

Mamluk Architecture and the Question of Patronage

The study of patronage of the arts and architecture during the Mamluk period helps us sharpen the picture that we have of this alien ruling class. At the same time, it illuminates the relationships which existed between the Mamluks, the religious elite, and the rest of the population. In examining the patronage of architecture in the Mamluk period, historians and art historians face a number of complex problems. Some derive from the nature of the buildings themselves or their inscriptions, while others result from the conflicting accounts provided by the various literary sources and, sometimes, by the *waqf* documents. Scholars also have to be aware of external factors—economic, social, political—which had an impact on the decisions of patrons to construct one type of building rather than another.

The present article is an attempt to reflect on the patronage practices and to raise some questions about the architectural achievements of the Mamluk period. It also tries to sort out the patterns followed by both the military and civilian elite when commissioning their buildings. A survey of the extant monuments from the period between 1250-1517, as well as those no longer extant but recorded in the literary sources, allows us to identify four broad categories of buildings of either a religious or a secular nature. The classification of the buildings under a given category is based on the function of the buildings as defined in their inscriptions, literary sources, or *waqf* documents.¹ Accordingly, buildings may be grouped under four categories: (1) religious, which includes the *jāmi'*, *masjid*, *madrasah*, *khānqāh*;² (2) social, which includes the *zāwiyah*,³ *ribāṭ*, *bīmāristān*, *sabīl*, *sabīl-kuttāb*, *ḥammām*; (3) domestic, which consists of the palace, *dār*, and house (*qā'ah*, *riwāq*, *ṭabaqah*, *rab'*); (4) commercial/industrial, which includes the *qaysārīyah*, *wakālah*, *khān*, *funduq*, *sūq*, *mi'ṣarah*, *ṭāhūn*, *furn*, *maṭbakh sukkar*, *sirjah*.

The ratio of religious to secular buildings constructed at a certain time is difficult to assess. At the present time our understanding of the economic, political, and social factors which had an impact on the choice of buildings constructed by patrons allows us to draw only broad conclusions as to how this choice was made. We can sometimes speculate that

©Middle East Documentation Center. The University of Chicago.

¹The reader is asked to keep in mind the fact that, in some cases, buildings—especially large complexes—had multiple functions. In such cases the predominant function of the building will determine the category into which it falls. Civil and military architecture have been deliberately left out of this discussion since both categories included buildings which were generally part of large projects placed under the aegis of the state.

²Although *madrasahs* and *khānqāhs* had functions which were not directly related to religious rituals, their primary concern was the teaching of the religious sciences and/or Sufism; therefore, their inclusion under this category is justifiable.

³*Zāwiyahs* have been deliberately excluded from the category of religious buildings since their function—at least as far as Mamluk Egypt is concerned—was not directly associated with “orthodox” religious practice. See Fernandes, “The *Zāwīya* in Cairo,” *Annales islamologiques* 18 (1982): 116-121.

the need to control or create ties with religious scholars often motivated patrons to establish foundations providing positions for the civilian elite.⁴ We can further point out the relationship which existed between the growing interest of patrons in constructing commercial buildings such as *wakālahs* or *qaysārīyahs* and *funduqs* around the end of the fourteenth century and onwards, and the growth of Mediterranean trade. One can also speculate on the lack of interest shown by the Mamluks in the construction of mosques per se on the basis of the religious developments of the period.

However, before turning our attention to the pattern of patronage arising from the varying motives of patrons, let us pause for a moment to ask the question, Who were the patrons? We could use—although with reservation—the answer provided by L. A. Mayer, who writes:

. . . although the bulk of public buildings in Islam were either devoted to religious use (like mosques, madrasas, kuttābs, zāwiyas, cemeteries) or founded out of a religious impulse (like hospitals or sabīls), with very few exceptions they were constructed by order of laymen. Economically they were entirely the work of the governing classes, military or civilian, and independent of any ecclesiastical authority. . . . And just as there is no ecclesiastical architecture of any consequence except that ordered by laymen, so there is no bourgeois architecture worthy of the name.⁵

The preceding statement calls for two comments. Firstly, it uses a terminology which totally ignores the nature of Islam when it refers to an “ecclesiastical authority” and “ecclesiastical architecture.” Secondly, the statement mentions the absence of “bourgeois architecture” without taking into consideration the structure of the Muslim society under study. Despite its defects, we have to agree with Mayer’s statement that the patrons were those who could afford to pay for the construction of a building, whether from the military or civilian elite. It would also be appropriate to include explicitly two groups who were actively involved in the establishment of both religious and secular foundations: women and merchants.

The best documented of the various groups of patrons are the rulers and their military elite. The sources provide us with enough information to allow us to reconstruct the pattern of patronage of this group during the Mamluk period. It is evident that religious foundations, which helped the ruler legitimate his rule, were the primary focus of patronage by the sultan and his amirs. For the Mamluks, perhaps even more than for any other group, political power was acquired and maintained by force and legitimized by an ideology at the center of which was Islam. According to the medieval scholars, a good ruler was the one striving to impose and uphold the *sharī’ah* and thus hold high the banner of Islam.

With this ideal of rulership in mind, the Mamluk rulers arranged and rearranged their public buildings so as to project and maintain an image of themselves in harmony with the expectations of their subjects, both the religious elite and the masses. The patronage of religious buildings such as the *jāmi’*, for instance, was regarded as part of the ruler’s

⁴See Fernandes, “Mamluk Politics and Education: The Evidence from Two Fourteenth Century *Waqfiyya*,” *AI* 23 (1987): 87-98.

⁵L. A. Mayer, *Islamic Architects and Their Works* (Geneva: Albert Kundig, 1956), 22-23.

duties.⁶ Thus, it is not surprising to note that every effort was made by the Mamluks to associate their names with the greatest possible number of religious buildings, whether newly constructed or rebuilt. Among the most important foundations were *jum'ah* mosques, which provided a place for the community to perform their daily rituals, attend the Friday prayer, and listen to the *khuṭbah*. Sultan Baybars encouraged the introduction of the *khuṭbah* in a number of mosques in the same urban agglomeration.⁷ He also ordered the building of his *jāmi'*, which was constructed between 665-67/1266-69. Many important mosques date from the time of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad who, along with his amirs, embarked on a large program of building and rebuilding mosques as mentioned by al-Maqrīzī.⁸ However, after a period of about twenty-five years of intense activity involving the construction of mosques, one notes that fewer mosques were built after the death of this sultan.

Talking about a fifteenth century *madrasah*, van Berchem pointed to the fact that the Friday rituals were now celebrated in such foundations: "À cette époque, on ne bâtissait presque plus de Mosquées, et l'office du vendredi ce célébrait dans la plupart des *madrasahs*."⁹ By the mid-fourteenth century, a number of *madrasahs* also had the function of *jāmi'*s. Despite the strong opposition of the Shāfi'ī school of law to the deliverance of more than one *khuṭbah* in an urban center, this practice was introduced in a number of foundations.¹⁰ However, we should point out that permission to build a *jāmi'* or to introduce a *khuṭbah* in a *madrasah* had to be obtained from the sultan and approved by the religious scholars. It is clear that this privilege was enjoyed primarily by members of the military elite. With time, however, the same privilege came to be shared by members of the civilian elite, women related to the sultans, and rich merchants. Al-Sakhāwī mentions a number of cases in which construction of, or introduction of the *khuṭbah* in, a foundation were authorized. Thus, we read that the *khuṭbah* was delivered in the *madrasah* built by al-Zaynī ibn al-Jī'ān next to his house, with the permission of the sultan and sanction of the religious scholars.¹¹ Elsewhere, we read that the *khuṭbah* was delivered in the mosque built by al-Zaynī al-Uṣṭādār in Būlāq with the permission of the sultan (*bi-idhn al-sulṭān*) and the agreement of the jurists.¹²

Because the *khuṭbah* was delivered in so many *madrasah* foundations, some jurists felt the need to point out that a *madrasah* was not a mosque. Indeed, we read: "*madrasahs* are not to be considered mosques but only the *miḥrāb* itself or some say the *īwān al-miḥrāb* exclusively [is to be considered as a *jāmi'*]; the rest of it is not to be treated as a *jāmi'* since it is permissible [for people] to gather in it, to eat and to work in it, and so

⁶Ibn Taymīyah, in a number of his *fatwās*, goes so far as to consider a ruler's neglect in building or restoring mosques as deviant behavior; *Majmū' Fatāwī Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad Ibn Taymīyah* (Riyadh: Maṭābi' al-Riyāḍ, 1381).

⁷al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz wa-al-I'tibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār* (Būlāq; reprint, 1977), 2:297-298.

⁸Ibid., 304-325.

⁹Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum: Égypte* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1894-1903), 3:344.

¹⁰al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:331.

¹¹al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk fī Dhayl al-Sulūk* (Būlāq: n.p., 1897; reprint, Cairo: Maktabat al-Kullīyah al-Azharīyah, 1972), 176.

¹²Ibid., 217, see also, 185; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr bi-Abnā' al-'Umr* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah, 1968), 9:156-157; Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr fī Waqā' i' al-Duhūr*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafá, 5 vols. (Cairo: In Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1960-84), 3:117.

on.¹³ The practice of delivering the *khuṭbah* in *madrasahs* was still frowned upon by the Shāfi‘ī jurists as late as the middle of the fifteenth century. Al-Sakhāwī mentions an incident which took place between Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanafī jurists regarding the introduction of the *khuṭbah* in the *madrasah* of Qāḍī Badr al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Suwayd, built in Miṣr in 845/1441-1442.¹⁴ The author clearly states that Ḥanafī jurists allowed more than one *khuṭbah* in one *miṣr* while the Shāfi‘īs opposed it. He then provides his own opinion on the matter saying: “non-authorization of multiplicity [of *khuṭbahs*] is more appropriate and God provides guidance” (*‘adam al-ta‘addud awlā wallāh al-hādī*). The opposition of the Shāfi‘ī jurists was so strong that when the introduction of the *khuṭbah* in the *madrasah* of Qalāwūn was proposed in 774/1372-73, a great debate took place between the Ḥanafīs and the Shāfi‘īs. *Fatwās* were issued on the subject, explaining their respective positions. Al-Suyūṭī¹⁵ adds that al-Bulqīnī wrote to support the practice while al-‘Irāqī opposed it. Could this strong opposition to the deliverance of more than one *khuṭbah* in an urban center have influenced the decision of patrons regarding the type of building to be commissioned, especially in centers like Bayn al-Qaṣrayn? Baybars, Qalāwūn, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, Barqūq, and Barsbāy, each of whom erected one of their foundations in this location, declined to build a *jāmi‘*. They all chose to build religious foundations, the functions of which were associated with teaching and Sufism. Furthermore, the *khuṭbah* was not given originally at some of the early foundations.¹⁶

The former site of the Fatimid palaces, which had been transformed by the Ayyubids into a center of religious and commercial activities, Bayn al-Qaṣrayn became a prime locus for the construction of large foundations during the Mamluk period. Indeed, early patrons, in imitation of their former master al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, elected to build at least one of their foundations here whenever possible. The fact that Bayn al-Qaṣrayn was deemed an important site highly appreciated by religious scholars is reflected in a comment that al-‘Aynī made when talking of Sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh. According to this author, when the sultan discussed his intention to build a *madrasah/jāmi‘* in al-Qāhirah with his advisors, they all recommended the location opposite the *madrasah* of Sultan Barqūq in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn so that al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh, too, would have a foundation standing among those of other sultans.¹⁷

It is also worth mentioning that by the Mamluk period Bayn al-Qaṣrayn had become, as al-Maqrīzī says, the site of an important *sūq*.¹⁸ This probably would also have influenced the type of foundation erected there, and would perhaps have caused reluctance to build a *jāmi‘* in this location. Indeed, the objection to the building of a *jāmi‘* in a *sūq* is well documented. Al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī both mention a heated debate which took place apropos the *jāmi‘* of al-Ghamrī (d. 849). Many religious scholars, we are told, admonished him and some tried to dissuade him from building the *jāmi‘*. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī mentions that he was among the people who advised the shaykh to forego

¹³al-Shaykh al-Tūnisī, *al-Masā’il al-Malqūṭah*, MS Dār al-Kutub, Fiḥ Mālikī, no. 61.

¹⁴al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 9-11.

¹⁵al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍarah fī Akhbār Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah*, (Cairo: ‘Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1968), 2:304.

¹⁶See al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:379-380.

¹⁷al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd al-Jumān fī Ta’rīkh Ahl al-Zamān*, ed. ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṭanṭāwī al-Qarmūṭ (Cairo: n.p., 1985), 1:224-226.

¹⁸al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:27-29.

introducing a *khuṭbah* in the foundation (i.e., keep it a *masjid*) but that he was faced with the patron's total refusal of his advice.¹⁹ Al-Sakhāwī, who reports the same event, writes: "The scholars censured him for that" (*fa-'āba 'alayhi ahl al-'ilm dhālika*).²⁰

Both the opposition of the Shāfi'īs to more than one *khuṭbah* in a *miṣr* as well as the jurists' stand regarding the construction of a *jum'ah* mosque in a *sūq* must have inevitably influenced the choice of the foundations to be built on the site of Bayn al-Qaṣrayn. It is therefore not surprising that a sultan like Baybars al-Bunduqdārī, who commissioned a very large mosque in 665-67/1266-69, chose for its location a *maydān* outside al-Qāhirah proper. The same sultan had already built a *madrasah* in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn a few years earlier and had requested explicitly that no changes be made to this building. We read in al-Maqrīzī²¹ that Baybars went to his *madrasah* in al-Qāhirah and, "He entered it and so did the *fuqahā'* and the *qurrā'* . . . and he said, 'this is a place I have dedicated to God. . . . When I die do not bury me here and do not alter the plan of this place'."²² There was always an attempt to keep burial grounds away from urban centers. Al-Suyūṭī confirms that Baybars was firmly opposed to any urban development around burial grounds.²³ Interestingly, when the custom of adding a *qubbah* to religious foundations in urban centers was adopted by the early Mamluk sultans, their legal function as specified by the *waqf* documents was that of a *masjid* and/or teaching place. Only the *fisqīyah* (burial chamber) underneath them was to be considered a burial ground.²⁴

Talking about the complex of Qalāwūn, al-Nuwayrī writes that when the sultan saw al-Turbah al-Šāliḥīyah, he ordered the construction of a *turbah* for himself, containing a *madrasah*, a *bīmāristān*, and a *maktab sabīl*. He established as *waqf* a number of his properties including *qaysāriyahs* and *ribā'*, and most of the income from these was endowed on the *bīmāristān* and then on the *turbah bi-al-qubbah*. The use of the two terms juxtaposed clearly indicates that the two words were not synonymous. Often the functions of the *qubbah* went beyond what was specified in the *waqfiyah*. Indeed, many sultans made it a place for holding important *majālis* and paid regular visits to their mausoleums. For instance, Mamluk chronicles report a number of *majālis* taking place in the *qubbah* of Qalāwūn and attended by his sons and grandsons.²⁵ Furthermore, this *qubbah* became the locus of an important ceremonial: the swearing of the oath, which took place at the manumission of a *mamlūk* and his promotion.²⁶ In an article entitled "Reflections on Mamluk Art" Oleg Grabar writes:

The problem with all these Mamluk foundations is that there are so many of them, located so close to each other—as in the Shari' Bayn al-Qaṣrayn in

¹⁹Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 9:244-245.

²⁰al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 137.

²¹al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:300.

²²The reference here probably points to what had happened to the *madrasah* of his previous master al-Šāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb when his wife, Shajar al-Durr, added a *qubbah* to it.

²³al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍarah* 2:139-141.

²⁴Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Qalāwūn, Dār al-Wathā'iq 15; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, Dār al-Wathā'iq 25; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Ḥasan, Dār al-Wathā'iq 40.

²⁵Baybars al-Manṣūri, *al-Tuḥfah al-Mulūkīyah fī al-Dawlah al-Turkīyah* (Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣrīyah al-Lubnānīyah, 1987), 170; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:381; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab*, ed. al-Bāz al-'Arīnī (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-'Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1964), 31:197, 220-222, 225.

²⁶al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:380-381.

Cairo . . . and in Cairo's eastern cemeteries—that one begins to doubt their actual social, religious, or intellectual uses and usefulness.²⁷

One has to wonder why it is that we are still left in doubt as to the "usefulness" of a number of monuments whose function is clearly indicated in their inscriptions and explicitly described in great detail in their *waqfiyahs* and by the chroniclers. Referring back to the descriptions of buildings provided by the literary sources and the *waqfiyahs* of the buildings erected along Bayn al-Qaṣrayn, one can not help but notice their importance in the eyes of the people who witnessed their construction. There can be no doubt whatsoever as to the purpose and usefulness of a complex such as the one erected by Qalāwūn in which a *bīmāristān* was joined to a *madrasah* and a *qubbah*. Al-Maqrīzī describes the building, explaining the patron's choice of foundations and deals briefly with some of the services provided by the *bīmāristān*.²⁸ Details of the services provided by this hospital are found in its endowment deed.²⁹

It is equally interesting to read the texts of two chancery documents issued in the name of Qalāwūn, both dated 684/1285, appointing the *ra'īs al-aṭibbā'*. In the first document we read:

Since *'ilm* (science), as we are told, consists of two types, *'ilm al-adyān* (religious sciences) and *'ilm al-abdān* (sciences of the body, anatomy), it was incumbent upon us to focus on both and create for them, during our days, whatever will ensure their existence in perpetuity. . . . Thus we have constructed for the two a monument rooted in piety.³⁰

In another document of appointment issued by the same ruler to designate Qāḍī Muḥadhdhab al-Dīn as teacher in the *bīmāristān* one reads:

We have seen former rulers adopt sound policies towards their subjects. They showed great care for the sciences of religion but neglected the sciences of the body. Each constructed a *madrasah* and yet neglected to build a *bīmāristān* ignoring thus [the Prophet's] saying: Science is of two types (*al-'ilm 'ilmān*). . . . We have built a *bīmāristān* that fills the eyes with admiration and which surpasses other buildings and preserves the health and well being of people.³¹

²⁷Oleg Grabar, "Reflections on Mamluk Art," *Muqarnas* 2 (1984): 8.

²⁸al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:406-408.

²⁹Hujjat Waqf al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn, al-Awqāf 1010; also see Ibn Ḥabīb, *Tadhkirat al-Nabīh fī Ayyām al-Manṣūr wa-Banīh*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1976-86), 1:359.

³⁰The text of the document is preserved in Ibn al-Furāt, *Ta'rīkh*, 8:22-25, as indicated in Muḥammad Māhir Ḥamādah, ed., *al-Wathā'iq al-Siyāsīyah wa-al-Idārīyah lil-'Aṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Cairo: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1980), 324-327.

³¹al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-A'shā fī Ṣinā'at al-Inshā'* (Cairo: al-Mu'assasah al-Miṣrīyah al-Āmmah lil-Ta'lif wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Ṭibā'ah wa-al-Nashr, 1964), 11:253-256.

Baybars al-Manṣūrī writes about the complex of Qalāwūn which poets described in a number of *qaṣīdahs*, from which he quotes a few verses:

A minaret shining like a star in the darkness providing guidance to the world / A *madrasah* standing as testimony to its high civilization, a lofty achievement / The light of which eclipses the *Zāhirīyah*. . . / Knowledge by it remains soundly rooted and disseminated thus suppressing atheism and debauchery.³²

Waqf documents and other sources also mention some of the reasons motivating patrons to endow pious foundations. Among the principal reasons for constructing *jāmi'*s or *maṣjids* is the desire to follow the sayings of the Prophet, who is reported to have encouraged their building in a number of *ḥadīths*. In the statement of purpose contained in the *waqfiyahs* one reads that the Prophet said, "After the death of an individual three of his deeds will survive. Among the three, the most important is the construction of a house for God." One also reads that the Prophet said, "He who builds a house for God, no matter how small its size, God will build a place for him in heaven." In addition to the sayings of the Prophet, the idea of reward in the afterlife is always stressed in the statement of purpose found at the beginning of the *waqfiyahs*.³³ It is also interesting to note that the buildings themselves often carry at the beginning of the foundation inscription the *Sūrat al-Tawbah* (S. 18).

The decision of a patron to build a religious building was not, however, always dictated by personal considerations such as self-aggrandizement or reward in the afterlife. Indeed, sometimes the decision to build a *jāmi'* was a direct response to the needs expressed by the people or by religious scholars. Discussing the *Jāmi'* al-Jadīd al-Nāṣirī, Baybars al-Manṣūrī writes that al-Nāṣir Muḥammad gave the order to construct this *jāmi'* on the Nile opposite the Isle of Rawḍah because the inhabitants of this *maḥallah* (urban center) had no *jāmi'*. They kept expressing the wish to have a *jāmi'*, which would save them the trouble of walking to other mosques on Fridays. Baybars al-Manṣūrī writes that al-Nāṣir, "being aware of their needs, ordered the construction of this mosque and took a personal interest in its planning." We are told that it was constructed in the best way "displaying beauty, perfection and grandeur. . . . Trees lined its sides surrounding it with the perfume of their flowers and the shade of their branches."³⁴

Discussing the same mosque, al-Maqrīzī writes that Qādī Fakhr al-Dīn ibn Faḍl Allāh, the *wazīr al-jaysh*, built this mosque "in the name of" (*bi-ism*) the sultan.³⁵ Although the statement of al-Maqrīzī leaves no doubt as to who the real patron was, or that the Qādī must have been the supervisor of the construction, there are other cases where the question of patronage poses a problem. Indeed, how should we define patronage? On what basis do we attribute a building to a patron, especially when we are dealing with royal constructions? Is the person giving the order to construct a monument and whose name figures in the inscription on the building preceded by "has ordered construction" (*amara bi-*

³²Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *al-Tuḥfah al-Mulūkīyah*, 111-112.

³³Ḥujjat Waqf al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn, al-Awqāf 1010; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Ḥasan, al-Awqāf 881, fols. 4-9; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Abū al-Naṣr Qāyṭbāy, al-Awqāf 886, fols. 4-6, to name but a few.

³⁴Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *al-Tuḥfah al-Mulūkīyah*, 226.

³⁵al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:304.

inshā') to be considered the patron or is the one who undertakes the construction at his own expense the real one? Furthermore, in cases of the reconstruction of a building in ruins, are we entitled to credit the new monument to the patron whose name is on the new inscription or the previous patron?

The presence of phrases like "from his personal funds" (*min mālihi al-khāṣṣ*) or "has constructed [it] for" (*anṣha' a li*) found in some inscriptions on buildings, as well as a number of other oddities which exist in the inscriptions of some monuments, and discrepancies between the reports of chroniclers and *waqf* documents dictate great caution when deciding the question of patronage. For example, in the case of the *madrasah* of Khawand Barakah (Umm al-Sulṭān Sha'bān) constructed in 770/1368-69, the inscriptions clearly state that Sultan Sha'bān "has ordered the construction of this blessed *madrasah* for his mother" (*Amara bi-inshā' hādhihi al-madrasah al-mubārakah li-wālidatihi Mawlānā al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Ashraf Sha'bān*).³⁶ Yet the *waqfiyah* and the sources explicitly state that she is the one who commissioned (*anṣha' at, banat*) it and paid for its construction.³⁷

Another interesting case is presented by the complex of Faraj ibn Barqūq (803-813/1400-1411) in the desert, where all the inscriptions, except for one, mention that this sultan ordered its construction.³⁸ The only inscription which does not associate the construction of the *turbah* with the name of Faraj is that found in the interior of the northern mausoleum at the base of the dome. It reads: Sultan Barqūq "has ordered the construction of this blessed *turbah* . . . in the reign of his son Mawlānā al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Nāṣir Abū al-Sa'ādāt Faraj. . . ." (*Amara bi-inshā' hādhi[hi] al-turbah al-mubārakah Mawlānā al-Sulṭān al-Shahīd al-Malik al-Zāhir Abū Sa'id Barqūq . . . fī ayyām walidihi Mawlānā al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Nāṣir Abū al-Sa'ādāt Faraj. . .*).³⁹ The information provided by the sources indicates that Barqūq was the one who had selected the location for the construction of a *turbah* and had left a large sum for its erection. Al-Maqrīzī mentions that in his will (*waṣīyah*) Barqūq set aside 80,000 *dīnārs* for the construction of the *turbah* outside Bāb al-Naṣr and that he indicated that the surplus money was to be used for the acquisition of properties to be made *waqf* on the foundation.⁴⁰ There seemed to be no doubt in people's minds at the time as to who was the real patron since Ibn Taghrībirdī thought it important to correct their beliefs when he wrote:

People think that this *turbah* was built (*anṣha' ahā*) by al-Zāhir Barqūq before his death and they call it Zāhirīyah but this is not so, for none other than al-Malik al-Nāṣir Faraj built it after his father's death.⁴¹

It is clear that Barqūq did not witness the construction of the *turbah* and that Faraj probably was the one who gave the order to build it. However, since Barqūq expressed the wish to

³⁶van Berchem, *CIA, Égypte*, 1:279.

³⁷Hujjat Waqf Umm al-Sulṭān Sha'ban, Dār al-Wathā'iq 47; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:399; 'Alī Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Tawfiqīyah al-Jadīdah* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-'Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1980), 4:126.

³⁸van Berchem, *CIA, Égypte*, 3:316, nos. 205, 206, 207.

³⁹van Berchem, *CIA, Égypte*, 3:320, no. 212.

⁴⁰al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Ma'rīfat Duwal al-Mulūk*, 3/2:936-937.

⁴¹Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-'Āmmah lil-Ta'līf wa-al-Naṣh, 1963), 13:102.

build it, selected the location, and left the money to erect it, should we not consider him, as his contemporaries did, the real patron?

Another odd case is reported by Ibn Iyās who discusses a *madrasah* built in 859/1455 by the *nāzir al-khāṣṣ* al-Jamālī Yūsuf. He writes that "al-Jamālī began to construct a *madrasah* in the *ṣaḥrā'* for the sultan . . . and the expenditures for the work were paid out of his own money, not that of the sultan (*wa-kāna maṣrūf dhālika min māl nāzir al-khāṣṣ Yūsuf dūna māl al-sulṭān*). . . . He built a *zāwiyah* opposite this *madrasah* and a *ḥawsh* for the burial of the family of the sultan."⁴² Elsewhere, we read that the same amir restored (*jaddada*) a *madrasah*—the Madrasah Fakhrīyah—and placed on it an inscription in the name of the sultan.⁴³ Ibn Iyās's reports lead us to assume that we are faced here with a gift offered to Sultan Īnāl and his family.

Occasionally we find references to sultans' names in inscriptions on buildings built by amirs. For instance, we find an inscription on a wooden door in the mosque of Azbak al-Yūsufī (900/1494-95) which mentions the name of Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Abū al-Naṣr Qāytbāy and praises him.⁴⁴ Could the references to the name of a ruling sultan possibly indicate that the latter contributed to the construction of the building, donating money or building materials, and that as a gesture of gratitude his name would be mentioned in one of the inscriptions? The most interesting example is the one offered by the inscription on the mosque of Qānībāy built in 845/1441-42, which mentions the name of Sultan Jaqmaq.⁴⁵ Indeed, in that particular instance we know that when the sultan died in 857/1453 he was buried in the *qubbah* attached to the mosque. We also know that when the sultan's son died he too was buried in this mausoleum.⁴⁶ The questions raised here are, Why was the sultan buried in this mausoleum and why does his name appear in the inscription? Did Jaqmaq build this mosque and donate it as a gift or did Qānībāy build it?

The largest group of patrons was undoubtedly the military elite who would have had no trouble securing for themselves a permit to build a public building. However, one should not ignore the contributions of other groups such as members of the civilian elite, women, and rich merchants. Some women of the households of Mamluk sultans became actively involved in the construction of religious buildings, especially from the time of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's rule. Some of them, such as Sitt Hadaq (740/1339-40), built mosques; others built *madrasahs* like the *madrasah* of Umm al-Sulṭān Sha'bān (770/1368-69). A number of them patronized Sufi foundations or other charitable ones. Hence, Umm Anūk⁴⁷ built the *khānqāh* known under her name, the *khānqāh* of Ṭughāy in 749/1348; Khawand Ṭulbāy built hers in 765/1363-64. The daughter of Baybars al-Jāshankīr built the Ribāṭ al-Baghdādīyah in 684/1285-86.

⁴²Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:330-331, 367. The amount spent on the construction as reported by the author was 12,000 *dīnārs*.

⁴³Ibid., 291; see also al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 346.

⁴⁴van Berchem, *CIA, Égypte* 3:531, no. 356; 'Alī Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-Tawfīqīyah*, 4:115.

⁴⁵van Berchem, *CIA, Égypte*, 3:381, no. 260.

⁴⁶Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:300-303, 306; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 9:216-217.

⁴⁷Khawand Ṭughāy, also known as al-Khawand al-Kubrā, was a concubine of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad who later became his favorite wife. Ṭughāy, who was known for her beauty, had acquired great power and influence and, according to al-Maqrīzī, some *qādīs* and amirs would go so far as to kiss the floor in front of her as they would do for the sultan. Ṭughāy gave birth to a son Anūk, hence the title of Umm Anūk that al-Maqrīzī uses to refer to her foundation. Ṭughāy died in 749 leaving behind a great fortune. See al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:425-426.

A number of important religious foundations were built by civilians, patrons whose influential position and/or wealth earned them the privilege of erecting public buildings. Some were built by viziers, for instance, the *jāmi'* at Dayr al-Ṭīn rebuilt by Tāj al-Dīn ibn Ḥannā in 672/1273. Ibn Ḥannā, we are told, had moved to a new residence in the Bustān al-Ma'shūq. Realizing that the old *jāmi'* was too small for the inhabitants of the quarter, and for his own convenience (so as not to have to walk too far for the Friday prayer) he decided to tear down and rebuild the mosque in 672/1273.⁴⁸ Likewise, the vizier Sa'd al-Dīn Ibrāhīm al-Bashīrī rebuilt the *Jāmi'* Birkat al-Raṭlī when he decided to move to a new house nearby.⁴⁹

Members of the religious elite, especially *qādīs*, also rebuilt, restored, or built religious foundations. Qāḍī Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Umar al-Suyūṭī, *nāẓir bayt al-māl*, built the *Jāmi'* al-Suyūṭī in 671/1272. This mosque was restored and enlarged by Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-Bārizī, the *kātib al-sirr*, in 822/1419.⁵⁰ Qāḍī 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, one of the most famous patrons, is said to have commissioned a number of public buildings, among which was a *madrasah* dated 823/1420 at which he had the *khuṭbah* read, and behind which he added a *ribāṭ* for women, and a mosque in Būlāq built in 817/1414.⁵¹ Al-'Aynī and al-Bulqīnī both built *madrasahs*, while the *Jāmi'* al-Ḥanafī was built by Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī in 817/1414.⁵²

It is interesting to note that a number of mosques and *madrasahs* were built by influential officials who were converted Copts or of Coptic descent and/or rich merchants. Al-Maqrīzī mentions the *Madrasat al-Baqrī* built by Ra'īs Shams al-Dīn Shākir, one of the converted Copts who held the position of *nāẓir al-dhakhīrah* during al-Nāṣir Ḥasan's rule.⁵³ Al-Ṣāhib 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Shākir ibn al-Ghannām al-Qibṭī, who was a vizier, built and rebuilt the *madrasah* near al-Azhar.⁵⁴ Qāḍī Badr al-Dīn ibn Suwayd al-Miṣrī al-Mālikī (d. 829) built al-Madrasah al-Suwaydīyah. This individual was originally a Coptic merchant whose father was a poultry seller in Sūq Shanūdah.⁵⁵ Vizier Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ghanī ibn Niqūlā al-Armanī (of Armenian descent) built a *jāmi'* and a mausoleum in Bayn al-Sūrayn,⁵⁶ and 'Abd al-Bāqī ibn Ya'qūb, a *kātib* known as Abū Ghālib, built a *madrasah* near Qanṭarat al-Mūskī.⁵⁷

By the end of the fourteenth century, many of the religious officials who supervised *waqfs* were increasingly involved in the restoration of religious foundations. The work was often undertaken with the revenues derived from the *waqfs* but sometimes with the restorer's own money. We also note the growing interest of other civilians such as merchants or physicians in the construction or restoration of educational foundations. Thus

⁴⁸al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:298-299; Ibn Duqmāq, *Kitāb al-Intiṣār li-Wāsiyat 'Iqd al-Amṣār* (Cairo: n.p., 1893), 78.

⁴⁹al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:326-327.

⁵⁰Ibid., 315-316.

⁵¹Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:59; see also al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:327.

⁵²al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 378, 389; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:327; for other examples, see *ibid.*, 2:327-329.

⁵³Ibid., 391.

⁵⁴Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:57.

⁵⁵Ibid., 104; see also Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 8:111.

⁵⁶Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah*, 14:152.

⁵⁷al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 153.

we learn that the Ra'īs al-Aṭibbā' Ibn al-Maghribī built a *jāmi'* and next to it a *qubbah*.⁵⁸ Al-Maḥallī, a well-known merchant, built a *madrasah* on the Nile and restored the Jāmi' 'Amr.⁵⁹ Al-Maqrīzī mentions the Madrasah Musallamīyah built in the *khuff* of Bayn al-Sūrayn by Kabīr al-Tujjār Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Musallam (d. 776).⁶⁰

The close ties which existed between the merchant class and the religious class as well as the support of the former for the latter is well documented in the chronicles and biographical dictionaries. From these sources we learn that many rich merchants encouraged their children to get an education and often boasted of having sons who were members of the '*ulamā'*'. Furthermore, many religious scholars seem to have been involved in some type of trade at an early stage of their lives and sometimes even after they had been appointed to prominent positions.⁶¹ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī himself worked as a merchant before he dedicated his life to scholarship.⁶²

The case of Qāḍī Badr al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Suwayd al-Miṣrī, mentioned above, is relevant here since he had accumulated great wealth by investing in the Kārim trade in Yemen.⁶³ Qāḍī Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr al-Makhzūmī, known as Badr al-Dīn al-Damāmīnī, who held the position of *nā'ib al-ḥukm*, was also involved in trade. In fact this *qāḍī* died in 828/1424 while he was in India on business.⁶⁴ The direct involvement of the '*ulamā'*' in trade during the rule of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad may be inferred from Ibn Khaldūn's statement mentioning the emigration of the dealers from among the '*ulamā'*' and the merchants to Miṣr during the sultan's rule (*wa-raḥala arbāb al-baḍā' i' min al-'ulamā' wa-al-tujjār*).⁶⁵

Whatever the intent of the patrons when ordering the construction of a religious foundation, in order for it to provide its intended services, it needed fixed revenues. Such revenues were produced by *waqfs* which consisted mostly of buildings falling under categories three (domestic) and four (commercial/industrial) mentioned above. Although land represented an important part of the endowments, it seems that greater attention was given to investments in commercial properties such as the *wakālah*, *qaysārīyah*, *funduq*, *maṭbakh sukkar*, and *mi'ṣarah*, together with the construction/restoration of rental properties such as the *rab'*, *qā'ah*, *riwāq*, *ṭabaqah*, or *ḥawsh*. These foundations provide us with insights into investment practices as well as the transformation of the urban environment during Mamluk rule.

While the religious buildings remained as fixed landmarks, it was the secular buildings falling under categories three and four which defined the urban transformation of the quarters. The acquisition of large plots within the urban centers allowed patrons to restructure them in ways which suited their interests. The texts of *waqfiyahs* often allow us to follow what happened to a certain quarter when its land was acquired by the founder.⁶⁶

⁵⁸al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:328.

⁵⁹Ibid., 368.

⁶⁰Ibid., 401.

⁶¹Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 8:321; Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:356; al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, 191.

⁶²Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 2:196; Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:90, 269.

⁶³Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 8:111; Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:104.

⁶⁴Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 8:92; Ibn Iyās, *Badā' i' al-Zuhūr*, 2:98.

⁶⁵Ibn Khaldūn, *Ta'rīf* (Beirut: Dār al-Kātib al-Lubnānī, 1979), 351.

⁶⁶Ḥujjat Waqf al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn, al-Awqāf 1010; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Ḥasan, al-Awqāf 881; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Ashraf Barsbāy, Dār al-Wathā'iq 173; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān al-Ghawrī, al-Awqāf 882.

The sources also note the transformation of quarters due to the acquisition of their properties by rich owners. For instance, when al-Nāṣir Muḥammad decided to rebuild the Jāmi' al-Jadīd, he acquired a number of houses and appropriated part of the road. When the *jāmi'* was constructed the area around it became a prime location.⁶⁷

The pattern followed by patrons when planning their investments was to try to integrate the life of their quarters by building or reconstructing commercial and rental properties around their religious foundations. The advantages of having buildings clustered in one quarter were twofold. First, it allowed the *nāẓir* of the *waqf* to keep an eye on the foundations and control them. Second, from the economic point of view, it made sense especially if one takes into consideration the fact that water could be shared by more than one foundation (one *sāqiya* or *bi'r* could serve two or three buildings). Transportation of drinking water would also cost less and the collection of rents would be faster. In addition to these advantages, by constructing his secular buildings next to each other, a patron could avoid some of the building restrictions which the *sharī'ah* imposed on the proximity of buildings to each other, their architecture, their heights, and so on.⁶⁸ Rich and powerful patrons would invest in the construction of a number of such clusters throughout the city and thus be able to control the development of those quarters. Although such quarters usually developed around religious foundations,⁶⁹ sometimes patrons planned their religious foundations as part of a much larger project, as was the case with the foundation of Azbakīyah where the presence of the *birkah* (pond), rather than the mosque, was responsible for its development.⁷⁰

The booming trade of the fifteenth century gave impetus to the construction of a number of new commercial foundations such as *wakālahs*, and resulted in the growth of a new quarter, Būlāq, west of al-Qāhirah.⁷¹ According to the information provided by our sources, there was an increasing interest on the part of merchants and religious officials in the construction of either *wakālahs* or *qaysārīyahs*. Hence, Qāḍī Tāj al-Dīn al-Manawī built a *qaysārīyah* in 750/1349 and Qāḍī Jalāl al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī built another one in the same quarter (*khuff*) in 811/1408.⁷² Small industries based on imported agricultural produce, such as olives, were also increasing. Indeed, the *waqfiyahs* of sultans Barsbāy, Qāyṭbāy, and al-Ghawrī bear witness to the increase in the number of *maṭābikh sukkar* or *ma'āṣir*.⁷³ One notes that regardless of the class to which the patrons belonged, there was

⁶⁷al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:304-305; for other examples, see Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Inbā' al-Ghumr*, 208; al-'Aynī, *al-Sayf al-Muḥannad fī Sīrat al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad*, ed. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt (Cairo: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī lil-Ṭibā'ah wa-al-Nashr, 1967), 272. See also Doris Behrens-Abouseif, "The North-Eastern Extension of Cairo under the Mamluks," *AI* 17 (1981): 157-189.

⁶⁸For more information on this, see Fernandes, "Habitat et prescriptions légales" in *Habitat traditionnel dans les pays musulmans autour de la Méditerranée*, vol. 2: *L'histoire et le milieu*, Rencontre d'Aix-en-Provence, 6-8 juin 1984 (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1990), 419-426.

⁶⁹For example, the case of al-Zāhir, which developed around the Sultan's mosque, or the case of al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh or Sultan al-Ghawrī. See also *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:298-299.

⁷⁰For an interesting study on the development of Azbakīyah, see Doris Behrens-Abouseif, *Azbakiyya and Its Environs, from Azbak to Isma'il, 1476-1879* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1985).

⁷¹For further information on the growth of Būlāq, see Nelly Hanna, *An Urban History of Būlāq in the Mamluk and Ottoman Periods* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1983).

⁷²al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, 2:91.

⁷³Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Barsbāy, al-Awqāf 880; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Qāyṭbāy, al-Awqāf 888; Ḥujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān al-Ghawrī, al-Awqāf 882.

a growing tendency for them to invest in the construction of buildings which would produce greater revenues: *sūqs*, *qaysārīyahs*, and *ma'ṣarāhs*. These investments served no other purpose than to increase the patron's wealth.⁷⁴

As for real estate investment, patrons showed great interest in diversification. In areas around their foundations they built or rebuilt *rab's*, *ribāṭs*, *qā'ahs*, *riwāqs*, *ṭibāq* and *ḥawānīt* and endowed them as *waqfs*. Rich *wāqifs* would sometimes invest in the acquisition of whole quarters, as in the case of amir Mughultāy al-Jamālī, who acquired a large *ḥikr* land on which twenty-four properties were constructed.⁷⁵ Since the *ḥikr* was made *waqf*, the money collected from the lease of the land to the property owners was left under the control of the amir who was the *nāzir al-waqf*.⁷⁶

The restoration and rebuilding of urban properties as well as the creation of new urban centers never ceased to attract the interest of the Mamluks and other elite elements of society, who through their *waqfs* were transforming and restructuring the city of Cairo.⁷⁷ This paper has attempted to focus on some of the problems of the patronage of architecture in the Mamluk period. The discrepancies between some sources—chronicles and *waqfs*—and the inscriptions of the buildings themselves indicate that it is still difficult to know who the real patron of a building was. Identifying the patron or group of patrons still leaves us with the task of determining what factors influenced the choice of monuments to be built and the selection of their location. In this endeavor we benefit greatly by looking at

⁷⁴Even though revenue-producing foundations were placed under the umbrella of *waqfs*, the money collected exceeded, by far, the needs of the religious foundation on which they were made *waqf*.

⁷⁵*Ḥikr* (pl. *aḥkār*); a simplified definition of the term would be "long-term lease." In his discussion of the term, Claude Cahen wrote: "il s'agit d'une forme de louage à long terme et très souple, qui à la fois sauvegarde l'éminente propriété du propriétaire—ici l'État—, de l'autre donne au locataire une liberté d'usage plus grande que dans une ordinaire location. Les *aḥkār* dont il est question ici sont connus d'Ibn Mammātī, qui les dit tantôt bâtis, tantôt exploités en jardins"; "Contribution à l'étude des impôts dans l'Égypte médiévale," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 5 (1962): 270. The *ḥikr* as a long-term lease of land—built upon or used as orchards—was regulated by the *sharī'ah*. A freehold property could equally be held as *ḥikr* which the lessee could enjoy for a certain period of time. The lease of a *ḥikr* covered a period of time agreed upon between the two parties. The period could be ten to thirty years, but occasionally up to ninety years. A *ḥikr* was not always the property of the "state" since it could be bought from the *bayt al-māl* (public treasury), in which case it became private property of the individual. Usually, the lessee of the *ḥikr* agreed to pay the owner a lump sum, in addition to the monthly or yearly amount fixed by the lease. The money paid in advance granted the lessee the privilege of disposing of the land or the freehold property the way he wanted with the proviso that at the end of the lease, the land or property be returned to its owner in its original condition. During the Mamluk period the lease of *ḥikr* had become widespread, even though the practice was frowned upon by conservative jurists. Many of them opposed it since it often resulted in disputes between parties and/or claims of ownership by the lessees or their descendants. For information on the *ḥikr* during the medieval period, see Ibn Mammātī, *Kitāb Qawānīn al-Dawāwīn*, (Cairo: Maṭba'at Miṣr, 1943), 342. For interesting information on the practice and its developments during the Ottoman period, see Nelly Hanna, *Habiter au Caire: La maison moyenne et ses habitants aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1991), 168.

⁷⁶Hujjat Waqf Mughultāy al-Jamālī, al-Awqāf 1666; the passage dealing with the *ḥikr* is soon to be published by the present writer.

⁷⁷Hujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī, Awqāf 883, fols. 33-37, 128-157, provides a good example of how the urban center around the mosque of al-Azhar was restructured by al-Ghawrī who left his permanent imprint on the quarter. See also Hujjat Waqf Tatarkhān, daughter of Ṭashtumur, Awqāf 913, fols. 27-29, 34; Hujjat Waqf al-Sulṭān al-Ashraf Barsbāy, Awqāf 880, fols. 246-249, 249-261, to name but a few.

the information provided by sources such as legal opinions or epistles in addition to the accounts of the chroniclers. Indeed, these sources provide us with insight into the discourse taking place between scholars of the different schools of thought. Since many of the debates often dealt with issues concerned with the application of the law to daily life, for instance, the legality of some practices or innovations touching on religious matters, they may have had an impact on the planning of some types of religious buildings and their locations. The buildings in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn may represent a case in point as the patrons' choice of building type and architecture may have been influenced by the debates between Ḥanafīs and Shāfi'īs over the validity of the multiplicity of *khuṭbahs* in one urban center. Finally, thanks to the details they provide on the patterns of investment and the descriptions of the income-generating properties, *waqf* documents allow us to form a better picture of the relationship between power, wealth, and urban policies in the Mamluk period.