Zacharie Mochtari de Pierrepont
Ghent University

Tales of Reverence and Powers: Ibn Ḥajar's Narratives of Religious Charismatic Authority

This article examines the ways in which Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, the well-known ninth/fifteenth-century *muḥaddith* and chief Shafiʿi qadi of Cairo, organized the writing of his main historiographical work, the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr bi-abnāʾ al-ʿumr*, an annalistic chronicle covering a period between the years 773/1372 and 850/1446. It considers the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* as a deliberately constructed set of narratives displaying various layers of meaning, going well beyond the mere description and documentation of Ibn Ḥajar's own times. I will particularly focus here on the crafting of what will be called the *religious and charismatic layer of the socio-political order* that is presented in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* anchored in the display of religious charismatic authority and leadership,[1] namely—following Katherine Jansen and Miri Rubin—a layer which demonstrates authority by "preaching, creating and demanding new obligations, while at the same time evoking and associating with the sacred symbols of the shared religious culture."[2] In that context, "miracles, signs, and proofs" are usually considered "effective testimonials of charismatic authority,"[3] a notion that often intersects with, but is not subsumed in, *taṣawwuf,* and should thus be distinguished from it. The religious charismatic narrative layer set in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* illustrates that religious charismatic authority had a role to play in the society Ibn Ḥajar was crafting, but had to be integrated in a process of social normativity in order to both give an account

---

[1]Douglas F. Barnes, "Charisma and Religious Leadership: An Historical Analysis," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17, no. 1 (1978): 1–18.

[2]Katherine L. Jansen and Miri Rubin, "Introduction," in *Charisma and Religious Authority: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Preaching 1200–1500: Europa Sacra* (Turnhout, 2010), 6–7.

[3]Ibid., 7.

---

and produce moral, social, and political order and boundaries through an ever-changing social and political environment.

This article will emphasize how, through careful, selective historiographical construction, Ibn Ḥajar displayed religious charismatic authorities as a legitimate part of a greater social and political world. In such a world, religious charisma, enclosed in a set of institutions, groups, and cultural referents, was presented as playing a discreet, limited, and yet persistent role in the shaping of society and the gradual changes affecting the dynamics of power and the representations and *mises en scène* the ruling elites presented of themselves during the course of the first half of the ninth/fifteenth century.

Ibn Ḥajar thus laid out the specific influence that particular figures held over some of the faithful, including the ruling elites.[4] He also underscored the nature of this influence through a lexicon describing a power, both social and spiritual, that was not taken lightly nor to be left unchecked, as it exercised a deep influence in the social fabric of the Cairo Sultanate. These religious charismatic authorities were part and parcel of the ever-changing dynamics of power. Despite the "routinized" nature of most—yet, not all—of these charismatic figures, they were embodying an aspect of power and social anchorage, albeit not the most obvious one, that had to be included and bounded in Ibn Ḥajar's shaping of the society he was living in and accounting for. In that regard, Ibn Ḥajar's authorial personality appears as establishing a framework of social and political order that delimited situations and cases in which various types of authority could act, compete, and legitimately participate in that order. He underlined this feature without engaging explicitly with the question of the *walāyah* of charismatic religious figures, nor in discussing their spiritual authority. Taking note of the reverence people demonstrated for these characters, their recognition, he reinserted them in the social normative order so as to assert their function, role, and deeds in the historical framework of the chronicle.

The author hence appears as a social, cultural, and political actor engaged in both questioning and reflecting on the nature of the changing society he is part of. His relational networks, his personal involvement in the judiciary and scholarly environment and affairs, as much as his towering social position in Cairo at the end of his life, served as the main ground upon which to outline a history built as his final historiographical legacy, in which the display of religious charismatic authority played its part. Thereupon, the relationship between what Ibn Ḥajar seems to be doing in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* and the social realities of his life and context allows us to speculate in more informed ways about both the ninth/

---

[4] See for examples Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr bi-abnāʾ al-ʿumr fī al-tārīkh,* ed. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (Cairo, 1968–72), 1:240, 295.

fifteenth-century context and historical reality and Ibn Ḥajar's historiographical project.

To illustrate this argument, I will draw attention to key features of religious charismatic authorities depicted in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. After briefly engaging with the notion of charisma used by Max Weber, I will sum up how religious charismatic authority was displayed in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle, making it possible to use this notion and understand it in the web of intertextuality, vocabulary, and historical context of the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* rather than conflate it with Max Weber's analysis of charisma. I will then underline such display through the example of the obituary notice *(wafāyah)* of a character in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* arguing that Ibn Ḥajar approached a set of primarily Sufis and spiritual religious characters through the prism of religious charismatic authority that was especially anchored in specific spaces in the form of *zāwiyah*s.

In that regard, it is particularly interesting that Leonor Fernandes identified two major trends regarding *zāwiyah*s in the ninth/fifteenth-century Cairo Sultanate that may be seen as part of the process of institutionalization of *zāwiyah*s and routinization of their masters' religious charisma. Fernandes identified that the rise in importance of *zāwiyah*s was accompanied by two "different directions": first, the spread of *zāwiyah*s built by a shaykh with its own money or through donation by a member of the ruling houses;[5] second, the spread of *zāwiyah*s conceived as "*zāwiya-masjid* or *zāwiya-ribāṭ*"[6] independent of the ruling houses, which "adopted a type of orthodox Sufism which transcended the pettiness of the *ṭarīqa*-centered foundations. Most of them embraced Shādhilism or one of its branches."[7] Whatever orthodox Sufism precisely meant for Fernandes,[8] she saw in the spread

---

[5]Leonor Fernandes, "Some Aspects of the zawiya in Egypt at the Eve of the Ottoman Conquest," *Annales islamologiques* 19 (1983): 11–12.

[6]Ibid., 12.

[7]Ibid.

[8]The notion of orthodoxy used by Fernandes has for some time now been a subject of discussion, due to the problematic issues it raises when used indiscriminately, failing to render the "intrinsic pluralism and complexity characteristic of the religious life of the Muslim community" and its "theological polyphony" (Alexander Knysh, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Medieval Islam," *The Muslim World* 83, no. 1 [1993]: 62, 50). In that regard one may argue with Alexander Knysh that religious normativity correlated a more contextualized and moving set of ideas in each region and for each period in the history of the Islamic world (ibid., 66). As Richard McGregor reminds us, at times some Sufis or some of their ideas could be subject to censure by other scholars, including other Sufis (Richard McGregor, "The Problem of Sufism," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 13, no. 2 [2009]: 10) This underlines the fact that ideas brought forth by Sufi doctrines were not defined to fit into a specific orthodoxy, but were also prescriptive and explorative (Ahmad Shahab, *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic* [Princeton, 2016], 282–84). Since this article does not aim to discuss or explore the notion of orthodoxy, I will heed McGregor's warning and will not use that notion in the following pages, focusing instead on the display of accepted religious practices in

of *zāwiyah*s a reflection of the dwindling of "institutionalized Sufism" in the face of the rise of "popular Sufism," an oversimplified representation about which it is necessary to be very careful. But this phenomenon—beyond the economic and social elements at stake in such a troubled period[9]—may be part of a social and political reaction to integrate, contain, and institutionalize the progressive rise of religious charismatic authorities—fitting the idea that such figures appear in times of crisis—in the normative framework considered as acceptable by scholars like Ibn Ḥajar. Namely, this rise in the number of *zāwiyah*s may also be seen as part of the process of routinization of charisma, integrating a religious charismatic leader or his successors and their followers through an institutionalization process, in which fiscal, administrative, and educational organizations played an important role.[10] As Fernandes emphasizes it, from the seventh/thirteenth century onward, *zāwiyah*s were always built for a particular shaykh.[11] With time, the progressive dissolution of the religious charismatic authority of the shaykh's followers, and the gradual integration of the *zāwiyah* in the normative framework of institutions of knowledge, played their part in creating a feeling of identification between various Sufi institutions.

The fact that many new *zāwiyah*s were linked to the Shādhilī network,[12] as observed by Fernandes, points in the same direction: despite its plural forms,[13] the *ṭarīqah* al-Shādhilīyah and its affiliates took great care to educate the faithful in a way accepted by most of the religious elites.[14] From the start, the Shādhilīyah excluded "both antinomian behaviour and excessive devotional practices."[15] It in-

---

the framing of the social order shaped in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle (Richard McGregor, "The Problem of Sufism," 15).

[9]Daisuke Igarashi, *Land Tenure, Fiscal Policy, and Imperial Power in Medieval Syro-Egypt* (Chicago, 2017), 97, 119, 124, 183, 190.

[10]Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. Talcott Parsons (New York, 1964), 21, 369.

[11]Leonor Fernandes, "The *zāwiya* in Cairo," *Annales islamologiques* 18 (1982): 118. Also quoted in Donald P. Little, "The Nature of Khānqāhs, Ribāts, and Zāwiyas under the Mamluks," *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams,* ed. Wael B. Hallaq and Donald P. Little (Leiden, 1992), 95.

[12]Following Shazhad Basir's argument on the term Sufi "orders." See Shazhad Bashir, *Sufi Bodies: Religion and Society in Medieval Islam* (New York, 2011), 11–12.

[13]Éric Geoffroy, *Le soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers mamelouks et les premiers ottomans: Orientations spirituelles et enjeux culturels* (Damascus, 1995), 226.

[14]Ibid., 30; É. Geoffroy, "Entre ésotérisme et exotérisme, les Shâdhilis, passeurs de sens (Égypte—XIIIe–XVe siècles)," in *Une voie soufie dans le monde: la Shâdhiliyya,* ed. É. Geoffroy (Paris, 2005), 121, 128.

[15]Richard J. A. McGregor, *Sanctity and Mysticism in Medieval Egypt: The Wafāʾ Sufi Order and the Legacy of Ibn ʿArabī* (New York, 2004), 31.

sisted on the importance of *waʿẓ;*[16] was more suspicious of *karāmāt* than other Sufi networks;[17] payed particular attention to the necessity of work;[18] and was a quite discreet order.[19] The masters of the Shādhilīyah were also recognized as reconciling shariʿah and *ḥaqīqah,*[20] as embodied both by the figure of Ḥasan al-Shādhilī[21] and, in the late ninth/fifteenth century, that of the great theologian, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, a member of the *ṭarīqah al-Shādhilīyah.* Thus, it is not a surprise that affiliates of the Shādhilīyah represent the largest number of Sufis mentioned in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,*[22] for the Shādhilīyah was "the most important Egyptian Sufi order"[23] of the Cairo Sultanate and quite collaborative among the religious elites and legal authorities, as it explicitly sought the instruction of its disciples in religious and legal sciences and an association "with those in power."[24]

The *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*'s concern with documenting *zāwiyah*s, as a distinct and carefully selected number of *loci* of religious charismatic authority set as narrative markers considered in the more general chronicle's intertextuality, illustrates their role as important indicators of a particular narrative pattern in the chronicle, and of the process of institutionalization of religious charismatic authority, grounded in specific characters and institutions. This role and the limits and boundaries assigned to these characters and institutions allow us to better consider the links made by Ibn Ḥajar between two dimensions of his narrative. On the one side, a historiographical production of a political and social order was

---

[16] Geoffroy, *Le soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers mamelouks et les premiers ottomans,* 30, 129.

[17] Ibid., 30.

[18] Ibid., 99.

[19] Ibid., 172.

[20] Ibid., 403.

[21] Giuseppe Cecere, "Le charme discret de la Shādhiliya: Ou l'insertion sociale d'Ibn Ata Allah al-Iskandari," in *Les mystiques juives, chrétiennes et musulmanes dans l'Egypte médiévale (VII–XVI s.): Intertextualités et contextes historiques* (Cairo, 2013), 73–74.

[22] Zacharie Mochtari de Pierrepont, "Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's Texts and Contexts: Producing a Sufi Environment in the Cairo Sultanate," in *New Readings in Arabic Historiography from Late Medieval Egypt and Syria,* ed. M. Termonia and J. Van Steenbergen, Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts (Brill, 2021, forthcoming), 5–6.

[23] Richard McGregor, "Is this the end of Medieval Sufism? Strategies of Transversal Affiliation in Ottoman Egypt," in *Sufism in the Ottoman Era* (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle), ed. Rachida Chih and Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen (Cairo, 2010), 85.

[24] McGregor, *Sanctity and Mysticism in Medieval Egypt,* 32; Jean-Claude Garcin, "Histoire et hagiographie de l'Egypte Musulmane à la fin de l'époque Mamelouke et au début de l'époque Ottomane," in idem, *Espaces, pouvoirs et idéologie de l'Egypte médiévale* (London, 1987), 304–11.

progressively[25] laid out in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.* Namely, the author brought to the narrative forefront a contextualized plurality of events, behaviors, crises, legal and moral attitudes, and decisions, presented at the core of the Cairo Sultanate's history. Religious charismatic authority was fully integrated in this display as part of the broader narrative. On the other side, the text itself can be seen as organized to address various institutions and characters. Each of these dimensions thus shaped a specific historiographical space, with dedicated narratives, as was the case with religious charismatic authority. It is in that relationship between this historiographical production and the historiographical space related to the narrative layer of religious charismatic authority that the social, cultural, and political role of charismatic authority may be analyzed as part and parcel of the social order Ibn Ḥajar aimed to shape.

Abū Bakr al-Mallawī: Displaying Charisma and Setting Boundaries

> [In the year 841/1438 died] Abū Bakr ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ayyūb ibn Aḥmad al-Mallawī al-Miṣrī al-Shādhilī, the shaykh Zayn al-Dīn. His grandfather Ayyūb had a *zāwiyah* in al-Mallawī, and he was revered *(muʿtaqad).* As for [Abū Bakr], he was born in 762 [1360–61], and became a companion of the *fuqarāʾ* and the pupil *(tulmidha)* of the shaykh Ḥusayn al-Ḥabbār,[26] and he remained [after his death] with the companion [of Ḥusayn al-Ḥabbār], Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Kalāʾī.[27] He talked in front of the people in the *zāwiyah* of al-Ḥabbār in Qanṭarat al-Mawsakī [in Cairo] and he explained the Quran, using his own opinion *(raʾy)* and following his master's rules *(qāʾidah).* [The people] pointed out some of his mistakes, which they brought *(rufiʿa)* to the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn [al-Bulqīnī].[28] And he forbade him

---

[25]The writing of the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* seems to have lasted for fourteen years, and it is likely that Ibn Ḥajar adapted his narrative to new contexts. See Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn ʿIzz al-Dīn, *Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī muʾarrikhan* (Beirut, 1987), 115.

[26]Misspelled in the edition of Ḥasan Ḥabashī (Ḥasan al-Hayyār). Al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥabbār (d. 791/1389) was a Sufi master of some renown, buried in al-Qarāfah (Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:385; al-Sakhāwī, *Al-Ḍawʾ al-lāmiʿ li-ahl al-qarn al-tāsiʿ* [Beirut, 1992], 7:67).

[27]Misspelled in the edition of Ḥasan Ḥabashī (al-ʿAlāʾī). Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl al-Kalāʾī (d. 801/1399), member of the Shādhilīyah *ṭarīqah* and follower of Ḥasan al-Ḥabbār. He became quite famous as a preacher *(wāʿiẓ).* He succeeded his master as head of his *zāwiyah.* See Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 87; idem, *Dhayl al-durar al-kāminah,* ed. ʿAdnān Darwīsh (Cairo, 1992), 39.

[28]Likely Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī (d. 824/1421). Ibn Ḥajar, *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr* (Cairo, 1998), 226–29; idem, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:259–60.

such speeches, unless [Abū Bakr] read from al-Baghawī's *tafsīr*[29] and that he aligned [with him].

And [Abū Bakr] met me on this matter. I found that he had a beautiful perception [of the Quranic text], but that he was bare of [religious] knowledge. Among what he told of what he saw in the word of the Almighty [in the Surah Hūd, was the following]:[30]

"[It is said in Surah Hūd] 'The people of Hūd rejected the Messengers [of God],'[31] and 'their brother Hūd told them.'[32] [But] what is meant in His words 'his brothers the Messengers'?"[33]

And I replied: "The ʿĀd."[34]

He said: "No, for it is not suitable for a Messenger [of God] to be described *(an yūṣafa)* as the brother of miscreants."[35]

Then I cited another verse: "And mention the brother of ʿĀd."[36]

And he went silent.[37] And he had [other] interpretations like that, but he performed a lot of *dhikr* and worship. He earned his living in the commerce of weaving *(al-ghazal)* and some people revered him strongly. He died in the night of Jumʿah the fifth of the month of Dhū al-Ḥijjah [30 May 1438]. A large number of people came to his funeral procession. He was the brother of Shams al-Dīn, head of the *muʾazzīn* in the *jāmiʿ* of Ibn Ṭūlūn, who has been called al-Musajjal.[38]

The above is but one example of how Ibn Ḥajar presents the many characters attached to what appears as religious charismatic authority in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. Although specific differences are attached to this figure, he is quite representa-

---

[29]Al-Ḥusayn ibn Masʿūd al-Bajhawī (d. 516/1122), a *muḥaddith* following the Shafiʿi *madhhab*, author of a very famous work of *tafsīr,* especially after it was popularized by Walī al-Dīn (d. 743/1442). See John Robson, "al-Baghawī," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 2nd ed., 1:893.

[30]Quran 11.

[31]Quran 11:53, 59.

[32]Quran 11:50. Namely, the ʿĀd, referred to indeed as "the people of Hūd" and his brothers.

[33]Abū Bakr pointing out that the term "their brother" could not refer to the ʿĀd, in relation to Hūd, a prophet of God.

[34]And not the messengers; Ibn Ḥajar correcting Abū Bakr's mistake concerning the Surah Hūd.

[35]Namely the ʿĀd.

[36]Quran 46:21, illustrating through another verse the effective qualification of a Messenger of God as a "brother" of the ʿĀd. Ibn Ḥajar again points out the error of Abū Bakr.

[37]Ibn Ḥajar thus illustrates the lack of knowledge of Abū Bakr, unable to answer, either because of his ignorance of the full Quranic text or maybe his inability to provide a coherent answer, implying in both cases his lack of religious knowledge.

[38]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 4:81.

tive of the biographical notices of characters endowed with religious charisma. The individual depicted, Abū Bakr al-Mallawī (d. 841/1438), was a native of Cairo and a prominent Shādhilī. He appears as a pious and religious man. His poor and peculiar understanding of the Quran, in Ibn Ḥajar's view, allows the author not to point out "an unorthodox practice" but a misunderstanding and a lack of knowledge, reaffirming an "authoritatively prescriptive norm"[39] of understanding, which in this case could be asserted through legal sanction.

The narrative structure of this notice presents several common features of the chronicle's obituaries: an introduction with the character's *ism, naṣab, nisbah,* title (shaykh), and *laqab.* It then comes back to the origins and main features of Abū Bakr's personal background. A short exposition presenting his development and his main master and companions is followed by an account of his famous deeds. Next is a *peripeteia,* reporting an incident in which the reader would see an anecdotic story going far beyond the character's *persona* and context. The conflict, and its resolution, were illustrated as a case of normative theological, social, and political behaviors and moral exempla, constructed through the triple perspective of the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn, Abū Bakr, and Ibn Ḥajar himself. Abū Bakr's inclusion in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* also gives Ibn Ḥajar an opportunity to engage in self-promotion and present his opinion on a religious matter, while also adding a more authentic touch to the story. The end of the notice characterizes the main features of the character, namely what he may and should be remembered for, why he is included in the chronicle's metatextual narrative, and how he fits the stated purpose of Ibn Ḥajar's work of documenting the main events and characters of his times.

As a character in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*'s narrative, Abū Bakr al-Mallawī was particularly *mis en scène* to emphasize the specific question of the role of the trained ulama to frame and guide Islamic society: his only other mention in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* finds him directly associated with questions of religious authority and knowledge, and his obituary echoes a previous story in the work, concerning another of al-Mallawī's "reprehensible" stances:[40]

> A person called Abū Bakr al-ʿAzūlī,[41] who put himself forward as a shaykh and preached to the people, was brought to the Shafiʿi qadi. And they noticed among [his words]: "The Prophets are devoid of science *(ʿarāyā ʿan al-ʿilm),* according to the word of God: 'Exalted are You, we have no knowledge except what You have taught us.'"[42]

---

[39] Ahmad Shahab, *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic* (Princeton, 2016), 285, n. 85.

[40] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:226.

[41] A reference to al-ʿAzūlī's brother, "Shams al-Dīn, head of the *muʾazzin* in the *jāmiʿ* of Ibn Ṭūlūn," allows us to identify him as Abū Bakr al-Mallawī. Ibid., 226.

[42] Quran 2:32.

Although there is much to say about the theological aspects of the quoted examples, these are beyond the concern of the current article. Suffice it to say that if the rather balanced perspective in which Abū Bakr was described by Ibn Ḥajar in his obituary—that he was a good man despite his weaknesses in religious knowledge—was also put forward to underline Ibn Ḥajar's personal skills, it underlines more generally the role of religious knowledge and the mastery of religious sciences deemed necessary in the legitimation of religious authority, limiting the likelihood of beliefs assessed as blameworthy by prominent scholars like Ibn Ḥajar, who saw their role as paramount to establish, maintain, and supervise the norms of social and religious production and practice. The fact that Abū Bakr's words were brought to the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn, and that he came to Ibn Ḥajar to discuss this with him,[43] stresses some sort of pressure and power of coercion linked to the formulation of Abū Bakr's discursive stance, despite his apparent willingness and efforts toward truth. Thus, having reasserted the appropriation of the religious and social normative discourse, carrying its knowledge and powers, Ibn Ḥajar could conclude with a more gentle touch, recalling the piety and firm worshipping practices of Abū Bakr, a man whose *vox populi* had given him influence and prominence. It is this prominence that leads the reader to question the reputation and aura of such a character, which hints at the religious charismatic authority Abū Bakr was recognized for.

In fact, it seems the obituary itself was also shaped to remind the audience of this singular feature of Abū Bakr. After introducing Abū Bakr, the character's background is sketched: his grandfather had a *zāwiyah* and was revered *(fīhi iʿtiqād kabīr)* in the Upper Egyptian city of al-Mallawī, some 90 kilometers north of Asyūt. Here, Ibn Ḥajar was not only providing historical information about Abū Bakr, he was also presenting the religious, social, political, and historiographical categories and contexts in which Abū Bakr was to be understood, apprehended, and referred to.

According to Ibn Ḥajar's presentation strategy, Abū Bakr was to be remembered as a religious man with some knowledge in religious sciences. Abū Bakr's genealogical background also hinted at the honored status of his family, in the eyes of both God and men. This is why the "reverence" attributed to his grandfather immediately follows the main characterization of Abū Bakr as a member of the Shādhilī Sufi order, trained (badly, according to the author) in *tafsīr*, his commentaries being the subject of polemical disputes. The final portion of the notice, however, portrays Abū Bakr in a positive light, restoring him to the bosom of righteousness and finally stressing the main feature of his character: that he was

---

[43] It also allows Ibn Ḥajar to put himself forward through a parallel with the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn, a rival scholar of Ibn Ḥajar: if the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn had to take a decision concerning Abū Bakr al-Mallawī, the latter took steps to discuss it with Ibn Ḥajar.

a great worshipper of God. Abū Bakr also was a man working in the weaving trade—thus trying to live combining the *ʿilm* and the *ʿamal*[44]—connected to some established Cairene scholars and mystics, as illustrated by his proximity to the Sufi shaykh al-Ḥabbār and his disciple and successor Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad—two prominent members of the Sufi environment of Cairo and recognized ulama. Thus, Abū Bakr's narrative space goes beyond the polemical dispute that claims the bulk of his *wafāyah* (obituary and biographical notice) in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.*

Abū Bakr's life must also be put in perspective with the little information given about his grandfather, Ayyūb. Like him, he trained in a *zāwiyah.* Like him, he was revered by some people *(wa-li-jamāʿat min al-nāsi fīhi iʿtiqād kabīr),* a point reinforced by the important public gathering during his funeral procession. Abū Bakr al-Mallawī's influence and reputation were not specifically grounded in his knowledge of religious sciences but originated from his own personal ability to create a feeling of reverence in the personal opinions of others, reinforced by his genealogical background and his position as a preacher in the famous *zāwiyah* of al-Ḥabbār.

Abū Bakr thus did not only belong to a narrative pattern and social status documenting religious elites. His authority and qualities streamed from something more that made people believe in him *(aʿtaqada).* Such wording and features echo, within all due limits, the concept of charisma developed by Max Weber. Thus, Abū Bakr al-Mallawī was apparently someone whose narrative description fit the main features of a religious charismatic character, and whose figure was shaped precisely by Ibn Ḥajar so that Abū Bakr appeared as a very likely charismatic religious *persona.*

Charisma and Religious Charismatic Authority

Much has been written about charisma and its uses, gradually changing the way charisma is conceived of as a conceptual tool for social sciences. To better grasp the notion of religious charismatic authority that was widely displayed by Ibn Ḥajar in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* with an apparent normative purpose and narrative pattern, a brief explanation of this Weberian notion will prove useful.

Charisma, religious charismatic authority, and the notion of the charismatic leader were addressed in the writings of Max Weber.[45] Together, they became important features of Weber's contribution to social sciences, especially in regard to processes of institution building, religious studies, psychology, sociology of re-

---

[44]Kenneth Garden, *The First Islamic Reviver: Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī and His Revival of the Religious Sciences* (Oxford, 2014), 40–55.

[45]For a summary of Weber's concept building, see John S. Potts, *A History of Charisma* (Basingstoke, 2009), 116–26.

ligion, and political sciences.[46] Max Weber defined charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities"[47] and as a "quality beyond daily life." Charismatic authority thus signifies: "domination (be it external or internal) wielded upon men, and to which those who are dominated submit themselves, in accordance with belief in this quality, attached to this person in particular."[48] As Gary Dickson sums it up, "Weber's charisma is a particular gift, reserved for a special type of leader."[49]

Some major characteristics that mainly defined charisma and charismatic authority for Weber[50] may be summarized in a few propositions.[51] Charismatic authority was considered by Weber as a freely given recognition on the part of those subject to authority, consisting in devotion or trust for the charismatic *persona,* guaranteed by "what is held as a 'sign' or 'proof'";[52] the charismatic character would be seen as possessing exceptional or specific qualification for his followers, resulting in a capacity of influence or leadership for such a persona. The disappearance of such a sign or qualification would mean the end of his charismatic quality: thus, charismatic leaders only prosper if they can guarantee the permanence of such capacities. As Weber put it, "by its very nature, the existence of charismatic authority is specifically unstable."[53] Since the charismatic character is seen as legitimate because of his personal abilities, such abilities must be "constantly being proved"[54] and displayed. A charismatic holder may be abandoned by his following at some point because pure charisma[55] does not know any "legitimacy" other than the charismatic holder's personal ability, one which must constantly be proved.[56] The "distinction between charisma and charismatic lead-

---

[46] Ibid., 132–33.

[47] Max Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* ed. S. N. Eisenstat (Chicago, 1968), 48.

[48] Max Weber, *Sociologie des religions,* Textes réunis, traduits et présentés par Jean-Pierre Grossein, 2nd ed. (Paris, 2006), 370.

[49] Gary Dickson, "Charisma, Medieval and Modern," *Religions* 3 (2012): 765.

[50] Scott Appelrouth and Laura Desfor Edles, *Classical and Contemporary Sociological Theory: Text and Readings* (Los Angeles, 2008), 182.

[51] See Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* ed. Talcott Parsons (New York, 1964), 358–63.

[52] Ibid., 359.

[53] Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York, 1946), 248.

[54] Max Weber, *The Sociology of Charismatic Authority,* reprinted in idem, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* 22.

[55] Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* 46–47.

[56] Ibid., 22.

ership" matters,[57] for charisma is always limited to a particular relationship between the leaders and their followers,[58] whence stems the authority of the leaders and the behaviors of their followers, linked together through "an emotional form of communal relationship." Pure charisma was also specifically seen by Weber as foreign to economic considerations.[59]

Because of the nature of charismatic authority in the making,[60] and the challenges it may set for society, concerns usually arise among already established authorities that charismatic leaders are threats, being seen as "foreign to everyday routine structures."[61] Such a danger, or its perception, is grounded in the competition for religious legitimacy and is quite real, for what is at stake is "the monopoly of the legitimate exercise of the power to modify, in a deep and lasting fashion, the practice and world-view of lay people."[62] Coupled with the instability linked to charismatic authority, the rise of a charismatic leader would eventually lead, in Weber's theory, to what he called "the routinization of charisma,"[63] namely the "transformation of a great charismatic upsurge and vision into some more continuous social organization and institutional framework"[64] as the first step in the routinization of charisma, qualifying this ongoing process of change and stabilization in the everyday routines of society. In that way, the process of routinization of charisma, beyond the varied display of charismatic authority, has its own "principal motives," explaining why and how it usually takes place.[65]

This initial model was the subject of valid criticism pointing to a number of issues—especially by E. Schills—well analyzed in the context of early Islamic law by Jonathan E. Brockopp, who proposed an interesting and more dynamic framework to use the notion of charisma.[66] Particularly problematic were the strict di-

---

[57]Douglas F. Barnes, "Charisma and Religious leadership," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17, no. 1 (1978): 2.

[58]Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* 361.

[59]Pure charismatic authority is an authority based entirely on charismatic grounds, and according to Weber, one of the three "pure types of legitimate authority," the two others being authority based on rational grounds and traditional grounds. Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* 46.

[60]For, as Weber put it, "in its pure form charismatic authority may be said to exist only in the process of originating." Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* 54.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Pierre Bourdieu, "Legitimation and Structured Interest in Weber's Sociology of Religion," in Sam Whimster and Scott Lash, *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity* (London, 1987), 126.

[63]Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* 363–73.

[64]Weber, *On Charisma and Institution Building,* XXI.

[65]Ibid., 54–55.

[66]Jonathan E. Brockopp, "Theorizing Charismatic Authority in Early Islamic Law," *Comparative Islamic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2005): 129–58.

chotomy laid out by Weber between "pure charisma" and "routinized charisma," and the rigid "binary opposition between tradition, law and routine on the one side, and charisma on the other," an element that could not be operative, especially in the late medieval Muslim world, when important religious charismatic figures often had a deep background both in hadith studies and *fiqh:*[67] as such, charisma could not in this context be opposed to rationality, contrary to Weber's thinking.[68] Taking note of these distinctions and of the necessity to identify the notion of charisma in a particular historical framework, its usefulness as an analytical category could not be understated, as illustrated by its common use in medieval studies, adapting the Weberian conception to a more contextualized and dynamic use.[69] In that regard, the terms "charisma" or "charismatic religious authority" can be deemed practical analytical and conceptual tools, evoked and understood here in a specific discursive and historical context: the ninth/fifteenth-century Cairo Sultanate in Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*.

The *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* and the Narrative Representation of Charismatic Authority

Although it is difficult to categorize the "unique personalities requisite for charisma,"[70] narrative representation of religious charismatic authority in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* can be defined as a set of terms constituting specific kinds of behaviors, respect, and influence, underlying the main features of religious charismatic authority. In the order of discourse, it underlines features close to the main characteristics proposed by Weber regarding charismatic authority, albeit important differences in terms of economic considerations or forms of organizations, contextual situations, and relations to the law and tradition should be considered to understand the status of religious charismatic authority in a chronicle like the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. However, a specific lexicon seems indeed to have distinguished characters upon whom were bestowed religious charismatic authority.

---

[67] Ibid., 130 and 133.

[68] Ibid., 133.

[69] McGregor, *Sanctity and Mysticism in Medieval Egypt;* Maria Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition: Turko-Persian Politics and Acculturation in Medieval Iran* (Leiden, 2007); Jansen and Rubin, *Charisma and Religious Authority;* Denise Aigle, ed., *Les autorités religieuses entre charismes et hiérarchies: Approches comparatives* (Turnhout, 2011); Peter Iver Kaufman and Gary Dickson, "Charisma, Medieval and Modern," *Religions* 3 (2012), reprinted in Peter Iver Kaufman and Gary Dickson, eds., *Charisma, Medieval and Modern* (Edinburgh, 2014); Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak and Martha Dana Rust, *Faces of Charisma: Image, Text, Object in Byzantium and the Medieval West* (Leiden, 2018).

[70] Barnes, "Charisma and Religious Leadership," 2.

As far as Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle is concerned, "routinized charisma," namely the acceptance and integration of some charismatic religious authorities in a society, seems to represent the bulk and vast majority of all forms of religious charismatic authority and the normative expression of charisma, bearing in mind that, in Islam, religious charismatic authority is always recognized by the *vox populi.*[71]

Ibn Ḥajar did not employ the term *"qadara"* (derived from the root *q-d-r,* referring to power, ability, and capacity) that may be used today to define a specific capacity or ability of a person, but he did use various terms that may be referring in one way or another to the notion of religious charisma. *Haybah,* a word often translated today as "charisma," is employed by Ibn Ḥajar, though sparsely. Related to some form of respect or veneration, with a degree of fear or apprehension *(al-ijlālu wa-al-makhāfah), haybah* could also be linked to piety.[72] Majd al-Dīn al-Fīrūzābādī (d. 817/1415), with whom Ibn Ḥajar studied the Arabic language,[73] defined *haybah* as fear, piety, and dignity *(al-mahābah).*[74] As far as the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* is concerned, *muhayb* and *haybah* are mentioned nineteen times. Yet, their use does not distinguish people of religious background, as illustrated in many examples given by Ibn Ḥajar.

Thus, Muḥammad ibn Lājīn obtained an office as *wazīr* thanks to his firmness *(ṣawlah),* his vigilance *(yaqaẓah),* and his charisma *(haybah).*[75] In fact, it seems that many people serving in the administrative offices of the sultanic or ruling houses are designated as *"muhayb,"* in possession of *haybah:* the amir Īnāl al-Yūsufī (d. 794/1392), Muḥammad al-Farghanī (d. 796/1394), head of the chancery *(kātib al-sirr),*[76] and many others, with a connotation of prestige.[77] *Haybah* does not specifically imply religious charismatic authority in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* even if it does involve some form of personal charisma and influence, spreading both fear and respect, due to an individual's personal abilities and behaviors. Although it never implied, by itself, any sort of charismatic religious authority, it makes sense that *haybah* was also used for people more closely associated with a religious background or position linked to religious knowledge, as in the case of the qadi Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ṭrāblusī (d. 799/1397).[78] But if *haybah* was indeed

---

[71]Denise Aigle, "Introduction," in idem, ed. *Les autorités religieuses entre charismes et hiérarchies: Approches comparatives* (Turnhout, 2011), 12.

[72]Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* (Beirut, 1955), 1:789.

[73]Ibn Ḥajar, *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr,* 63. On al-Fīrūzābādī, see Vivian Strotmann, *Majd al-Dīn al-Fīrūzābādī (1329–1415): A Polymath on the Eve of the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2016).

[74]Al-Fīrūzābādī, *Al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ,* ed. Nuʿaym Muḥammad al-ʿArqsūsī (Beirut, 2005), 145.

[75]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:448.

[76]Ibid., 1:482

[77]Ibid., 1:385, 2:119, 3:81103 ,, etc.

[78]Ibid., 1:239.

meant to refer to some sort of charisma in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* it was never used to qualify a religious charismatic form of authority *per se.*

A more common term related to such influence comes from the root *j-dh-b,* characterizing the attraction toward something, and from which originates the word commonly used to define social charisma today, *jādhibīyah.*[79] The term *jādhibīyah* was also used in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* appearing twenty-one times. This word is used in the chronicle in reference to religious people and women. It seems to have been employed by Ibn Ḥajar either to describe the attractiveness of a person to other people,[80] as in the case of Masʿūd al-Muraysī (d. 777/1375–76), or someone's attraction toward the divine (how strongly they are pulled to it), mainly referring to *majdhūbīn* characters scattered in the chronicle.[81]

As for *karāmāt,* the "visible trace of sainthood,"[82] it may also be considered in the narrative of the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* to be a sign of religious charismatic authority. *Karāmāt* has been a clear ground upon which the notion of religious charismatic authority was based in the medieval Islamic world, as illustrated by the bibliography dedicated to this concept.[83] Indeed, in Islamic medieval historiographical sources, *karāmāt* featured highly in the display of religious charismatic authority, since the accomplishment of outstanding deeds or premonitions thanks to the help of God could play a strong role in establishing one's charismatic authority, while attribution of such powers was a clear testimony of God's favor toward a character. It therefore functioned to bring influence over people who recognized the possessor of *karāmāt* as a religious charismatic authority, whatever his scholarly background. Attributions of the performance of *karāmāt* brought charisma and could help shape a person's religious charismatic influence. By itself, however, *karāmāt* was not enough to establish religious charismatic authority, and many blessed men performing *karāmāt* cannot be considered charismatic leaders, since they did not engage in activities that displayed any charismatic authority and had no dedicated groups of followers.

---

[79] Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab,* 1:257.

[80] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:50.

[81] Ibid., 1:125, 426, 442, 2:120, 250, 3:261, 4:28, etc.

[82] D. Gril, *La Risāla de Safî al-Dîn Ibn Abî l-Mansûr: Biographies des maîtres spirituels connus par un cheikh égyptien du VIIe/XIIIe siècle* (Cairo, 1986), 56.

[83] Al-Nabhānī, *Jāmiʿ karāmāt al-awliyāʾ* (Porbandar, 2001); Denise Aigle, "Sainteté et Miracles en Islam médiéval: l'exemple de deux saints fondateurs iraniens," *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public* 25 (1994): 47–73; idem, ed., *Saints orientaux: Hagiographies médiévales comparées 1* (Paris, 1995); idem, *Miracles et karâma* (Turnhout, 2000); Christopher S. Taylor, *In the Vicinity of the Righteous: Ziyāra and the Veneration of Muslim Saints in Late Medieval Egypt* (Leiden, 1999); Daniella Talmon-Heller, *Islamic Piety in Medieval Syria: Mosques, Cemeteries and Sermons under the Zangids and Ayyūbids (1146–1260)* (Leiden, 2007).

The chronicle's mentions of *karāmāt* are rather sparse. Although it may have borrowed some tropes of hagiographic literature, it was not Ibn Ḥajar's intent to document the many wonders claimed to have happened in the midst of religious charismatic characters' deeds. Thus, there are only a few explicit mentions of people having *karāmāt* in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* which engaged twenty-eight times with this concept. Ibn Hajar used quite careful wording toward statements of *karāmāt,* and he only rarely implicitly associates himself with such claims with a direct affirmative and authoritative sentence, such as "he possessed *karāmāt*"[84] *(la-hu karāmāt),* either when reformulating a broad, well-known consensus, or talking about individuals unknown to his likely audience in the Cairo Sultanate (such as the Yemeni *faqīh* Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī [d. 800/1398])[85] since there was little risk of being contradicted in such cases and his audience could marvel at the stories.

More than *karāmāt,* the notion of *barakah,* namely divine impulse or blessing—also conveyed by the *karāmāt* themselves—appears paramount in the acknowledgement of religious charismatic authority. *Barakah* designates the divine or "spiritual flow,"[86] granted by God. The question of *barakah* has been abundantly studied[87] due to its importance in the cult of saints, a fundamental marker of holiness and a deep presence in the social imagination of medieval Islamic societies. The term *mubārak* entails the idea of dissemination and movement, and underlines the spiritual, exceptional, and properly blessed character of people or places.

By itself, acknowledgement of a person's *barakah* does not lead to the rise of charismatic authority, nor can it be a proof of such: a blessed man living as an ascetic far from anyone, not engaging in preaching and having no disciples, would not appear as a charismatic religious leader, despite being *mubārak.* Nevertheless, it does emphasize religious charismatic authority if and when a blessed character would make others benefit from his blessings. One may say that people coming to a pious man in search of his *barakah,* and the commitment of the blessed man in engaging with these blessings, does necessarily imply religious charismatic authority, as it would entail a trust for the blessed *persona,* displaying a "sign" of his singular quality to his followers. Thus, it is the notion of *tabarruk*—the move

---

[84] For example, Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:184, 346.

[85] Ibid., 2:23

[86] Michel Chodkiewicz, *An Ocean without Shore: Ibn ʿArabî, the Book, and the Law* (New York, 1993), 15. Josef W. Meri, "Aspects of Baraka (Blessings) and Ritual Devotion Among Medieval Muslims and Jews," *Medieval Encounters* 5, no. 1 (1999): 46; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (Berkeley, 2007), 130.

[87] See for example Joseph Chelhod, "La Baraka chez les arabes ou l'influence bienfaisante du sacré," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 148, no. 1 (1955): 68–88; Josef W. Meri, *The Cult of Saints among Muslims and Jews in Medieval Syria* (Oxford, 2002), 101–8; idem, "Aspects of Baraka," 46–69.

to ask for another's blessings—only concerning individuals with religious backgrounds, that conveys best to the giver of *barakah* a characteristic of religious charismatic authority. Such a term is only explicitly mentioned three times in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,*[88] which underlines, again, Ibn Ḥajar's very discreet attitude concerning such pretention, as well as the strength—its rarity making it all the more meaningful—attributed to that kind of ability.

In the end, whatever the terms and abilities used at some point to describe different religious charismatic persons holding sway over the lives of some believers, religious charismatic authority always meant popular recognition and some kind of fame, even at a local level. It follows that the only true measure of an established religious charismatic authority is that it is derived from the people, be it the elites of the ruling houses, established scholars, or common folks. Therefore, the most important among the terms emphasizing religious charismatic authority in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* are those derived from the root *ʿa-q-d,* through *iʿtaqada* and *yaʿtaqidu,* referring to the fact of strong belief. The persons subject to *iʿtiqād* were both those who believed strongly in God *(muʿtaqid),* and those in whom people strongly believed, the *muʿtaqad*s (revered persons)—with the implicit meaning of being favored in the eyes of God.[89] This specific feature should be distinguished from mentions concerning the affirmation of strong beliefs associated with some scholars, as a positive statement, or with specific doctrinal positions dealing with *ʿaqīdah* and *ʿaqāʾid.* It is thus not surprising that Nelly Amri, discussing the notion of *iʿtiqād,* recognized it as the primary notion used by sources to designate the saints in the late medieval Maghreb.[90] Such characters were taken in a triple movement of beliefs: they were recognized as being favored by God, and such belief was a testimony of their personal belief in God, producing an acknowledgment of their charisma, namely, that one could recognize them as favored by God and believe in their blessings, participating in producing defining characteristics of religious charismatic authority.[91]

The *muʿtaqad*s, as a regular element of narratives in chronicles like the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* have been greatly overlooked. Carl F. Petry, in his study of the civilian elite of Cairo, devoted a few pages to them.[92] It is, to my knowledge, the only academic work addressing the *muʿtaqad*s as a distinct category of people or a social class, not just as a feature of various characters, even if Berkey did note the attraction

---

[88]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:199, 2:311, 3:459.

[89]Jonathan Berkey also translates the term as "confidence." Jonathan Berkey, *Popular Preaching and Religious Authority in the Medieval Islamic Near East* (Seattle, 2001), 26.

[90]Nelly Amri, *Croire au Maghreb Médiéval: La sainteté en question, XIVe–XVe siècle* (Paris, 2020), 43–46.

[91]Weber, *Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* 358–59.

[92]Carl F. Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1981), 267–69.

of *iʿtiqād* for biographers.[93] Petry distinguished the *muʿtaqad*s as a sub-category among the "religious functionaries." He also separated them from "Sufi Mystics." Such an understanding, although problematic, grasps an essential feature of the *muʿtaqad*s as having attained their status by applying themselves to worshipping, preaching, and study on religious matters.[94] The presentation of a clear categorization between groups of pious men with knowledge of religious sciences also raises problems of its own and might be revised: in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle, it seems there is no clear causal link between *taṣawwuf* and the *muʿtaqad*s, the latter not always being Sufis or at least not necessarily being mentioned as such.[95] This fact was also noted by Petry himself. Petry described the *muʿtaqad*s with three distinct qualities: their rejection of a high standard of living for themselves; their peculiarity in the eyes of other people; their experiences of "extreme emotional crisis."[96] He stated that few could "claim identification with a family of the ʿulamāʾ" nor were they "related" to the civilian elites.[97] The data in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* seems to convey the same impression, though one may temper the statement concerning the ulama, since many of the characters linked to the notion of *iʿtiqād,* the *muʿtaqad*s themselves, were ulama trained in legal and religious sciences. It seems in fact that the *muʿtaqad*s fit physical and intellectual standards of the time but rarely engaged with judiciary or administrative activities, nor were they very connected to scholars employed in activities linked to administrative offices.[98] The fact that only a few people designated as *muʿtaqad*s engaged in these activities or were close to scholars on this career path tends only to show that "it is impossible to describe them as having a common profession,"[99] as Petry himself emphasized. So, the main distinct qualities the *muʿtaqad*s all seem to share, in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* are that they engaged in religious-linked activities and that they

---

[93]Berkey, *Popular Preaching and Religious Authority,* 26.

[94]"Functionaries" is indeed a very vague category. It is not a social but a very large functional category. It includes "officials" working in an administration or performing an "official duty." In that regard, *muʿtaqad*s cannot be considered "religious functionaries," since being "revered" by some people does not entail any official duty and does not connect them to any state-linked administration, even if some of them could indeed be working in an official capacity for the state or a religious institution. The same could be said for Sufi mystics, who came from all fields and backgrounds and did not have to be related to any kind of official duty anywhere, even if they could be.

[95]As is the case for many of the *muʿtaqad*s, like Mūsá ibn ʿAlī al-Munāwī (Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:152), Abū Bakr al-Ṭuraynī (ibid., 3:332), Khalīfah al-Maghribī (ibid., 3:377).

[96]Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo,* 267.

[97]Ibid., 267.

[98]Yet some were, as in Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 4:82.

[99]Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo,* 267.

were specifically mentioned as *muʿtaqad*s, this term carrying by itself a strong statement on a person.

Thus, introducing the *muʿtaqad*s as a specific category of people, as Petry did, makes sense, and this is also true in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. The *muʿtaqad*s are indeed referred to as a distinct group in the chronicle's narratives, albeit not a social or functional one, and statements like "he was among [those] revered" *(kāna mimman yuʿtaqadu)*[100] or "one of those revered in Egypt" *(aḥadu al-muʿtaqadīn bi-Miṣr)* set the *muʿtaqad*s apart from other members of the religious environment of the Cairo Sultanate. In the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*—but one may certainly find many examples in other ninth/fifteenth-century historiographical works—they seem then to have been considered a specific group of discursive representation, and the most obvious candidates for identification as charismatic religious authorities.

References to such characters are numerous in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle, with at least 121 *muʿtaqad*s explicitly mentioned.[101] This is a rather considerable portion of the nearly twelve hundred biographical notices included in the text. These references are, it seems, the most direct allusions in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* to clear forms of religious charismatic authority. They can be, and often are, coupled with other features implying charisma. Clear demonstrations of charismatic religious influence were, for example, emphasized through prostration[102] *(al-sujūd)*, the reverence attributed to a *muʿtaqad* could be one of great faith or "excess" *(fīhi iʿtiqād zāʾid)*,[103] or a *muʿtaqad* could also be a *majdhūb*, said to "possess" *jadhbah*[104] or *karāmāt*.[105] These features underline, among the *muʿtaqad*s, a difference of degree, nature, and moral assertion by the author, in what appears as a narrative archetype in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*, used to establish the acceptability of religious practices, knowledge, preaching, and sociability. Some characters explicitly designated as Sufis are also mentioned as charismatic figures, but it is worth pointing out that most of the characters associated with religious charismatic authority were not related, in the *Inbāʾ*, to *taṣawwuf* or explicitly referred to as Sufis. Thus, even if it is quite possible that many of these characters did engage with Sufism in various ways, following the chronicle's narrative framework, religious charisma cannot be related to Sufism *per se* and Sufism does not appear as a corollary of religious charisma.

---

[100] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 2:410.

[101] This number comes from the listing of all the scholars mentioned explicitly associated with the notion of *iʿtiqād* based on the frequency list of the root *ʿaqd* in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* and a close reading of each of these references.

[102] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 2:308.

[103] Ibid., 2:495, 498.

[104] Ibid., 1:125, 442.

[105] Ibid., 1:203.

Ibn Ḥajar, certainly well aware of criticism concerning the behaviors of some of the *muʿtaqad*s' followers,[106] was quite cautious concerning these charismatic figures, referring to generic formulas *("kāna yuʿtaqadu bi-*[such a region]*"* or *"kāna yaʿtaqiduhu al-nās").* Such detachment seems to have been a rather neutral statement and an assessment of something that was or had been, for Ibn Ḥajar sometimes made a clearer distinction regarding these beliefs that did not include himself discursively. It was specifically the case when mentioning the *madhjūb*s, such as in the obituary of Shaykh Ḥutaybah, "one of the *madhjūbīn* in whom believed the *ʿāmmah,"*[107] *de facto* implying that people outside the *ʿāmmah* did not revere this character. Such a narrative precision should not be seen as a way to inform about "popular religion" as opposed to the high culture and religious practices of a religious elite, for many among the *muʿtaqad*s seem to have been genuinely revered, in a particular region, by both the *ʿāmmah* and the *khāṣṣah.* Thus, a man like Mūsá ibn ʿAlī al-Shaybī (fl. eighth/fourteenth century), a *muʿtaqad* and a descendant of one of the most prestigious religious lineages of northern Tihāmah,[108] was clearly identified by Ibn Ḥajar as "a master of [mystical] unveilings *(mukāshafāt)* and divine favors *(karāmāt),"* features upon which there was a general consensus.[109]

Precision regarding funeral processions—beyond the historical documentation of an extraordinary event and a way for Ibn Ḥajar to introduce direct testimony—may also be understood as an attempt to double down on a *muʿtaqad*'s success, thus exemplifying the people's "reverence" for him. It is the case for some figures whose presence punctuates the chronicle, such as Abū Bakr al-Mallawī[110] or Abū Bakr al-Jubāʾī al-Miṣrī, a man one day drawn to God *(ḥaṣalat lahu jadhbatun),* for whom people had "an indescribable reverence" *(kāna lil-nās fīhi iʿtiqād yafūq al-waṣf),* and whose funeral ceremony was spectacular *(janāzatun ʿaẓīmatun)* "like during the day of *ʿīd* or rain [prayer] *(al-istisqāʾ),* or even more."[111]

It is worth emphasizing that most of the *muʿtaqad*s introduced in the chronicle were not linked to any training as scholars. Only a handful of them were explicitly referred to as Sufis or members of a Sufi network, that is, as being linked in the text to Sufi practices, thought, doctrinal engagement, a *ṭarīqah,* or terms directly associated with *taṣawwuf,* like *"ṣūfī"* or *"taṣawwuf."* Although the two works are not comparable in terms of their aims and narrative engagements, it is

---

[106] And being part of it himself. See ibid., 2:308, 495.

[107] Ibid., 2:331.

[108] Zacharie Mochtari de Pierrepont, *Espaces sacrés et lignages bénis dans la Tihāma yéménite: sociétés, identités et pouvoirs (VIe–IXe/XIIe–XVe siècle)* (Paris, 2018), 1:470–80.

[109] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 2:410.

[110] Ibid., 4:81.

[111] Ibid., 1:497.

still interesting to note that only thirty-three characters are mentioned as receiving *iʿtiqād (al-nās)* in the *Durar al-kāminah,* Ibn Ḥajar's biographical dictionary concerning the eighth/fourteenth century. In the course of a hundred years, he deemed it useful to refer to only a third as many religious charismatic figures as he did in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.* Add to that the very short notices concerning them, and they seem almost irrelevant in the general framework of this work of *ṭabaqāt.* One may wonder if the religious, cultural, and social environment of the Cairo Sultanate between the end of the eighth/fourteenth century and the first decades of the ninth/fifteenth allowed such a multiplication of religious charismatic figures, and if it may have been driven by the discomfort and troubles of the time, echoing one of the main features of the rise of charismatic authority.

All in all, it seems that the notion of *iʿtiqād* and that of *tabarruk* and *barakah* are the main markers of religious charismatic authority in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.* They are only applied to characters with religious knowledge or a mystical tendency. Figures tied to *iʿtiqād* in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* are also specifically portrayed as distinct from other scholars, as is illustrated in the notice of the qadi Jalāl al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī.[112] In the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* this famous, high-profile scholarly figure is not mentioned as one with *iʿtiqād,*[113] but he is directly referred to as such in the *Rafʿ al-iṣr,*[114] Ibn Ḥajar's historiographical work documenting the life and deeds of the *quḍāt* of Egypt.[115] It is also the case of the qadi Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 797/1396–97),[116] who is mentioned as a *muʿtaqad* in the *Rafʿ* but not in the *Inbāʾ.*[117] Thus, the "revered" characters presented in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* were serving a different narrative purpose and may also be distinguished as a specific narrative type in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* itself, compared to the revered judges mentioned in the *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr,* emphasizing a different perspective in regard to the formal and informal status of religious and legal authorities, the audience, and the types of respect and reverence such figures were deemed to deserve.

The charismatic religious figures in the *Inbāʾ,* through the notions of *iʿtiqād* and *barakah,* were not presented as wandering in the streets and campaigns of the Cairo Sultanate. As in the display of other types of powers and authorities, holders of religious charisma were often presented in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* in a set of specific places that, more than introducing to the chronicle's audience a geography of religious charismatic power, participated in the illustration of the routinization of charisma. Namely, they shaped the processes of institutionalization of religious

---

[112]Ibn Ḥajar, *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr,* 226–29.

[113]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:259–60.

[114]Ibn Ḥajar, *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr,* 229.

[115]On this work, see Mathieu Tillier, *Vies des cadis de Miṣr* (Cairo, 2002).

[116]Ibn Ḥajar, *Rafʿ al-iṣr ʿan quḍāt Miṣr,* 364–65.

[117]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:503.

charismatic authority and powers, gradually translated in an impersonal evolution of power,[118] enclosed in a set of institutions.

The Production of Charismatic Authority and the Institutionalization of Religious Charisma: The Case of *Zāwiyah*s

If the idea of religious charismatic authority seems to be conveyed through a specific lexicon in the *Inbāʾ*, the power or influence of religious charismatic leaders—or rather the narrative representation of this influence—seems to be exercised and enclosed in a specific set of *loci.* Two particular spaces seem to be the main repositories of charismatic authority: Sufi *zāwiyah*s and mausoleums, a fact already emphasized by Petry.[119] Both convey a different aspect of charismatic authority, since the former was part of the living display of a religious leader's standing and reputation, and the latter was an ongoing memorial of such a past influence that actualized the standing of his successors and served as a reminder of their spiritual—and sometimes genealogical—affiliation, if any.

Sufi Institutions in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*

Sufi institutions—mostly *zāwiyah*s and *khānqāh*s[120]—were important to Ibn Ḥajar. As for *khānqāh*s, if we consider them as representing Sufi institutions,[121] they occupy a relevant narrative space in the chronicle and are quite well documented. Yet, contrary to *zāwiyah*s, it is noticeable that very few members of *khānqāh*s are mentioned in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* as being on the Sufi path, although some of them were. Thus, in contrast to Petry's analysis of late ninth/fifteenth-century biographical dictionaries, stressing that "the two khānqāhs of Saʿīd al-Suʿadāʾ and Baybarsiyya accounted for half of all references"[122] to Sufis, *khānqāh*s account for less than ten percent of all *explicitly* mentioned Sufis in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* with only 12 clearly identifiable Sufis directly associated with such institutions. In fact, the majority of the 99 references to *khānqāh*s in the text concern the hold-

---

[118] Carl J. Friedrich, "Political leadership and the problem of the charismatic power," *The Journal of Politics* 23:1, 13.

[119] Petry, *Civilian Elite of Cairo,* 268.

[120] The *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* includes limited references to *ribāṭ*s, the word only appearing 12 times in the chronicle. These do not seem to be *specifically* linked to Sufism in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle, which seems to corroborate Muḥammad Amīn, Leonor Fernandes, and Donald P. Little's statements, the latter writing that *ribāṭ*s had "very little" relationship to Sufism. See Donald P. Little, "The Nature of Khānqāhs," 101–2.

[121] Ibid., 97–101.

[122] Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo,* 272.

ers of the *khānqāh*s' *mashyakhah*s, the visit of a sultan to a *khānqāh,* or troubles and developments concerning these institutions. In that regard, both as institutions and as what they represented in the narrative frame of the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr, khānqāh*s were obviously viewed very differently from other Sufi institutions like *zāwiyah*s, and one of the recurrent topics attached to them was the question of the *mashyakhah,* the competition for *mansab*s, and the career paths and positions held by prominent ulama.[123] Ibn Ḥajar himself, who served as shaykh of the Khānqāh al-Baybarsīyah longer than any other holder of the position since its erection in 705/1306,[124] was obviously very interested—as, certainly, was a part of his target audience—in this competitive environment, in which he was personally involved.[125]

As for *zāwiyah*s, Ibn Ḥajar never documented these institutions in the same way as al-Maqrīzī, who, in a distinct section of his *Khiṭaṭ,* referred to twenty-six of them in Cairo.[126] Nonetheless, he still mentioned forty-two *zāwiyah*s scattered around the Syro-Egyptian territory, one in Iraq, and one in Yemen. Meccan and Ḥijāzī *zāwiyah*s were ignored,[127] although Ibn Ḥajar did refer to some Sufi *shuyūkh* of the holy city.[128]

It follows that, for Ibn Hajar, *zāwiyah*s were relevant to introduce the Sufi environment presented in his chronicle, but only as part of a broader picture. Among these institutions, thirty-eight Sufis are mentioned, in large part from outside Cairo, which means that a minority of the Sufis presented in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* are directly related to *zāwiyah*s.[129] This geographical display may also be linked to one of the main sources Ibn Ḥajar used for his coverage of Syria, the *Tārīkh* of Ibn Ḥijjī (d. 816/1413).[130] Most of these Sufis (thirty-three) were the heads of their *zāwiyah*s. *Zāwiyah*s in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* are generally mentioned *before* al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq's rule (r. 842–57/1438–53): the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* includes, to my knowledge, no references to such an institution between 841/1438 and 850/1446, although two of them are mentioned for the year 841/1437–38. That indicates a conscious shift

---

[123]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:229, 232, 290, 2:98, 112, 224, 3:45, 62, 151, 4:102, 230, etc.

[124]On this *khānqāh,* see Leonor Fernandes, "The Foundation of Baybars al-Jashankir: Its Waqf, History, and Architecture," *Muqarnas* 4, no. 1 (1986): 21–42.

[125]He completed the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* while trying to take back the *mashyakhah* of the Khānqāh al-Baybarsīyah that he had lost in 849/1445. ʿIzz al-Dīn, *Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī muʾarrikhan,* 77–78, 126–27; R. Kevin Jaques, *Ibn Ḥajar* (New Delhi, 2009), 140–41.

[126]Al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār* (Beirut, 1997), 4:307–16.

[127]Yet we know that some are mentioned in contemporary sources. For example, al-Fāsī, *Al-ʿIqd al-thamīn fī faḍāʾil al-balad al-amīn* (Beirut, 1998), 1:284, 4:450, 5:450.

[128]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:383, 4:25.

[129]Mochtari de Pierrepont, "Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's texts and contexts."

[130]Ibn Ḥijjī is quoted at least 97 times in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.*

in Ibn Ḥajar's narrative regarding the relevance of such institutions during Jaq-maq's reign, which may be connected to the personal display of piety of the sultan himself and his court,[131] but also to the decreased prestige and fame enjoyed by religious charismatic leaders under Jaqmaq, due to the sultan's personal policy on the matter.

Because of Ibn Ḥajar's attempt to precisely locate some of the *zāwiyah*s he refers to, the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* may seem at first to indicate his possible interest in mapping the Sufi topography of the Syro-Egyptian landscape. Thus, precision concerning the location of the *zāwiyah* near Bāb al-Jubān in Aleppo, where resid-ed Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥalabī (d. 807/1404–5),[132] or Ḥusām al-Dīn, "in the neighborhood of Yaʿqūb, in the city of Safad,"[133] must be considered as carefully selected information in the life of some of the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* characters, while the bare mention of a *zāwiyah* is the only information provided about others, as in the case of ʿAlī al-Qalnadarī (d. 823/1420): we learn nothing about him except that he was the *"ṣāḥib"* of a *zāwiyah* outside Cairo, and one of those revered by the people *(muʿtaqad).*[134] Though the author may have been interested in the Sufi environment of the Cairo Sultanate, the small number of *zāwiyah*s mentioned in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* rather seems to indicate that Ibn Ḥajar's interest in these spaces lay elsewhere.

Indeed, the number of Cairo *zāwiyah*s mentioned (seven) is particularly low, which also indicates that, when it comes to the heart of the sultanate, Ibn Ḥajar had no specific interest in such locations. Having first-hand information about the Sufi environment of Cairo, such a lack of focus shows that mapping the Sufi *zāwiyah*s was by itself irrelevant to his historical chronicle. In the same way, many of the individuals praying and living in such places that were mentioned in Cairo by other historiographers are ignored in Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* as can be seen from a brief look at al-Maqrīzī's or al-ʿAynī's works.[135] Not only were these Cairo institutions neglected, but Ibn Ḥajar also decided in the course of the 830–40s/1430–40s to emphasize for his readers different institutions from those previously mentioned in other historiographical works. Therefore, such mentions

---

[131] Mochtari de Pierrepont, "Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's texts and contexts," 18.

[132] Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 2:311.

[133] Ibid., 3:24.

[134] Ibid., 3:229.

[135] See for examples al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk,* 6:312, 7:200. As for al-ʿAynī, he seems to mention very few *zāwiyah*s in the parts of the *ʿIqd al-jumān fī tārīkh ahl al-zamān* dealing with the ninth/fifteenth century. We could multiply the examples, but comparing some years in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle with the same years in al-ʿAynī is enough to see a very different kind of account. See for example the year 841, where Ibn Ḥajar mentions two *zāwiyah*s (Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 4:81, 87) and al-ʿAynī none (al-ʿAynī, *ʿIqd al-jumān fī tārīkh ahl al-zamān,* ed. Maḥmūd Razaq Maḥmūd [Cairo, 2010], 2:493–507).

in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* were not intended to reference any implicit urban landscape nor to give insight into a broader Sufi environment. It seems that they had other purposes, one of which was certainly recording the places and institutions routinized by religious charismatic authority, the centers of a form of power that was relevant to documenting the history and social fabric of the Cairo Sultanate.

*Zāwiyah*s in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr:* Charisma and Ephemeral Institutions in a Troubled Context

As institutions, *zāwiyah*s have been largely neglected for a long time, as they seem to have been merely considered as small institutions, in the continuous "institutional spectrum that included *zāwiya, madrasa,* and *mosques.*"[136] Muḥammad M. Amīn, Fernandes, Little, and Behrens-Abouseif are still the best studies of references to Sufi institutions and *zāwiyah*s in the Cairo Sultanate.[137] It is generally admitted that lines between *zāwiyah*s, *ribāṭ*s, and madrasahs were progressively blurred during the period of the Cairo Sultanate.[138] Indeed, all these structures participated in religious practice, teaching, and charitable activities, and "the social and intellectual assimilation of Sufis and Sufism into the mainstream intellectual life"[139] during the course of the eighth/fourteenth century certainly played a role in this blending. Yet, such assessment also seems to have constrained contemporary research, mostly excluding the study of medieval *zāwiyah*s as themselves presenting specific aspects. It may seem quite a bold supposition to accept that the linguistic process of distinction between different Sufi institutions used by contemporary historiographers did not reflect a different perception of their distinct nature, if not of their function. If al-Maqrīzī dedicated a whole chapter in his *Khiṭaṭ* to *zāwiyah*s and most ninth/fifteenth-century authors refer to *zāwiyah*s as a particular institution, it means that *zāwiyah*s were clearly distinct and identifiable for contemporaries, since they were presented as such, even if lines could sometimes be confused.

As a hypothesis, based on Ibn Ḥajar's presentation in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* I would like to propose here that *zāwiyah*s were partly distinguished from other Sufi institutions due to their role in the process of institutionalization of religious

---

[136] Jonathan Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo: A Social History of Islamic Education* (Oxford, 1992), 58.

[137] Muḥammad M. Amīn, *Al-Awqāf wa-al-hayāh al-ijtimāʿīyah fī Miṣr* (Cairo, 1980), 206–22; Fernandes, "The *zāwiya* in Cairo," 105–21; idem, "Some Aspects of the zawiya in Egypt," 9–17; Little, "The Nature of Khānqāhs, Ribāts, and Zāwiyas under the Mamluks," 91–105; Doris Behrens-Abouseif, "Change in Function and Form of Mamluk Religious Institutions," *Annales islamologiques* 21 (1985): 73–93.

[138] Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge,* 57–58.

[139] Ibid., 59.

charismatic authority. That is also why it is possible to interpret the evolution put forward by Fernandes concerning ninth/fifteenth-century *zāwiyah*s in a multi-layered representation: that is, not only to consider the rising number of *zāwiyah*s in the Cairo Sultanate as evidence of a new trend in the religious needs of the faithful, but also as a reaction to incorporate and maintain a number of religious charismatic authorities in an approved institutional and social framework linking together military, intellectual, and cultural elites, which explains the new efforts of established elites and patrons to directly sponsor *zāwiyah*s.

Compared to other religious and pious foundations mentioned in the chronicle, *zāwiyah*s have three particularities in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle.

First, most of these institutions, during the first half of the ninth/fifteenth century, belonged to a religious charismatic individual or a spiritual affiliate of a religious charismatic individual, so their success came in part from a charisma-driven authority. Thus, many (17) *muʿtaqad*s and shaykhs gifted with *karāmāt* or to whom people were looking for *tabarruk* are associated with a *zāwiyah.* This is never the case for a *khānqāh* or a *ribāṭ:* no charismatic religious figure said to be a *muʿtaqad* is associated with these institutions in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.*

Second, *zāwiyah*s are always presented in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* with reference to a few characters, spanning generations, before disappearing from the narrative. They are presented as *contextual and ephemeral* institutions which would fit in the framework in which religious charismatic authority is usually understood.

Third, they are almost never linked in any way to the sultanic authority: the rulers had no sway upon these institutions, at least in the narrative representation offered by the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr.* The only time a direct connection with the sultanic office is mentioned in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle, it is the subject of a moral assertion on corruption and failure.[140]

Therefore, some *zāwiyah*s are clearly spaces where religious charismatic authority was displayed, even if not all *zāwiyah*s were. Though not all Sufi *shuyūkh* of *zāwiyah*s are mentioned as *muʿtaqad*s or as gifted with important *barakah,* most *muʿtaqad*s *are* mentioned as being linked either to a *zāwiyah* or to a mausoleum, and many Sufi *shuyūkh* are associated with *karāmāt.* Thus, the main terms emphasizing religious charismatic authority were related to *zāwiyah*s. One may indeed say of a ninth/fifteenth-century *zāwiyah* shaykh that he, considering his defined group of disciples, exercises influence and authority over them because of their belief in his virtues or his *barakah.* They stood in reverence before of their charismatic leader, something said to have been experienced by Ibn Ḥajar himself.[141] Such reverence was attached to the persona of the master; it was not

---

[140]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:213.

[141]Geoffroy, *Le soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers mamelouks,* 87, n. 3, quoting al-Battanūnī, *Al-Sirr al-ṣafī,* 1:7.

imposed institutionally from outside. Thus, even if many masters could be succeeded by one of their family members—since the *transmission of barakah* was stronger through blood—it was never an obvious pattern, for charismatic authority had to be proven and maintained on an everyday basis and renewed at each generation, which sometimes allowed prominent disciples to take over a *zāwiyah*, despite there being trained members in the founding shaykh's family. When religious charismatic leaders disappeared, *zāwiyah*s certainly carried on their functions as institutions of teaching and worship, but at that point they are rarely mentioned in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle.

Because of the charismatic and mystical nature of the *zāwiyah*, allowing the institution to develop for a time around a recognized figure, *zāwiyah*s are only relevant enough to the chronicle to be mentioned for one or two generations. Most of the *zāwiyah*s included in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* are relatively new, having been established within the time frame covered by the work; the oldest *zāwiyah* of them, the Badrīyah, whose shaykh died in 776/1374,[142] is only mentioned once. Few masters are mentioned for each *zāwiyah*, nor are there usually more than two religious charismatic characters in succession. Usually, these are the founder of the *zāwiyah* or the founder of a movement and one successor, rarely more.[143] A process of "charismatic decay" does not seem to be directly proposed by Ibn Ḥajar, but he does refer frequently to the lower quality of the teachings and virtues of the successor, as in the cases of Ibrāhīm al-Māḥūzī or ʿAlī Wafāʾ.[144] That may lead us to consider Ibn Ḥajar's acknowledgment of the founder's virtues, but also his creation of a repetitive narrative structure emphasizing that the progressive rise of charismatic authority was linked to a decrease in the quality of Islamic moral virtues and might lead to blameworthy practices. While never condemning any great eponymous figure of spiritual authority, he was thus able to describe the moral balance deemed positive for the charismatic leader and assert such a role in a broader perspective, especially in relation to the political elites: *zāwiyah*s' masters were sometimes connected to leading members of amiral households.[145] The spaces of charismatic religious authority integrated in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* were thus incorporated in the general display of various forms and places of authority presented in the work as a framework upon which to reflect about Ibn Ḥajar's contemporary history and society.

---

[142]Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:78.

[143]For example, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn and his disciple ʿAbd Allāh ibn Khalīl al-Bisṭāmī (Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:167), Abū Bakr al-Mawṣilī and his son (ibid., 1:497–98; 2:495), Maḥmūd al-ʿAyntābī and his son (ibid., 1:215).

[144]Ibid., 2:308–9, 2:495.

[145]Leonor Fernandes, "Some Aspects of the zawiya in Egypt," 11–12. For examples in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* see Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 3:349, 3:524–25, 4:52.

To conclude, we have demonstrated that in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* Ibn Ḥajar used a set of narrative markers and a specific lexicon—especially through the notion of *iʿtiqād*—to display religious charismatic authority in the social fabric and history of his time. Religious charismatic authority was associated with a distinct historiographical space in the chronicle, shaping a category of power that can be identified. In the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr, zāwiyah*s were presented as the primary places in which such power and authority were performed and from which they could be constrained in a structured and institutional framework.

As spaces where a specific kind of authority, influence, and power resided, carried by singular men—holders of a charismatic religious authority—*zāwiyah*s were thus mostly integrated in Ibn Ḥajar's chronicle in such a way that they still retained their charismatic peculiarity.[146] In that way, Sufi *zāwiyah*s, *shuyūkh,* and famous mystical characters were presented in an environment linked not only to Sufism but also to the broader idea of religious charismatic authority. The limits of this authority, as well as of specific Sufi movements, were implicitly defined by the author in the framework of religious practices and theological discourses.

Ibn Ḥajar could express the role of such spaces and characters as enclosed in a form of normative social order, including the ambivalent relationship between charismatic religious authorities, scholars associated with the judiciary, the ruling elites, and the *ʿāmmah.* As part of a set of institutions displayed in a multi-layered narrative representation, *zāwiyah*s and religious charismatic authorities played their roles in the crafting of history, identity, and society that Ibn Ḥajar chronicled.

Doing so, the author was a social, political, and cultural actor. On the one hand, Ibn Ḥajar was concerned with laying out a socio-historical reality, illustrated by a set of characters and events that he deemed important to include in his chronicle. This was a partial—voluntarily incomplete—staging of the interconnections between remarkable people—the *aʿyān,* those who were noteworthy and allowed themselves to be remarked—and events. Due to his fame and position in Cairo society, the careful selection made by Ibn Ḥajar, and his chosen wording, could also be counted as a subtle attempt of *damnatio memoriae,* either through omission or explicit contempt. Thus, on the other hand, the author was creating the framework of a new normative history passing into memory, assigning negative and positive opinions, comments, judgements, and appraisals, interjected either through his personal authoritative assessment or summoning high figures of consideration and authority.

---

[146] These narratives were consistent with the circumscribed purposes laid out by the author himself in his chronicle's introduction, namely documenting "the situation of states, through the examination of remarkable people." Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* 1:4.

For all its common aspects with other chronicles, the Inbāʾ al-ghumr was producing a historical meaning of its own and of Ibn Ḥajar's time. It expressed and made sense of a social order that may have seemed sometimes to turn upside down for his contemporary readers.[147] Such a social order was produced through narratives that participated in a process of legitimization and carved new memories in a deeply contextualized environment. The rise to power of al-Ashraf Barsbāy (under whom Ibn Ḥajar started his broad historiographical project[148]) and al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq (with whom Ibn Ḥajar had a difficult relationship)—the ways they ruled and how this was felt, the symbolic perception of these reigns and their displays, the different trends and changes affecting religious piety and judiciary customs and practice—were in that regard paramount features in the chronicle. Hence Ibn Ḥajar's relative insistence in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* on the notion of *iʿtiqād* and his staging of prominent characters like Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī or his own self-promotion, amid which was introduced the multi-layered narrative representation of the various forms of power of the ninth/fifteenth century set in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. The layer of religious charismatic authority that we engaged with was but one among them.

---

[147] A feeling that will also echo in later narratives. Jean-Claude Garcin, "The regime of the Circassian Mamlūks," in *The Cambridge History of Egypt* (Cambridge, 1998), 1:290–99; J. Loiseau, *Reconstruire la maison du sultan: ruine et recomposition de l'ordre urbain au Caire (1350–1450)* (Cairo, 2010), 143–214; idem, *Les Mamelouks, XIIIe-XVIe siècle : une expérience du pouvoir dans l'islam médiéval* (Paris, 2014), 124–37; J. Van Steenbergen and S. Van Nieuwenhuyse, "Truth and Politics in Late Medieval Arabic Historiography: The Formation of Sultan Barsbāy's State (1422–1438) and the Narratives of the Amir Qurqumās al-Shaʿbānī (d. 1438)," *Der Islam* 95, no. 1 (2018): 147–88.

[148] Indeed, it is in the 830s, after the coming to power of al-Ashraf Barsbāy, that Ibn Ḥajar started simultaneously to write the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr,* the *Durar al-kāminah fī aʿyān al-miʾah al-thāminah,* his biographical dictionary of the eighth/fourteenth century, and the *Dhayl al-durar fī aʿyān al-miʾah al-thāminah,* his biographical dictionary concerning people from the first decades of the ninth/fifteenth century.