ 98; and Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 170. Exceptions may have been made on occasion regarding law school affiliation, for the Damascus *khānqāh* of the amir Yūnus, Dawādār of the Sultan Barqūq, apparently required that the Sufis and their shaykh there be Ḥanafīs (al-Nu‘aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:189-90 [no. 184]).

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

The Mamluks obviously desired to control their *khānqāh*s from which they expected to benefit financially, politically, and religiously, and so several scholars have regarded the Mamluk *khānqāh* as an embodiment of an ″official″ or ″institutional″ Sufism. From this perspective, Leonor Fernandes, a pioneer in her studies of the *khānqāh*, has suggested that the Mamluks intended their *khānqāh*s as a means to monitor, if not control, Sufi doctrine and activities, and she has drawn attention to the fact that Sunni affiliation was a stated criteria for *khānqāh* residency. But Fernandes and others go too far in their view of the *khānqāh* as a state-sponsored bastion of ″orthodox Sufism″ standing against a ″popular″ religion of the *zāwiyah*s.[56]

The Mamluks certainly founded their *khānqāh*s with an eye to the endowment′s influence on the religious elite, but this was no different than other religious institutions supported by the Mamluks. Further, there is little evidence that these endowments were made with any overall state policy in mind, and the fact that the *khānqāh*s were usually named for and ordered by their Mamluk founders suggests a more individual or personal aim.[57] By contrast, most *zāwiyah*s were under the control of a shaykh or a brotherhood, which initiated and trained new members, and set the rituals and rules to be followed.[58] Still, the historian al-Maqrīzī (769-845/1367-1441) frequently notes in his account of Cairo′s *zāwiyah*s that many of these establishments had, likewise, been founded by the Mamluks, who had dedicated them to respectable Sunnis, most of whom were Sufis.[59] Al-Maqrīzī′s two major exceptions were the *zāwiyah* of the Qalandārs, charged with violating prophetic custom, and the *zāwiyah* of the Yūnusīyah order, suspected of Shi‘i affiliation. This underscores the crucial fact that the Sunni Islam of this period did not define itself in opposition to some type of popular or ″heretical″ Sufism, so much as to Shi‘ism, and militant Christianity.[60]

---

[56]E.g., Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 1-2, 17-18, 96-103; idem, ″Three Ṣūfī Foundations,″ 141, 150; idem, ″Baybars al-Jashankir,″ 21, 34; Behrens-Abouseif, ″Change in Function,″ 84-85, 92; and Little, *″Khānqāhs,″* 94-95, 99. Also see Chabbi, ″Khānḳāh,″ 1026; Hermansen, ″Khānqāh,″ 415-17; and Geoffroy, *Soufisme*, 170-75.

[57]For more on the personal nature of Mamluk endowments see Berkey, *Knowledge*, 132-34.

[58]See Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 13-20, 96-104; her ″Zāwiya″; and her ″Three Ṣūfī Foundations,″ 141, 150, 155-69. Also see al-Asyūṭī, *Jawāhir*, 1:360-63, and Little, *″Khānqāhs,″* 102-4.

[59]Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:430-36. For more on respected Sunni *zāwiyah*s and their shaykhs in Damascus see al-Nu‘aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:196-222, and Pouzet, *Damas*, 446-47, and for the *zāwiyah*s of Jerusalem and Hebron, many of which were founded by Ayyubid and Mamluk amirs, see Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns*, 2:23-48, 78-80.

[60]See John E. Woods, review of *Mongols and Mamluks: The Mamluk-Īlkhānid War, 1260-1281,* by Reuven Amitai-Preiss, *Mamluk Studies Review* 1 (1997): 133; and al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:432-35, who notes that in 761/1359 Sultan Ḥasan forbade the Qalandārs from shaving their beards and wearing foreign, Persian dress, as both practices were counter to well established prophetic custom;

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Of course, the sultans rarely tolerated abnormal religious practices in the *zāwiyah*s, *khānqāh*s, or anywhere else, since this could lead to public and political unrest.[61] Perhaps for this reason, some Mamluk religious officials advocated the careful scrutiny of *khānqāh* residents. The Sufis in residence were not expected to be distinguished scholars or celebrated spiritual masters, with the possible exception of their shaykhs.[62] In fact, the conservative Ḥanbalī scholar Ibn Taymīyah (661-728/1262-1328) stated that the great Sufi masters rarely had need of a *khānqāh*, which was normally the place for ″funded Sufis″ (*ṣūfīyat al-arzāq*). These professional Sufis should obey sacred law, adhere to the Sufi rules of conduct (*ādāb*), fulfill their religious obligations, and avoid greed and other selfish behavior.[63]

Similarly, the Shāfi'ī judge Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (727-71/1327-70) was particularly concerned that the resident Sufis lead ascetic lives, for he believed a number of individuals stayed in the *khānqāh*s only for an easy life; they were lazy drones who should be thrown out together with the frauds who posed as mystics to conceal their filthy lives dedicated to smoking hashish and other illicit acts.[64] Al-Subkī´s criticisms, however, and those by other Mamluk religious authorities should not be read as attacks on Sufism, for while they might criticize individual Sufis or practices of a specific order, they seldom contested Sufism´s positive contributions to religious life or the important roles of the *zāwiyah* and *khānqāh* within Muslim society.[65]

As for the differences between the *khānqāh*, *zāwiyah*, and, for that matter, the *madrasah*, they resulted largely from differences in size and focus, not their underlying Sunni mission. There was a considerable amount of overlap between these institutions, particularly with the joining of the *madrasah* and *khānqāh* in the Mamluk period. But for the most part, the *madrasah´*s curriculum was law, while the shaykhs of the *zāwiyah*s instructed students in the foundational beliefs and rituals of Islamic mysticism. Senior Sufi shaykhs in the *khānqāh*s also advised younger protégés on mystical matters, while the endowments sometimes established stipends for further non-mystical religious studies in jurisprudence, *ḥadīth*, and,

---

also see al-Nu'aymī, *al-Dāris*, 2:209-18, and Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 102.

[61]For several incidents see Shoshan, *Popular Culture*, 9, 18-19.

[62]Al-Maqrīzī, for instance, refers by name to only a dozen or so of the hundreds of Sufis who resided at the Dār Sa'īd al-Su'adā' in the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth centuries; see n. 27.

[63]Th. Emil Homerin, ″Ibn Taymīya´s *al-Ṣūfīyah wa-al-fuqarā*',″ *Arabica* 32 (1985): 219-44, esp. 233.

[64]Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Mu'īd al-Ni'am wa-Mubīd al-Niqam*, edited by David Myhrman (Leiden, 1908), 171-80, esp. 178-79; also see Makdisi, *Colleges*, 177-79, and Geoffroy, *Soufisme*, 170-71.

[65]See Th. Emil Homerin, ″Sufism and Its Detractors in Mamluk Egypt: A Survey of Protagonists and Institutional Settings,″ forthcoming in *Islamic Mysticism Contested*, ed. Frederick De Jong and Bernd Radtke (Leiden); Trimingham, *Orders*, 19-21; and Geoffroy, *Soufisme*, 170-87.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

occasionally, in other subjects, including Quranic commentary and dialectical theology.[66] Yet references to specific Sufi orders, doctrines, or rituals, such as seclusion (*khalwah*), are almost never found in *khānqāh* endowment deeds, which stipulate that the residents of the *khānqāh* were to be initiated Sunni Sufis, not untutored novices. Sufi instruction and private mystical devotions were certainly a part of *khānqāh* life, but they were not its only mission.[67] Rather, as spelled out in the deeds of endowment, the primary ″Sufi duty″ of the *khānqāh*s was the daily communal performance of the *ḥuḍūr*.

In terms of function, then, the Mamluk *zāwiyah*s resembled the Christian monasteries, while the *khānqāh*s had a closer parallel in the chantries of medieval England. Founded around this same time by a wealthy nobility, the chantries were to say mass on behalf of Christians, living and dead, so as to free them from purgatory. Like the Mamluk *khānqāh*s, these chantries were endowed in perpetuity to secure blessings for the founder, his or her relatives, and finally, all Christians. In comparison to the *khānqāh*s, most of the chantries were rather modest, supporting several priests who said mass daily in accord with the founder′s will. But the endowments often paid for the erection and care of a free standing chapel, along with maintaining a residence for the priests; some endowments also provided alms for the poor, support for primary schooling, or stipends for student priests at college.[68]

The English chantries, too, were funded by private donations, usually of properties. The founder designated the endowment′s supervisor, who was often a relative or close friend, as was frequently the case with the priests appointed to say mass. In addition, the founder determined such matters as the particular liturgy to be said, its time and place, and the priests′ terms of employment, including room and board, religious and non-religious duties, required attendance and excused leaves, restrictions pertaining to other forms of employment, and the priests′ permissible interactions with women and possible concubinage.[69]

---

[66] See al-Subkī, *Mu'īd*, 176-78; Makdisi, *Colleges*, 216; Behrens-Abouseif, ″Change in Function,″ 81-93; al-Asyūṭī, *Jawāhir*, 1:357-59; Little, ″*Khānqāhs*,″ 99; Berkey, *Knowledge*, 44-60, 74; Amīn, *al-Awqāf*, 237-39, 253; Fernandes, *Khanqah*, 16; idem, ″Three Ṣūfī Foundations,″ 152; Pedersen and Makdisi, ″Madrasa,″ 1129; and Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:247, 257-70, 315-38; 2:438-500, 545-47, 612-18, 636-38, 657.

[67] See al-Asyūṭī, *Jawāhir*, 1:357-59; Little, ″*Khānqāhs*,″ 97-99; and Doris Behrens-Abouseif, ″An Unlisted Dome of the Fifteenth Century: The Dome of Zāwiyat al-Damirdāš,″ *Annales islamologiques* 18 (1982): 105-15, esp. 112.

[68] K. L. Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain* (Cambridge, 1965), 2-5, 34-54, 143, 177-79, 210-11, 269; Alan Kreider, *English Chantries: The Road to Dissolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 26-46; and T. S. R. Boase, *Death in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972), 59-69.

[69] Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries*, 65, 95, 140-45, 154, 186, 195-97, 242-89, and Kreider, *English Chantries*, 26-46.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Like the Mamluk *khānqāh*s, the English chantries attested to the nobility's power in both secular and religious affairs, serving their founders as an important source of patronage and support. But endowing a chantry for such selfish motives did not pass unnoticed, and the religious reformer John Wycliffe (ca. 1320-84) denounced the chantry as yet another example of the spiritual pride of the rich, who parted with their wealth solely to buy a plot in Paradise. Ecclesiastic officials, too, occasionally criticized the chantries, with their undistinguished priests prone to lax behavior. Echoing the moral indignation voiced by his Muslim contemporary al-Subkī against charlatan Sufis in the Mamluk *khānqāh*s, the Archbishop Islip in 1362 accused some chantry priests of being "pampered with exorbitant salaries, and discharging their intemperance in vomit and lust, becoming delirious with licentiousness and finally drowning themselves in the abyss of vice."[70] Yet, these criticisms aside, few medieval Christians prior to the Reformation questioned the importance of the chantry per se, and for one very good reason: purgatory. For whatever the economic, political, or philanthropic aims of the founders, the prime motive for founding a chantry was the soul's release from the pains of purgatory.[71]

Christian purgatory derived a scriptural basis from 1 Cor. 3:13 in which Paul declared "the fire shall test what sort of work each one has done." As elaborated by the early Church fathers, this purgatorial fire was different from that of hell, as it would punish and, perhaps, purify sinners after their death and prior to the Judgment Day. For Origen (ca. 185-254 C.E.), this assured eventual salvation for all, but others such as Augustine (354-430 C.E.) disagreed. Augustine divided humanity into four groups with their respective fates after death. First, there were the godless who went straight to hell, and their blessed counterparts, the martyrs, saints, and the righteous who would quickly enter Paradise. Between the two were those sinners who did some good, but not enough and so were bound for a less intense hell, and, finally, there were those sinners who might yet enter Paradise after the purgatorial fire, but who could use some help to attain salvation.[72]

Based in part on Augustine's categories, Christian doctrines of purgation and intercession continued to develop, eventually coalescing by the late twelfth century in the notion of a distinct, spatial purgatory. There, many of the dead would be punished for their past sins in preparation for eternal life, but their stay in purgatory could be made more amenable and even curtailed by the pious efforts of the living. Suffrages such as prayers, fasting, and alms performed by the living for the dead were believed to help the deceased, especially if offered by devoted loved

---

[70]Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries*, 190, 209-11, and Kreider, *English Chantries*, 26-30.

[71]Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries*, 189-90, 303-6. Also see Kreider, *English Chantries*, 40.

[72]For an excellent study of Christian notions of purgatory and intercession see Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, 1984), esp. 4-12, 52-95.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

ones.[73] Further, as early as the third century, the eucharist was given as solace for the souls of dead Christians, and subsequently, Pope Gregory the Great (590-604 C.E.) permitted the saying of mass as a way to deliver sinners from the purgatorial fires. Naturally, right doctrine and good deeds were essential for salvation, but many Christians came to believe that priestly intercession in the form of prayers and masses said on their behalf were even more effective for assuaging the horrors of purgatory and securing eternal life. As a result, the laity gave alms and offerings to churches and monasteries which, by the ninth century, annually performed services for the dead.[74]

Donors, however, had little control over monasteries or churches, whose routines and rituals had long been established by either a religious order or ecclesiastic authorities. Further, their masses and prayers were often said collectively for the good of all Christian souls while, increasingly, the quantitative equation took hold that the more masses said for the fewer beneficiaries, the greater their effectiveness. So beginning in the tenth or eleventh century, the chantry arose as an attractive individual alternative, for those who could afford it. Of course, as Wycliffe had sharply noted, the chantry founders were largely concerned with their own souls and those of their relatives; while chantry foundation deeds invariably stipulated that the spiritual benefits must be shared, the distribution was not equal, for the order of those blessed was believed to be directly proportional to the amount of blessings received.[75]

Still, the larger society apparently felt blessed by these somewhat diluted prayers, as well as by the considerable alms and activities supported by the many chantry endowments, when they were in operation. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were an estimated two thousand active chantries, employing priests and members of the laity essential to the daily life and work of these institutions. But by this time, too, other chantries had fallen into ruin or been dissolved. For like the Mamluk *khānqāh*s, many chantries were eventually closed due to a decline in revenues as a consequence of plague and other natural catastrophes, mismanagement, or from outright confiscation of the endowments.[76]

Then, in 1545, Henry VIII closed all of the chantries and pensioned off their priests. Henry was strapped for cash in his war with France, and the extensive lands and revenues held by monasteries, chantries, and other Catholic institutions were easy targets for this recently converted king. Not surprisingly, he justified his actions based on the Protestant denial of purgatory. Luther and other Protestants

---

[73]Ibid., 154-59, 275-77, and Kreider, *English Chantries*, 40-42.

[74]Le Goff, *Purgatory*, 102-7, 274-75; Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries*, 3-6, 303-6; and Kreider, *English Chantries*, 40-42, 86-87.

[75]Wood-Leigh, *Perpetual Chantries*, 5, 34-35, 154, 289, 304-10.

[76]Ibid., 93, 125-29, 194-95, 314 and Kreider, *English Chantries*, 89.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

had denounced belief in purgatory as lacking a firm scriptural foundation and being premised on the false belief that one could enter heaven by way of others´ good works. By annulling purgatory, they undercut the intercessory role of the Catholic Church, and cleared the way for Henry to dissolve the chantries.[77]

In comparison to the English chantry, the Mamluk *khānqāh* had a far less dramatic decline, yet this institution likewise underwent transformation in the ninth/fifteenth century, often resulting from economic stress, as noted above, though politics, too, continued to play a part. In 923/1517, the empire fell to the Ottomans who, as Sunni Muslims, continued to support pious endowments in the former Mamluk domains. But few Ottoman governors or amirs appear to have been willing to commit the substantial funds necessary to establish a *khānqāh* there, perhaps reserving such investments and their graves for the imperial capital at Istanbul.[78] Whatever the case, the *khānqāh*´s decline cannot be traced to a major upheaval in religious belief, as happened with the chantries. Yet, despite this significant difference, the English chantry and the Mamluk *khānqāh* bear striking similarities in terms of their foundation, administration, and economic affairs.

As important, they also shared an analogous intercessory function within their respective religions, and this underscores the centrality of purgatory not only to the chantry, but to the Mamluk *khānqāh* as well. Similar in spirit to portions of the New Testament, the Quran warns of a judgment day when each person will learn his eternal fate. On a number of occasions, Muslims have feared that this day was fast approaching, and at least twice during the Mamluk period, some warned that the final hour would soon arrive with the Mongols or the plague.[79] But, normally, this day has not been considered imminent, and Muslims have wondered about the state of their dead prior to the resurrection, and the possibility of a purgatory.[80]

Some Muslim exegetes found allusions to a type of purgatorial process in several verses of the Quran, especially 9:101: ″. . . We will punish them twice, then they will be thrown back into a terrible punishment!″ For the most part, however, Muslim notions of a purgatorial existence derive from traditions ascribed to the Prophet Muḥammad (*ḥadīth*), and often grouped together as *ʻadhāb al-qabr*,

---

[77]Kreider, *English Chantries*, esp. 93-208.

[78]Doris Behrens-Abouseif has noted the exception of one Ottoman governor, Maḥmūd Pasha, who constructed a mausoleum in Cairo in 975/1568 next to a mosque where sixty non-resident Sufis were to perform the *ḥuḍūr* daily (″Takiyyat Ibrahim al-Kulshani,″ 43-60, esp. 44). Also see Chabbi, ″Khānḳāh,″ 1026.

[79]See Aḥmad Ibn Taymīyah, *Majmūʻat al-Rasāʾil wa-al-Masāʾil*, ed. Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍá (Cairo, 1922-30; reprint, Beirut, 1983), 1:186, and Dols, *Black Death*, 243-45.

[80]See Jane Idleman Smith and Yvonne Y. Haddad, *The Islamic Understanding of Death and Resurrection* (Albany, 1981), esp. 34-36, and Le Goff, *Purgatory*, 12-13.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

"the punishment of the grave."[81] Beginning as early as the second/eighth century, Muslim creeds asserted that the recently deceased must undergo a trial in the grave. If the dead person can bear witness to his belief in the one God and Muḥammad as His Prophet, then he will eventually enter Paradise, but if he is unable to do this, he will be tortured in the grave before being cast into hell on the Judgment Day. Yet punishment for past transgressions also awaits many of the Muslims destined for heaven, though opinions varied to what extent this punishment took place in the grave or in hell itself.[82]

In a manner reminiscent of Augustine, the theologian Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (450-505/1058-1111) divided humanity into four groups: the damned, the punished, the saved, and the victorious. The damned are the godless infidels engrossed with the world who will be destroyed in hell, whereas the victorious include the martyrs and great gnostics who love only God and so will dwell in the highest reaches of Paradise. On lower levels, and of less stature, will be the saved, who lead a devout life to acquire the pleasures of Paradise and who repent of their sins before death. As for the punished (*mu'adhdhabūn*), they believe in God, but they have committed major or minor sins in pursuit of selfish passions, and these unrepented acts have contaminated their faith. As a result, these individuals are punished after death and prior to the Judgment Day, with their afflictions in hell being commensurate to their misdeeds. Al-Ghazālī adds that of this last group, the majority have oppressed other people, and so after death they will be made to bear the sins of those they had oppressed who, in exchange, will reap the rewards for the good deeds done by their oppressors.[83]

In a similar fashion, al-Ghazālī and a number of Muslim scholars throughout the Mamluk period, including al-Qurṭubī (d. 681/1273) and al-Suyūṭī (839-911/1445-1505), discussed the tortures in the grave, which afflict the dead proportionally to their past sins. A primary aim of these authors was to exhort the living to mend their ways while time remains and so avoid an anguish far exceeding any earthly pain. But their doctrine of a purgatory also resolved theological issues regarding divine justice and punishment short of eternal damnation, and, more important still, this purgatory offered many sinners a second chance. For even the most sinful believer would eventually be released when the Prophet Muḥammad

---

[81]A. J. Wensinck and A. S. Tritton, "'Adhāb al-Ḳabr," *EI*^{2}, 1:186-87; Ragnar Eklund, *Life Between Death and Resurrection According to Islam* (Uppsala, 1941), esp. 72-92; and Smith and Haddad, *Understanding*, 24-59.

[82]Eklund, *Life*, esp. 86-87, and Smith and Haddad, *Understanding*, 33-49.

[83]Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn* (Cairo, 1957), 1:24-30. Also see idem, *The Remembrance of Death and the Afterlife*, translated by T. J. Winter (Cambridge, 1989), xxii.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

intercedes for all believing Muslims on the Judgment Day.[84] Further, prior to this final all-encompassing intercession, God allows the prophets, the pious, the religious elite (*'ulamā'*), and anyone else whom He chooses, to intercede on behalf of relatives, friends, and acquaintances. The prayers, alms, and other pious acts performed by these individuals on behalf of the deceased could substantially reduce both the severity and length of the dead's purgatorial punishment. These suffrages also gave hope to the living that they could intercede on behalf of their dead loved ones, and, in turn, be aided by others when their time came.[85]

Among the acts of intercession, the chanting of the Quran has long been considered most efficacious, with *sūrah*s 1, 112-114, and the beginning of chapter 2 held to be especially powerful.[86] As we have seen, these passages were a central part of the *ḥuḍūr* ritual conducted in the *khānqāh*s and other Mamluk religious establishments. Although Islam does not have an equivalent to the saying of mass by an ordained clergy, Quranic recitation and prayers chanted by the Sufis offers an intriguing parallel. In addition, the daily performance of the *ḥuḍūr*, and the naming of its beneficiaries beginning with the founding sponsor and ending with all Muslims, suggest that medieval Muslims, like medieval Christians, thought quantitatively about the spiritual power and effectiveness of these suffrages. This may also account for the large numbers of Sufis employed by the *khānqāh*s, though there may be a more sociological reason as well.

Collectively, the English chantries and the Mamluk *khānqāh*s could support several thousand persons, despite differences in the size of their respective establishments. There were at least two thousand small chantries by the sixteenth century, each with a priest or two and widely distributed throughout England and Scotland. Reflecting the family and gentry life of the nobility, the chantries frequently employed the founder's relatives or friends as priests, while building the chapel on the family estates. By contrast, the Mamluks concentrated their buildings in major urban areas such as Cairo and Damascus, and though they probably built fewer than seventy *khānqāh*s, many of them could support up to a hundred resident Sufis. These large groups of often foreign, unmarried Sufis, and their barracks-like residence halls mirrored the life of their Mamluk patrons, who had been imported

---

[84] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, 4:433-578, esp. 483-86, and Winter's translation in *Remembrance*, esp. 135-44; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Tadhkirah*, 1:173-86, 189-215, 330-43; al-Suyūṭī, *Sharḥ*, esp. 212, 245-51. Also see Eklund, *Life*, 1-53, and Smith and Haddad, *Understanding*, 33-48.

[85] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, 4:509, and 4:473-77; Winter's translation, *Remembrance*, 210, and 111-20; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Tadhkirah*, 1:118-29; and al-Suyūṭī, *Sharḥ*, 404-15. Also see Eklund, *Life*, 7; Smith and Haddad, *Understanding*, 27, 59; and Le Goff, *Purgatory*, 5, 156, 173, 227-29.

[86] Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, 4:476; Winter's translation, *Remembrance*, 117; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Tadhkirah*, 1:118-29; and al-Suyūṭī, *Sharḥ*, 416-19.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.

to Egypt as young slaves without family, to be raised and trained together as a cohort.

Further, just as aspiring Mamluk amirs recruited their personal corps of Mamluk soldiers, so too, did a sultan or powerful amir endow a *khānqāh* in his own name to be manned by a contingent of Sufis to pray on his behalf. With these prayers and other rituals, the Sufis could aid their patron while alive, and then, after his death, strive to free him and his loved ones from the agonies of the grave and hellfire. Given this important religious mission, it is not surprising to learn that a reigning sultan would suppress a rival's *khānqāh*. While sultans often appropriated endowments of existing religious establishments to finance their own projects, there may have been other, less material motives for tampering with a *khānqāh*.

When al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn returned to power as sultan in 709/1310, he not only had the usurper Baybars II strangled, but he closed the latter's *khānqāh* and gouged out his titles from the *khānqāh*'s building inscription. Fifteen years later, after completing his own massive *khānqāh* complex at Siryāqūs, al-Nāṣir allowed the *khānqāh* of Baybars II to reopen in 725/1325.[87] Nevertheless, by closing this *khānqāh* for such an extended period, the sultan had denied his foe the prayers and blessings believed to help the recently deceased, and so al-Nāṣir may have intended to torture Baybars II both in this world and the next.[88]

As this incident indicates, the *khānqāh*s were a vital concern of the Mamluk sultans, but not as outposts of some state-sponsored "orthodox Sufism." For, as we have seen, the inculcation of mystical doctrine and practice was not the major function of the *khānqāh*s; this was going on elsewhere, increasingly within the *zāwiyah*s of specific Sufi orders, likewise supported by the Mamluks. Instead, the *khānqāh*s primarily served the Mamluks as chantries, where pious Sufis could undertake the essential task of intercession. For, like Egypt's early pharaohs who raised pyramids in search of immortality, the Mamluk sultans built their *khānqāh*s to secure eternal life.

---

[87]Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:417, and noted by Fernandes, "Baybars al-Jashankir," 36-38; Williams, "Siryāqūs," 116; Berkey, *Knowledge*, 132-33; and Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:215.

[88]Similarly, when al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's viceroy Qawṣūn tried to usurp the throne after the sultan's death in 741/1341, the populace favored an heir of al-Nāṣir and pillaged Qawṣūn's *khānqāh*; Shoshan, *Popular Culture*, 54; Rizq, *Khānqāwāt*, 1:276. Also see Berkey, *Knowledge*, 133-34 and Chamberlain, *Knowledge*, 56, for other instances of sultanic desecration and/or appropriation of religious endowments for reasons of fame and fortune.

DOI: 10.6082/M1S46Q26. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1S46Q26)

DOI of Vol. III: 10.6082/M1765CFB. See https://doi.org/10.6082/ZJY1-1449 to download the full volume or individual articles.