
MINISTÈRE DE L'ÉDUCATION NATIONALE, DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE



ANNALES ISLAMOLOGIQUES

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

AnIsl 37 (2003), p. 329-354

Ḥātim Maḥāmīd

Developments and Changes in the Establishment of Islamic Educational Institutions in Medieval Jerusalem.

Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

9782724711264	*La chapelle d'Osiris Ounnefer Neb-djefaou*	Laurent Coulon
9782724711752	*Guide du Caire Islamique*	Hadrien Collet
9782724711660	*Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études orientales 41*	Adrien Candiard (éd.)
9782724711745	*Bulletin archéologique des Écoles françaises à l'étranger (BAEFE)*	
9782724711271	*Du côté de chez Zeus*	Emmanuel Botte (éd.), Hélène Cuvigny (éd.), Michel Reddé (éd.)
9782724711677	*La Description de l'Égypte*	Paul-Marie Grinevald
9782724711714	*La pensée et la pratique pharmacologiques d'Avicenne*	Sylvie Ayari
9782724711899	*BCAI 40*	

© Institut français d'archéologie orientale - Le Caire

Ḥātim MAḤĀMĪD

Developments and Changes in the Establishment of Islamic Educational Institutions in Medieval Jerusalem

WHILE Muslim Jerusalem has been the subject of many research studies, such as those of H. Luṭfī, M. H. Burgoyne and others,[1] most of them have focused on social, economic, political or religious topics, or on the city's architecture. Specific studies regarding the history of Islamic education in Jerusalem have been few, though these have contributed to the knowledge of this field. Such are the studies of Yehoshua Fraenkel on the establishment of charitable endowments by the Ayyubid Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in Jerusalem: the *madrasa* (religious college) and the *ḫānqāh* (Sufi hostel). Likewise Fraenkel's article on Muslim educational institutions in Mameluke-era Jerusalem has added greatly to our understanding of education in the city during that period.[2]

Several important studies on the history of Islamic education and its institutions in Jerusalem are those of al-ʿAsalī and of ʿAbd al-Jalīl ʿAbd al-Mahdī.[3] These are, however, of a broad and general nature, relying upon the descriptive context of a survey of educational institutions rather than employing an analytical method. Their approach involved reviewing the issues relating to these institutions as described in primary sources such as "*Al-Uns al-Jalīl bi-tārīḫ al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl*," the work of Mujīr al-Dīn al-ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī, a 15th century Jerusalem historian.

Ḥātim Maḥāmīd, a lecturer in Tel Aviv University; Department of the Middle East and Africa. This article is based on my doctoral dissertation: "Islamic Education in Syria (Bilād al-Šām) in the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods, 569-922 /1173-1516," for the Ph.D. degree, Tel Aviv University, 1999. I wish to express my thanks here to my advisor, Prof. Michael Winter, for his guidance and advice during the preparation of my dissertation.

[1] These studies focus on the Mameluke period. See: Hudā Luṭfī, *Al-Quds al-Mamlūkiyya* (Berlin, 1985). Michael Hamilton Burgoyne, *Mameluke Jerusalem, an Architectural Study* (London, 1987).

[2] See: Yehoshuaʿ Fraenkel, "Kinnun Heqdesh (waqf) al-Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya bi-Yerushalayim bi-Yidei Salāḥ al-Dīn ha-Ayyubi" in Joseph Drory (ed. in Hebrew), *Eretz Yesrael bi-Tequfah ha-Mamlukit* (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 64-85. Y. Fraenkel, "Shtar Heqdesh Ayyubi bi-Yerushalayim, Waqf al-Ḫānqāh al-Ṣalāḥiyya", *Cathedra* 65 (in Hebrew), (September 1992), p. 21-36. Y. Fraenkel, "Mosdot Hinukh Muslemiyim bi-Yerushalayim bi-Tiqufah ha-Mamlukit (1250-1516)", in Rivka Feldhay and Emmanuel Ataex (eds. in Hebrew), *Hinukh vi-Historya*, (Jerusalem, 1994), p. 113-146.

[3] See: ʿAbd al-Jalīl Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Ḥaraka al-Fikriyya fī Ẓill al-Masjid al-Aqṣā fī al-ʿAṣrayn al-Ayyūbī wal-Mamlūkī* (Amman, 1980); ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris fī Bayt al-Maqdis* (Amman, 1981); ʿAbd al-Mahdī, "Al-Mu'assasāt al-Taʿlīmiyya wal-Ṭaqāfiyya fī Bilād al-Šām fī al-ʿAṣrayn al-Ayyūbī wal-Mamlūkī", in *al-Tarbiyya al-ʿArabiyya al-Islāmiyya: Al-Mu'assasāt wal-Mumārasāt* 2 (Amman, 1989), p. 597-612. Kāmil Jamīl al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid al-ʿIlm fī Bayt al-Maqdis* (Amman, 1981); K. J. al-ʿAsalī, *Waṭā'iq Maqdisiyya Tārīḫiyya* (Amman, 1983).

AnIsl 37 (2003), p. 329-354 Ḥātim Maḥāmīd

The aim of this study is to clarify the issues regarding the history of education in Jerusalem during the Late Middle Ages, particularly the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods (1187-1516). I will present data regarding the construction rate of Islamic educational institutions in the city and the considerations affecting this, in light of political, social, economic and religious developments and changes of circumstances in Jerusalem itself and in the surrounding areas, especially in Syria and Egypt. The study will also discuss the practices observed in the functioning of these educational institutions in the city, as described in *waqf* (charitable endowments) deeds of the period. These include the *waqf* deeds of Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn regarding his institutions in Jerusalem, and those of the Mameluke governor of Damascus, Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz, for his *madrasa*, al-Tankiziyya.

In the following pages, I shall also endeavor to present a comparison between the processes involved in erecting educational institutions in Jerusalem in the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods. Likewise, I shall draw what comparison is possible, highlighting the similarities and differences, between these institutions in Jerusalem and similar ones in other cities of the Ayyubid and Mameluke Empires, such as Damascus, Aleppo (Ḥalab) and Cairo. I contend that Jerusalem's geographic location and its status as a holy city aided in preserving and maintaining the charitable endowments of the city's educational institutions through the end of the Mameluke period. This is contrasted with the drastic reduction in educational activities in other cities throughout the Mameluke Empire, particularly those of Greater Syria (*Bilād al-Šām*).

In this study, I shall present statistical data and tables. These, however, do not constitute an authoritative survey. Rather, they represent a general tendency indicating phenomena and changes related to matters of education, and serve as a tool to aid in understanding the influence of historical developments on the city of Jerusalem regarding the topic under investigation.[4]

Islamic Education and its Institutions in the Shadow of the Muslim-Crusader Conflict

With the liberation of Jerusalem from Crusader control in the year 583/1187, the eastern regions of the Islamic hegemony were notable centers of religious education and culture, attracting students and teachers as well as religious scholars (*'ulamā'*). The Zangid rulers in Syria of that time, particularly the Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zangī, actively promoted the development of educational institutions such as the al-Niẓāmiyya[5] of Baġdād.

[4] In addition to other primary sources, the documents of the al-Ḥaram al-Šarīf Archive have served as a valuable source for researchers on various subjects in general as well as the specific topic of education. I wish to thank those responsible for the al-Ḥaram al-Šarīf Archive for allowing me to use these documents. Regarding the al-Ḥaram al-Šarīf documents, see Donald P. Little, *A Catalogue of the Islamic Documents from al-Ḥaram al-Šarīf in Jerusalem* (Beirut, 1984); D.P. Little, "The Significance of the Ḥaram Documents for the Study of Medieval Islamic History", *Der Islam* 57 (1980), p. 189-219.

[5] The *madrasa* was named for the Seljuk vizier Niẓām al-Mulk (d. 485/1092). He built several *madrasa*-s in the eastern Islamic countries bearing the same name (al-Niẓāmiyya) which served as a model for subsequent *madrasa*-s throughout the Islamic world.

These *madrasa*-s were common throughout the cities of Northern Syria such as Damascus, Aleppo, Hamat, Homs, Baʿalbek, Manbaj and others.[6] The Zangid rulers built their institutions according to the al-Niẓāmiyya model so as to reinforce the foundations of orthodox religious education, to counter the Šīʿī holdouts remaining from the Fatimids in Syria, and also to strengthen religious sentiment against the Crusaders. It should be noted that during this period Jerusalem and the coastal areas were under Crusader rule.

The occupation of Jerusalem by the Crusaders caused a sharp decline in the Islamic religious educational activities in the city, both in institutions and among the educated class. The Jerusalem mosques of al-Aqṣā and the Dome of the Rock (*al-Ṣaḫra*), as well as their associated educational institutions, were badly impaired by the Crusader policy of converting these facilities to serve their needs. This situation led to a massive emigration of *ʿulamā'* and their families from Jerusalem and its vicinity in favor of more secure locations, chiefly Syria which was then under Zangid rule. The emigration of *ʿulamā'* from the city during the Crusader period led not only to a decrease in the city's religious-educational activity, but also enhanced such activity in the locations where these scholars settled.[7] Damascus was the primary locus of attraction for the Jerusalem *ʿulamā'* and their students likewise, due both to the security under Zangid rule and to the opportunities afforded by the development of religious-educational activities with the construction of educational institutions in the city.

Many of these *ʿulamā'* who originated in Jerusalem, and their descendants as well, became well known in Syria and contributed significantly in the fields of education and religion there. They were prominent as founders of various educational and religious institutions, and also as teachers and functionaries, such as in the position of judge (*qāḍī*). The sons of Abū Šāma emigrated from Jerusalem to Damascus at the time of the Crusader conquest when their father was killed in 492/1099. One of Abū Šāma's descendants, Šihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān bin Ismāʿīl, known as Abū Šāma al-Maqdisī (d. 665/1267), gained renown as a historian and teacher in Damascus educational institutions.[8] Likewise the sons and descendants of Abū al-Faraj al-Šīrāzī, of Persian origin, emigrated from Jerusalem to Damascus due to the Crusader conquest. These descendants of al-Šīrāzī did much to strengthen the Ḥanbalī school of Islamic law (*Maḏhab al-Ḥanābila*) both in the Jerusalem area and in Damascus. They built educational institutions in Damascus as well as contributing in the field of instruction and preaching.[9]

[6] Šihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Maqdisī / Abū Šāma, *ʿUyūn al-Rawḍatayn fi Aḫbār al-Dawlatayn: al-Nūriyya wal-Ṣalāḥiyya* (Damascus, 1991), 1: p. 350, 351, 353, 355, 369-370; Ibn Ḫallikān, *Wafayāt al-Aʿyān, wa-Anbā' Abnā' al-Zamān*, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut, 1972), 3: p. 53; ʿIzz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Šaddād, *Al-Aʿlāq al-Ḫaṭīra fi Ḏikr 'Umarā' al-Šām wal-Jazīra* (Damascus, 1991) 1: p. 245; ʿAbd al-Qādir bin Muḥammad al-Nuʿaymī, *Al-Dāris fi Tārīḫ al-Madāris* (Beirut, 1981) 1: p. 401.

[7] Boʿaz Shoshan, "ʿUlama Yerushalmiyim 'u-Fuʿalam bi- Imperya ha-Mamlukit", in J. Drory (ed. in Hebrew), *Eretz Yesrael bi-Tiqufah ha-Mamlukit* (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 86-97; H. Maḥāmīd, "Al-ʿUlamā' al-Maqādisa wa-Dawruhum al-Ṭaqāfi fi Dimašq fi al-ʿAṣr al-Wasīṭ" in Ḫalīl ʿUda (ed.) *Yawm al-Quds 5* (Nablus, 1999), p. 44-64.

[8] See the biography of Abū Šāma regarding the migration of the first members of his family from Jerusalem to Damascus: Abū Šāma, 1: p. 70-73.

[9] See the biography of Abū al-Faraj al-Šīrāzī (d. 486/1093) and his family: Al-Nuʿaymī, *Al-Dāris fi Tārīḫ al-Madāris*, (Beirut, 1988), 2: p. 64-73, 79-86, 112-113; ʿImād al-Dīn abū Al-Fidā' Ismāʿīl ibn Kaṯīr, *Al-Bidāya wal-Nihāya fi al-Tārīḫ* (Aleppo, undated), 12: p. 248; *ibid.*, 13: p. 34-35, 91, 116, 132, 154; Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Rāfiʿ al-Sulāmī, *Al-Wafayāt* (Beirut, 1982), 2: p. 135-136; Muḥammad bin ʿAbdallāh al-Ḥanbalī al-Najdī, *Al-Suḥub al-Wābila ʿalā Ḍarā'iḥ al-Ḥanābila*, (Mecca, 1989), p. 499; Šihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Al-Durar al-Kāmina fi Aʿyān al-Mi'ah al-Ṯāmina* (Beirut, 1993), 4: p. 480; Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ṭūlūn, *Al-Qalā'id al-Jawhariyya fi Tārīḫ al-Ṣāliḥiyya* (Damascus, 1979), 2: p. 113, 143, 286, 340.

The main migration of Jerusalem's *ʿulamā'* as a result of Crusader pressure on the local Muslim population took place in the 6th/12th century. The year 551/1156 saw a mass emigration of the Ḥanbalite Banū Qudāma from the village of Jammāʿīl (Jammāʿīn) adjacent to Nablus. There was a similar migration of the educated elite from the nearby villages of Mardā, al-Sīla, Yāsūf, al-Dīr and others.[10] The Jerusalem *ʿulamā'* among the Banū Qudāma contributed to the building of al-Ṣalāḥiyya on the slopes of Mount Qāsiyūn, which later became a neighborhood of Damascus, and to that of other religious and educational institutions such as the Ḥanbalite mosque (*Jāmiʿ al-Ḥanābila*) and the renowned *madrasa*-s including al-ʿUmariyya and al-Ḍiyā'iyya, as well as other institutions in Damascus.[11] As the Banū Qudāma belonged to the Ḥanbalite school of Islamic law, this exodus of the senior Ḥanbalī scholars to Damascus resulted in a weakening of the Ḥanbalī adherents' base in the Jerusalem area. The Jerusalemite historian Mujīr al-Dīn al-ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī made note of this weakness in his work "*Al-Uns al-Jalīl bi-tārīḫ al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl*." Al-ʿUlaymī's version describes how, in the year 841/1437, at the end of the reign of Sultan Bārsbāy, a Ḥanbalī judge (*qāḍī)* was appointed after a period of nineteen years during which there was not a single Ḥanbalite *qāḍī* in Jerusalem. According to al-ʿUlaymī, this position of Ḥanbalī *qāḍī* also remained vacant at the end of the 15th century because no suitable candidate could be found and due to the small number of Ḥanbalis in the city.[12]

After Jerusalem's liberation by Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn from the Crusader occupation, the threat of a renewed Christian conquest was still present. Taking action to restore the Islamic character of the city, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn effected a purification by removal of the Christian symbols remaining on the al-Aqṣā and al-Ṣaḫra mosques. He revived the religious-educational activities in these mosques immediately following the first Friday prayer after the liberation. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn appointed the judge Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Zakī al-Qurayšī to serve as the Friday sermon preacher *(ḫaṭīb)* of the al-Aqṣā mosque.[13] In addition, the Sultan appointed the Ḥanbalī sheikh Zayn al-Dīn abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Najā as preacher delivering the weekday sermons (*al-waʿẓ*).[14]

Furthermore, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn saw to the establishment of educational and religious institutions to serve the Muslim population, notably several institutions which came to bear his name afterwards: al-Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya which served the adherents of the Šāfiʿī *maḏhab*, and al-Ḫānqāh al-Ṣalāḥiyya for the Sufis. In addition to these, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn endowed a hospital that likewise came to bear his name: al-Māristān al-Ṣalāḥī.[15] It is important to note that

[10] About the migrations of the banū Qudāma from the region of Jerusalem and Nablus, see Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 37-38; Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Al-Qalā'id...*, 1: p. 7, 68-83; *ibid*. (1979), 2: p. 388, 459, 475; Al-Nuʿaymī, 2: p. 100-101; Muḥammad Aḥmad Dahmān, *Fī Riḥāb Dimašq*, (Damascus, 1982), p. 35-44.

[11] About these institutions, see al-Nuʿaymī, 2: p. 91-99, 100, 435-438; Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Al-Qalā'id...*, 1: p. 130-140, 248-273; Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 55-56; Dahmān, p. 44-55, 57-59; Muḥammad Kurd ʿAlī, *Ḫiṭaṭ al-Šām* (Damascus, 1928), 6: p. 63, 99-100.

[12] Mujīr al-Dīn abū al-Yumn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī, *Al-Uns al-Jalīl bi-Tārīḫ al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl* (Amman, 1973), 2: p. 32, 263.

[13] Al-ʿUlaymī, 1: p. 332. See also *ibid*., 332-339 regarding the sermon delivered by the *qāḍī* ibn al-Zakī in the al-Aqṣā mosque on the first Friday following the liberation of Jerusalem by the Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.

[14] Al-ʿUlaymī, 1: p. 339; *ibid*., 2: p. 256. Regarding the role of the al-Aqṣā mosque as an educational institution, see al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 25-45; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, "Al-Mu'assasāt...,", p. 567-612; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Ḥaraka...*

[15] See al-ʿUlaymī, 1: p. 340-341; *ibid*., 2: p. 41, 47.

these three institutions were established by converting existing Christian buildings in Jerusalem. The church of St Ann (*Ṣand Ḥanna*) became al-Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya, while the Sufi hostel (*al-Ḫānqāh*) and the hospital (*al-Māristān*) were set up in Christian institutions adjacent to the church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem.[16]

In order to strengthen the Islamic character of these institutions, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn allocated a considerable quantity of *waqf* producing generous revenues, which were intended to serve as a base and continuing source of the institutions' funding. Yehoshua Fraenkel supports this contention in his research studies relating to the educational institutions in Jerusalem. Fraenkel maintains that Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn set up these first endowments in the city as a means of winning the support of religious figures in Jerusalem as well as in the countryside.[17] Other investigators have also studied the subject of endowments (*waqf*) and their tremendous influence on the Muslim community in the social, educational and economic spheres. Some researchers contend that the endowments served as a political tool to strengthen the position of the incumbent leadership.[18]

The primary feature characterizing most of these endowments during the Ayyubid period was their being based on properties belonging to the State Treasury (*Bayt al-Māl*) in the form of acts of charity (*waqf ḫayrī*). However, this feature changed in the Mameluke period to privately-funded *waqf* designated from private monies and property (*waqf ḏirrī/ahlī*), in the service of the Muslims, but nevertheless remaining as privately-held endowments in the hands of the *waqf* owner and his descendants. The endowments designated for the institutions of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn were primarily in Jerusalem and adjacent regions, including one-third of the State-owned estates (*iqṭāʿ*) in the city of Nablus.[19]

After the death of Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in the year 590/1193, the succeeding Ayyubid rulers continued his policy of consecrating educational institutions in Jerusalem and allocating *waqf* for them, as they were doing in the other areas of Syria and Egypt. However, it may be surmised here that the part played by the Ayyubid rulers in consecrating educational institutions in Jerusalem was minor in comparison with the activities of the subsequent Mameluke rulers in establishing educational and other institutions in the city. This claim can be reinforced through a discussion regarding the political struggles which took place among the heirs of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in the various areas of Syria, as well as the Crusader threat that continued to hover in the region during this period.[20]

[16] See, *ibid*., 1: p. 340-341; *ibid*., 2: p. 41, 47; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid*..., p. 61-62, 294-331; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris*..., p. 181, 343, 403.

[17] Refer to Fraenkel's research studies.

[18] Several researchers have discussed the use of *waqf* as a political instrument, see: Ira Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1967), p. 73-113; Ofer Peri, "The Waqf as an Instrument to Increase and Consolidate Political Power", *AAS* 17, (1988), p. 47-62.

[19] Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīḫ ibn al-Furāt* (Basra, 1967), 4, part 2: p. 88-89, 92-93. See regarding the *waqf* of Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn for his institutions in Jerusalem: ʿIzz al-Dīn abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Aṯīr, *Al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīḫ* (Beirut, 1983), 9: p. 186, 222; Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Wāṣil al-Ḥamawī, *Mufarrij al-Kurūb fi Aḫbār banī Ayyūb* (Cairo, 1957), 2: p. 230, 407, 408; Ibn Kaṯīr, 12: p. 351-352, 377; al-Muʾayyad ʿImād al-Dīn Ismāʿīl abū al-Fidāʾ, *Al-Muḫtaṣar fi Aḫbār al-Bašar* (Beirut, undated), 83; Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf bin Taġrībirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fi Mulūk Maṣr wal-Qāhira* (Cairo, 1958), 6: p. 54, 55, 59, 99; Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 332-333; Muḥammad Abšarlī and M. al-Tamīmī, *Awqāf wa-Amlāk al-Muslimīn fi Falasṭīn* (Istanbul, 1982), p. 31, 32, 35, 45; Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯāʾiq*..., p. 91-95. See also Fraenkel, "Kinnun..."; Fraenkel, "Shtar...".

[20] See: Maḥāmīd, "Ha-Hinnukh ha-Islami...", p. 180-191.

The political circumstances in the region of Greater Syria (*Bilād al-Šām*) in general and in Jerusalem in particular during the Ayyubid period, left their mark on developments in the city not only in matters of politics per se, but also on the educational-religious sphere. Sultan al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā, the son of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, apprehensive that the Crusaders might renew their hold on Jerusalem, was compelled to destroy the walls of the city in the year 616/1219. The impending threat of a renewed Crusader conquest of Jerusalem continued until this became a reality in 626/1228. This new occupation lasted until 642/1244, when the Ayyubid Sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb effected the city's liberation. Sultan Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb visited liberated Jerusalem in 645/1247 and ordered the rebuilding of the walls and that the city be fortified anew.[21]

Despite the restoration of Muslim rule to the city during this period, there remained a looming threat to the area in the form of Mongol incursions from the east. The struggle between the Mongols and the Mamelukes over the territories of Syria, and the Mameluke victory in the battle of ʿAyn Jālūt in 658/1260, brought about the collapse of Ayyubid rule in Syria and its subsequent annexation to the Mameluke domain in Egypt. These circumstances had a profound influence on Jerusalem and resulted in instability and a lack of security in the city. This situation was reflected in the educational system there, both by the low number of institutions established and the emigration of *ʿulamā'* and intellectuals (see Tables 1 and 2, following). Only eleven educational institutions were founded in Jerusalem during the Ayyubid period, and these primarily after Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's liberation of the city in 583/1197 and up until 616/1219 when the fears of a renewed Crusader conquest of the city began to spread. Among the *ʿulamā'* who fled Jerusalem in anticipation of a Crusader invasion was the teacher, Taqī al-Dīn ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245), of the al-Ṣalāḥiyya *madrasa.* He emigrated to Damascus despite his having held the highest position in the field of education in Jerusalem at that time.[22] Likewise, Šeiḫ Šaraf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUrwa al-Mūṣilī (d. 620/1223) relocated from Jerusalem to Damascus for similar reasons. In the year of his death, he managed to erect an institution for the study of *Ḥadīṯ* (the collected sayings of the Prophet Muḥammad) in the courtyard of Damascus' Umayyad mosque. This institution later became known as Dār al-Ḥadīth al-ʿUrwiyya.[23]

The Crusaders' renewed occupation of Jerusalem in the year 626/1228 brought about not only the emigration of *ʿulamā'* and members of the educated class from the city, but also a partial cessation of the *waqf* incomes that funded educational institutions there. These incomes, in addition to the appointment of positions associated with Jerusalem, were relocated to the city of Damascus. The emir ʿIzz al-Dīn Aybak al-Muʿaẓẓamī (d. 645/1247) who was the secretary (*ustadār*) to the Ayyubid Sultan al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā, the ruler of Damascus (al-Šām), transferred to Damascus the income of his *waqf* which had previously been dedicated to his *madrasa* in Jerusalem. ʿIzz al-Dīn Aybak rededicated this endowment in

[21] Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 77, 156; Ibn al-Aṯīr, 9: p. 378.

[22] Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 155; Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 20.

[23] Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 82; see also *ibid.* p. 82-89 regarding the Dār al-Ḥadīṯ al-ʿUrwiyya institution. About the Jerusalem ʿulamā during the period of the migrations, see: Shoshan, "ʿUlama..."; H. Maḥāmīd, "Al-ʿUlamā' al-Maqādisa...", p. 44-64.

626/1228 toward the expenses of holding lessons at the Umayyad mosque. The conversion of this *waqf* and its conditions to funding the *madrasa* he established in the Umayyad mosque would continue in this format until Jerusalem would be relieved of the threat of Crusader occupation. This *madrasa* came to bear his name: al-ʿIzziyya al-Ḥanafiyya.[24] In addition to this, there were two more institutions of the emir ʿIzz al-Dīn Aybak in Damascus with his name: al-ʿIzziya al-Barrāniyya and al-ʿIzziyya al-Juwwāniyya.[25]

The step taken by the Ayyubid ruler al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd in naming Šeiḫ Šams al-Dīn Yūsuf Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī to the position of weekday sermon preacher (*al-waʿẓ*) in the Umayyad mosque, underscores the high degree of interest in Jerusalem evinced by the Ayyubid rulers, and the exploitation of the city's holiness for their own political aims. Ibn al-Jawzī preached to the Muslims regarding Jerusalem's importance to Islam, thus effecting a strengthening of religious sentiment in calling for the liberation of the city from Crusader hands.[26]

Mameluke Contributions to Education in Jerusalem

Since the establishment of Mameluke rule in Egypt and the annexation of Syria to its hegemony, the region enjoyed relative stability, particularly after the final expulsion of the Crusaders from Syrian areas by the Mameluke Sultan al-Ashraf Ḫalīl bin Qalāwūn in 690/1291. Following the victory over the Mongols in the battle of ʿAyn Jālūt in the year 658/1260, the foundations of security and stability were strengthened throughout the Syrian territory, including Jerusalem. This enhanced stability supported an upswing in the pace of constructing educational and religious institutions in Jerusalem and the allocation of many endowments to fund them. Thus, educational and religious activity in the city was amplified. Table 1 demonstrates the differences and changes in the construction of these institutions during the various historical periods under Ayyubid and Mameluke rule:[27]

Period	Before 583/1187	583-658 1187-1260	659-803/ 1261-1400	804-922/ 1401-1516	(unknown)	**Total**
Number of Institutions	—	11	47	10	6	**74**

Table 1. Changes in the development of educational institutions in Jerusalem during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods.

It should be noted that there were other such institutions, primarily Sufi *zāwiya*-s, which were not included in this classification because they did not conduct educational and instructional activities, such as the study of *ḥādīṯ*, *fiqh* and other religious subjects. Those *zāwiya*-s fulfilled only functions of mystical worship and Sufi activities such as the reading of Sufi prayers (*awrād,* sing. *wird*). However, the inclusion of other Sufi institutions in

[24] Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 557-558.

[25] See about these *madrasa*-s: *ibid.*, p. 550-558; Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 175.

[26] Ḥamza bin ʿUmar ibn Sabāṭ, *Tāriḫ ibn Sabāṭ (Ṣidq al-Aḫbār)* (Tripoli, 1993): 1: p. 296.

[27] The tables about the educational institutions in this article were prepared by extracting data about institutions discussed by Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī, *Al-Uns al-Jalīl bi-tāriḫ al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl.*

this classification, like the *ḫānqāh*-s, *ribāṭ*-s or large *zāwiya*-s,[28] was due to their active role in the transmission of knowledge. Moreover, the present paper does not intend to elaborate on the issue of Sufi mystical activities.

It should be noted that at the beginning of the Ayyubid period, there was an apparent differentiation between the functions of the various institutions. By the late Mameluke period this differentiation became considerably less clear, causing educational and religious institutions to be perceived as more complex in their functioning. Therefore, different historical sources refer to numerous institutions in Jerusalem by different functional names (*madrasa, ḫānqāh, zāwiya, ribāṭ* or *turba*). Examples in Jerusalem abound: al-Tankiziyya, al-Dwādāriyya, al-Faḫriyya, al-Karīmiyya, al-Amīniyya, al-Darkāh, al-Naṣriyya, al-Awḥadiyya, al-Baladiyya, al-Jāliqiyya, Ribāṭ al-Mārdīnī, Ribāṭ al-Zamanī and others. It may be concluded therefore, that this phenomena had many similar manifestations in other areas of the Mameluke state as has been shown by scholars, such as Behrens Abouseif, Leonor Fernandes, Gary Leiser and others.

The above table shows a certain trend which reflects the changes and developments in the construction of educational institutions in Jerusalem between the various periods. It may be seen from the table that prior to the year 583/1187, while Jerusalem was occupied by the Crusaders, it was not possible to build educational institutions in the city. This contrasts with the building activity in the cities of Northern Syria such as Damascus and Aleppo that were under Zangid rule during that same period. During the Ayyubid period in Jerusalem, between the years 583-658/1187-1260, only 11 educational institutions were erected. The meager number of institutions during this period, compared with the Mameluke period following it, was a result of conflicts between the heirs of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, an additional factor being the threat and ensuing re-conquest of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, as noted above.

In the first Mameluke regime and until the Mongol incursions into the territories of Syria in 803/1400, Jerusalem enjoyed a period of flourishing development in the building of educational institutions of all kinds, similar to that taking place in other areas of Syria. In contrast, there was again a massive downturn in construction of educational institutions in Jerusalem during the last Mameluke period, particularly in the 9th/15th century. This phenomenon was also evident in the rest of the Syrian region. The causative factors included a diminished degree of stability and security, as well as a general regression in the economic level throughout the Mameluke state. Thus, the country suffered simultaneous political and

[28] The *zāwiya* was the designated place within a mosque or private home in which a renowned sheikh would sequester himself with his followers. The development of the *zāwiya* as an institution was an advancement in Sufi organizational practice and mysticism in Islam. For further discussion of the *zāwiya*, see: Leonor Fernandes, "Some Aspects of the *zāwiya* in Egypt at the Eve of the Ottoman Conquest", *AnIsl* 19 (1983), p. 9-17. The *ribāṭ* was also a gathering place to host Sufi groups, passersby and various religious figures. In early Islam the *ribāṭ* was a military institution that developed into a religious one. See about the *ribāṭ* in L. Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Ḫānqāh* (Berlin, 1988), p. 10-12; George Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges* (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 33-34; ʿImād ʿAbd al-Salām Raʾūf, *Madāris Baġdād fi al-ʿAṣr al-ʿAbbāsī*, (Baġdād, 1966), p. 45, 87, 107, 116-117. The *ḫānqāh*, another later development, was likewise an institution for Sufis and mystics. See about the *ḫānqāh* in L. Fernandes, *The Evolution...*; Al-Nuʿaymī, 2: p. 195; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 2: p. 194-197.

economic distress, especially following the Mongol raids on the Syrian territories, which brought looting, destruction, and widespread damage to many institutions, among them institutions of learning and study.

The picture of the changes in the number of educational institutions in Jerusalem emerging from the data shown in Table 1, differs from the patterns of change in the remainder of the cities of Northern Syria for each corresponding period. In the cities of Damascus and Aleppo, for example, the majority of educational institutions were erected during the Zangid and Ayyubid periods. The increase in the number and growth of educational institutions during the Mameluke compared with the Ayyubid period, which was characteristic of Jerusalem, was also seen in other cities under the influence of the Crusader rule along the Syrian coast and in Palestine, such as Tripoli (Ṭarāblus), Safed (Ṣafad), Hebron (al-Ḫalīl) and Gaza (Ġazza). These cities were affected by the same historical circumstances as those characterizing Jerusalem.[29]

Viewing these changes in comparison with those occurring in the educational institutions of Cairo described in the research of Jonathan Berkey, a contrasting picture emerges. At the close of the Ayyubid period and beginning of the Mameluke regime (up to the middle of the 13th century) some 32 institutions existed in Cairo. This number rose to 70 by the start of the 15th century, and jumped to over one hundred *madrasa*-s by the end of the Mameluke period.[30] The ongoing process of dedicating and developing educational institutions, which was manifest in Cairo to a greater degree than in cities of Syria, may be attributed to Cairo's position as the seat of Mameluke rule on the one hand, and the city's being spared the ravages of Mongol predation on the other. The resulting security and stability granted the new and ongoing educational institutions in Cairo favorable conditions relative to the situation in other areas of Syria during this period.

This unique state of affairs, manifested in the changes and developments in Jerusalem's educational system during the Mameluke period, was determined by several key factors:

First: unlike the cities of Northern Syria, Jerusalem was not greatly damaged by the three Mongol incursions in the area, in the years 658/1260, 699/1299-1300, and 803/1400.[31] Thus, Jerusalem maintained its political stability and internal security, conditions that prompted many of the educated class residing in Syria and outlying areas to migrate to the city. There were two major motives for this, Jerusalem's holiness, and the continuation of the educational activities in its institutions. This latter advantage was especially significant at a time when the major cities of Syria, such as Damascus, Aleppo, Homs and Hamat, lost many of their institutions and the *waqf* supporting them, most notably in the last Mongol invasion of Syria in the year 803/1400.

Blackmail and bribery became more widespread in the 9th/15th century, as the struggle intensified between rival factions among the Mamelukes, and among high-ranking office holders of the State, vying for positions of influence. In addition, the economic troubles

[29] Regarding comparisons between different cities of Syria (Bilād al-Šām), see: Maḥāmīd, "Ha-Hinnukh ha-Islami...", p. 195-201.

[30] Jonathan Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo* (Princeton, 1992), p. 45-46.

[31] Regarding the Mongol invasion in the area of Palestine, see: Reuven Amitai-Preiss, "'Al Shtei Pshitot Mongoliyot li-Eretz Yesrael", in J. Drory (ed.), *Eretz Yesrael bi-Tequfah ha-Mamlukit* (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 43-63.

and lack of security and political stability throughout Syria during this period had a negative impact on the level of educational activity. The educational system in Jerusalem was also harmed, though to a lesser extent than in Northern Syria. The conflicts arising from time to time between the governor and the w*aqf* administrator responsible for the holy sites in Jerusalem and Hebron (*Nāẓir al-Ḥaramayn al-Šarīfayn fī al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl*) had a negative impact on the policies and administrative practices of Jerusalem's educational system and the *waqf* supporting it. It should be noted here that the authority over the *waqf* and the holy places in Jerusalem was generally in the hands of the governor. This was the case until the regime of the Mameluke Sultan al-Nāsir Faraj (r. 801-815/ 1398-1412) who ordered that this responsibility be split off from the governor's authority. This change in the administrative structure of the *waqf* authority exacerbated the conflict of interests and power struggles between Jerusalem's governor and its *waqf* administrator, resulting in a negative impact on the situation of the endowments and the institutions depending on them for support[32].

Despite the circumstances hampering the educational activities in Jerusalem and the sources of their institutions' funding, the Mameluke rulers, particularly the Sultans, continued, to a great extent, to take care of the maintenance and functioning of the *waqf*. It is possible that this preferential intervention on the part of the Mameluke Sultans' favoring Jerusalem over other cities in ensuring ongoing *waqf* activity was due to its status as a Muslim holy city. This factor remained important in the continuation of educational activities in Jerusalem until the end of the Mameluke period. No such continuity was enjoyed by the Northern cities of Syria such as Damascus and Aleppo, where educational programs were significantly disrupted. During the reign of the Sultan al-Ašraf Bārsbāy (r. 825-841/1422-1437), the governor of Jerusalem, Emir Arkamās al-Jilbānī, worked toward operating the *waqf* and its upkeep by arranging for its expenditure on the educational system and its salaries. Sultan al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq (r. 842-857/1438-1453) maintained the same policy as his predecessor in relation to the educational system and the holy places.[33]

Of note is the fact that Jerusalem saw the founding of new and magnificent institutions of learning during the 15th century, at a time when there was a massive downturn of founding such institutions in the other cities of Syria. Even the existing institutions there, which had been damaged in the last Mongol invasion, did not rate renovations. Some of the celebrated new *madrasa*-s founded in Jerusalem in this period were al-Ṣubaybiya (est. 809/1406), al-Ḥasaniyya (837/1433), al-Jawhariyya (844/1440), al-Muzhariyya (885/1480), and the most important of all, the al-Ašrafiyya (al-Sulṭāniyya) *madrasa* (885/1480), named for the Sultan al-Ašraf Qāytbāy.[34]

[32] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 95, 285.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 96-97.

[34] The al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* was one of the largest and most splendid among the ten *madrasa*-s built in Jerusalem in the 15th c. Regarding the *waqf* of al-Ašrafiyya, see Abšarlī and Tamīmī p. 39-41. About other *madrasa*-s build in the 15th c., see al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 35-36, 37, 38, 43, 284; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 2: p. 109-110, 124-129, 140-149, 150-151, 156-173; Kurd ʿAlī, 6: p. 117-120; ʿĀrif al-ʿĀrif, *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tāriḫ al-Quds* (Jerusalem, 1986), p. 123, 208, 252-255.

In addition to the local Mameluke rulers, foreign political leaders and donors from outside the city also contributed to fostering religious education in Jerusalem. They designated *waqf* resources to finance salaries for educational and religious positions and the building of new educational institutions in the city. These donations occurred mainly during the last Mameluke period, in the 15th century. Various Ottoman and other Turkish rulers served as benefactors in these fields in Jerusalem, despite their not exercising political control in the city at the time. In 833/1429, the Ottoman Sultan Murād bin Muḥammad bin Bayezīd designated a *waqf* for the position of Quran reader in the al-Aqṣā mosque. Likewise, Ibrāhīm bin Muḥammad bin Qarmān, the Turkish emir of the Qarmān dynasty, dedicated a similar *waqf* in 858/1454. Moreover, the emir Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad bin al-Ġādir (al-Qādir) designated a *waqf* for the erection of a *madrasa* in Jerusalem in 836/1432, which became known by his name, al-Ġādiriyya. Similarly, in 840/1436, an Ottoman princess named Aṣfahān Šāh Ḫātūn, dedicated a *waqf* for the construction of a Jerusalem *madrasa*, named al-Madrasa al-ʿUṭmāniyya.[35]

Second: The administrative class that developed in Jerusalem during the Mameluke period was an additional factor aiding the development of education in the city. Until the second half of the 8th/14th c., Jerusalem was under the administrative authority of the governor of Damascus. By the end of that century, the city served as an independent province (*niyāba*), with its governor appointed directly by the Mameluke Sultan in Cairo and not, as had previously been the case, by the governor of Damascus.[36]

At the end of the 8th/14th century Jerusalem also gained independence in the administration of Islamic jurisprudence (*al-qaḍā'*), with the appointment of four judges to represent each of the four orthodox schools of Islamic law: the Šāfiʿī, the Ḥanafī, the Mālikī and the Ḥanbalī. Initially, the Šāfiʿī *qāḍī* was in charge of administrative matters in Jerusalem, due to the fact that most of its inhabitants at that time were Šāfiʿī. However, in the year 784/1382, the Sultan al-Ẓāhir Barqūq appointed an additional *qāḍī* from among the Ḥanafīs. Subsequently, the Sultan al-Nāṣir Faraj bin Barqūq appointed a separate *qāḍī* for Mālikī affairs in 802/1399, and another representing the Ḥanbalī-s in 804/1401.[37] The appointment of these four judges in Jerusalem testifies to two principle trends: the development of Jerusalem's administrative and authoritative status, and the relative strength of the four orthodox schools of Islamic law among its inhabitants.

The jurisdiction of these judges was not focused solely on matters of the religious-legal system, but had more extensive applications. These included the supervision of institutions of religious instruction, teaching, the appointment and dismissal of teachers, supervision of the *waqf* and the management of orphans' finances and their institutions, and additional

[35] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 36, 40, 100; Kurd ʿAlī, 6: p. 118, 120; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 2: p. 119-123, 130-139; Al-ʿArif, p. 208, 253, 254; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 94, 135.

[36] The change in Jerusalem's administrative status apparently began at the end of the 14th c., from the reign of the Sultan al-Ẓāhir Barqūq (784-801/1382-1398). See regarding this: Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 282; Yūsuf Darwīš Ġawānma, *Tārīḫ Niyābat Bayt al-Maqdis fi al-ʿAṣr al-Mamlūkī*, (Amman, 1982), p. 13-26; ʿAlī al-Sayyid ʿAlī, *Al-Quds fi al-ʿAṣr al-Mamlūkī*, (Cairo, 1986), p. 33-40; H. Luṭfī, p. 154-168.

[37] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: 118-119; Eliyahu Ashtor, "Yerushalayim bi-Yemei ha-Binayim ha-Mi'uharim", in *Yerushalayim: Mihqarei Eretz Yesrael* 5 (1954/55), p. 92-93.

authorities. The judges were active in developing the institutions under their authority, both out of personal interest and as a way to strengthen the school of Islamic law to which each of them belonged. This was also the policy practiced in the important cities of the Ayyubid and Mameluke regimes in Syria and Egypt, though at a different rate and timing. It was often the case that the judges in Jerusalem were given additional jurisdiction over adjacent cities. Thus, the father of the historian Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī served in the position of Ḥanbalite *qāḍī* in Jerusalem and was additionally responsible for the judicial authority of the cities of Hebron, Ramle, Nablus and Gaza. He retained this position until his death in the year 873/1468.[38]

Third: The holiness of Jerusalem was considered to be a significant feature, a factor attracting Muslims throughout all these periods. This quality of the city served as a focus of study for several scholars, including Emmanuel Sivan, Hudā Luṭfī, K. R. Schaefer, and others.[39] The concern of the Ayyubid and Mameluke rulers for building educational and religious institutions, and the dedication of *waqf* for them, was for the primary benefit of Islamic scholars (*ʿulamā'*), teachers, pupils, and Sufis. Additionally, the general population enjoyed the fruits of these facilities directly or indirectly. The holy status of Jerusalem in Islam served as a lodestone attracting the attention of the various rulers, the *ʿulamā'* and the educated classes during the historic period under discussion. The dedication of *waqf* to educational and religious institutions in Jerusalem had great significance. It led to the rulers insisting on the appointment of a special official to deal with the affairs of the holy places, known as "*Nāẓir al-Ḥaramayn al-Šarīfayn fī al-Quds wal-Ḫalīl*" (the Administrator of the Holy Sites in Jerusalem and Hebron).

Jerusalem, like other Syrian cities, had served as a destination for internal exile of unwanted Mamelukes, whether by their own choice or because they were ordered by the Mameluke rulers to remain under supervision.[40] The exiles, known as *baṭṭālūn*, were usually given enough resources (*ṭurḫān*) to secure their living. Many of them had endowed *waqf* to sustain *ʿulamā'*, Sufis as well as various religious purposes by erecting religious and educational institutions in the city. One conclusion, which emerges when reviewing the biographies of several Mameluke exiles in Jerusalem, is that it was their religious background, which made them prefer Jerusalem over other places in the area.

There are numerous examples of Mameluke exiles who opted for Jerusalem and later endowed *waqf* in the city: the emir Manjak (d. 776/1374), who dedicated his *madrasa*, al-Manjakiyya; the emir Sayf al-Dīn Ṭāz al-Nāṣirī (d. 763/1361) who erected al-Ṭāziyya; Ṭaštamur bin ʿAbdallāh al-ʿAlā'ī (d. 786/1384) the founder of al-Ṭaštamuriyya; the emir Arġūn al-Kāmilī (d. 758/1357) and his al-Arġūniyya, and so on.[41] Numerous rulers of

[38] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 262-267; Al-Najdī, p. 384-385.

[39] See: Emmanuel Sivan, "Qedushat Yerushalayim ba-Islam bi-Tequfat Masa'ei ha-Tslav", in Joshua Prawer and Haggai Ben-Shammai (eds.), *Sefer Yerushalayim: Ha-Tequfa ha-Tsalbanit ve-ha-Ayyubit* (Jerusalem, 2000/2001), chapter 10; Joseph Drory, "Jerusalem during the Mameluke Period", *Jerusalem Cathedra* 1 (1981); H. Luṭfī; Karl R. Schaefer, *Jerusalem in the Ayyubid and Mameluke Era* (Ann Arbor, 1985).

[40] See: Aḥmad bin ʿAlī al-Qalqašandī, *Ṣubḥ al-Aʿšā fī Ṣināʿat al-Inšā* (Beirut, 1987), 7: p. 219-220.

[41] Regarding those Mamelukes, see: Ibn Ḥajar, *Al-Durar...*, 4: p. 360-361; *ibid.*, 2: p. 214-215; *ibid.*, 1: p. 352-353.

Damascus and other regions of Syria as well as unwanted Mamelukes in Egypt were also exiled to Jerusalem, examples being al-Ṭanbuġā al-ʿUṭmānī and Bardibek al-Ẓāhirī.[42]

Travelling to worship (*ziyāra*), at the holy sites in Jerusalem and Hebron was the aspiration of many Muslim pilgrims and clergymen.[43] Even during the period of Crusader dominion, devout Muslims from distant regions would fulfill the religious commandment of pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Such was done by the sheikh Quṭb al-Dīn al-Naysābūrī (d. 578/1182) when he visited the city before Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Zangī appointed him to various positions in the religious and educational systems in Aleppo.[44]

The phenomenon of *ʿulamā'* and their students migrating from one region to another of the Islamic world has been a subject of study by several researchers, each focusing on the various political, economic, religious and educational motives.[45] As regards the immigration of *ʿulamā'* and students to Jerusalem, an upswing would occur during periods in which the security was more stable. The rise in the city's status during the Mameluke period, following the removal of the Crusader threat, increased its appeal to religious scholars, students, and various Sufi movements and Muslim pilgrims. (See Table 2).

Origin	**Before 658/1260**	**658-803 1260-1400**	**After 803/1400**	**Total**
Local (including the various regions of Syria)	6	31	165	202
Iraq and the East	1	16	26	43
North Africa & Andalusia (the Maghrib)	1	4	21	26
Egypt	-	4	9	13
Other	-	1	4	5
Unknown	2	15	36	53
Total	**10**	**71**	**261**	**342**

Table 2. *ʿUlamā'* in Jerusalem during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods, according to their places of origin and period of their deaths.[46]

The data included in this table must not be considered as absolutely reliable, and do not constitute an authoritative survey. However, they can be seen as pointing to a certain tendency and phenomenon occurring in Jerusalem during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods.

[42] See: Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ṭūlūn, *I'lām al-Warā bi-man Waliya Nā'iban min al-Atrāk bi-Dimašq al-Šām al-Kubrā*, (Damascus, 1984), p. 48-49, 62, 87-88, 155.

[43] See Shoshan 1992: p. 86-97.

[44] Abū Šāma, 1: p. 376.

[45] About the migration of *ʿulamā'* in the region of Syria, see: Maḥāmīd, "Ha-hinnukh ha-Islami...", p. 9-73. About the migration of *ʿulamā'* in the areas of Persia and Egypt, see: Richard W. Bulliet, "A Quantitative Approach to Medieval Muslim Biographical Dictionaries", *JESHO* 13, (1970), p. 195-211; Carl F. Petry, *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1981).

[46] The tables about the *ʿulamā'* in this study were prepared with data on *ʿulamā'* taken from the work of Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī, *Al-Uns al-Jalīl*...

As can be seen, the figures show that the number of *ʿulamā'* and men of learning in Jerusalem was on the rise, up through the end of the Mameluke period, the opposite of the trend found in the Northern cities of Syria, such as Damascus and Aleppo.[47] The meager number of *ʿulamā'* and educated persons during the Ayyubid period (before 658/1260) was a direct result of political circumstances characteristic of Jerusalem at that time, such as the internal struggles among the Ayyubid rulers as well as the Crusader threat. These factors forced many of Jerusalem's *ʿulamā'* to emigrate and head for Damascus and other, safer areas. This phenomenon is also in keeping with the reduced number of educational institutions founded during the Ayyubid period in Jerusalem, compared with the other areas of Syria and Egypt.

After the liberation of Jerusalem by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 583/1187, the number of visitors to its holy sites grew, among them Sufi adherents from Eastern countries. Some of the pilgrims who visited Jerusalem at this time preferred lodgings in the holy places themselves (*mujāwara*), to seclude themselves in one of the designated places (*zāwiya*) within the al-Aqṣā mosque. Such was the case with the sheikh ʿAbdallāh al-Armanī (d. 631/1233), who came from the East to visit Jerusalem.[48]

From a study of the biography of the sheikh Burhān al-Dīn ibn Jamāʿa (d. 675/1276), it becomes apparent that the proximity to the holy places was an attraction sought by many *ʿulamā'*, who preferred to remain in Jerusalem after their visit. It was the devout desire of ibn Jamāʿa, whose origins were the city of Hamat in Northern Syria, to dwell in Jerusalem and upon his death, to be buried there near the holy sites.[49] Ibn Jamāʿa's descendants served in key positions in the city during the Mameluke period, particularly in matters regarding education and religion.[50]

Various Mameluke rulers contributed much in the way of assistance and *waqf* to support sheikhs and Sufi movements in Jerusalem. Apart from the city's holiness, these endowments served as an additional incentive to attract religious scholars, students and Sufi groups from abroad. The number of Sufi institutions was estimated to be over thirty, among them facilities of the *zāwiya, ribāṭ* and *ḫānqāh* type, the great majority of whom were founded during the Mameluke period.[51] In the year 706/1306, for example, a group of Sufis came from Persia, including nearly a hundred devotees with their leader, the sheikh Burāq al-ʿAjamī.[52] Some of these Sufi adherents preferred to remain in the city, close to the holy sites, and built themselves *zāwiya* facilities for their use. Thus did the followers of the Sufi sheikh ʿAlā' al-Dīn ʿAlī al-ʿIšqī al-Busṭāmī, who came from Ḫurāsān (Persia) and built the *zāwiya* named for him: al-Busṭāmiyya.[53]

[47] For comparison with the data on the Damascus during this period, see: Maḥāmīd, "Ha-hinnukh ha-Islami...", p. 24.

[48] Ibn Kaṯīr, 13: p. 128-129; Al-Nuʿaymī, 2: p. 196.

[49] See about Burhān al-Dīn ibn Jamāʿa: Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 150-151; Shoshan, 88-89; Kamāl S. Ṣalībī, "The Banū Jamāʿa: A Dynasty of Shafiʿite Jurists in the Mameluke Period", *StudIsl* 9 (1958), p. 98-99.

[50] For additional information on the Banū Jamāʿa, see: Shoshan, p. 88-92; Ṣalībī, p. 97-111.

[51] There are differing opinions and changes in the definition of Sufi institutions in Jerusalem and their exact number. See ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 1: p. 400-442; *ibid.*, 2: p. 194-226; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Ḥaraka...*, p. 74-78; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 315-368.

[52] Ibn Kaṯīr, 14: p. 48; Al-Nuʿaymī, 2: p. 250-251.

[53] Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba, *Tārīḫ ibn Qāḍī Šuhba*, (Damascus, 1977), 3: p. 442.

Political Considerations in the Construction of Educational Institutions in Jerusalem

The political considerations involved in constructing educational and religious institutions and designating *waqf* for them, particularly in the Mameluke period, have been dealt with by several researchers. David Ayalon considers the increase in building these institutions and dedicating *waqf* to support them, in the various regions of Syria and Egypt, to be an overtly political act on the part of the Mamelukes. In his view, the Mamelukes were motivated by a desire to improve their standing within the Muslim community. Having formerly been slaves who became freedmen and masters in their own right, they sought to enhance the legitimacy of their authority. By means of commissioning *waqf*, they aimed to ensure their future – politically, economically and socially – in the territories under their rule.[54] Jonathan Berkey also devotes a separate chapter to a discussion of the political considerations in establishing *waqf* and educational and religious institutions in Mameluke Cairo, in addition to the religious and financial aspects.[55] Michael Chamberlain, in his study of education in Damascus through the period from 1190 to the mid-14th century, contends that by means of building educational institutions in the city, the rulers reinforced their power and political influence in the region.[56] The researcher Ira Lapidus also focuses on the political motivations underlying the dedication of *waqf* in the cities of Syria.[57]

It is true that Jerusalem's religious status held significance in the rulers' eyes, but for some this additionally served as a tool for political leverage, strengthening their control of the city. Such was the case with the Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn directly following Jerusalem's liberation from Crusader dominion. The three institutions he consecrated in the city at that time were converted from Christian facilities. He designated substantial *waqf* from the State Treasury to provide funding for their activities in the city and its surroundings. Nevertheless, it is difficult to distinguish between purely religious-educational motives and those based on political considerations. However, it may be seen that the political and economic motives were more prominent in the Mameluke period than in the Ayyubid. The political considerations for building educational and religious institutions in Jerusalem were notable in two aspects.

a. Strengthening the Religious Streams of Sunni Islam

On the one hand, the building of educational and religious institutions during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods aided the campaign against the Šīʿa and against the Crusaders, while on the other it helped in supporting the Sunna and reinforcing its orthodox schools of Islam. These are the two contexts discussed by researcher George Makdisi in his various studies

[54] See regarding this context: David Ayalon, *The Moslem City and the Mameluke Military Aristocracy* (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 327-328.

[55] Berkey, p. 130-134.

[56] Michael Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190-1350* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 91-100. On religious life in Syria in general and in Damascus in particular, see: Louis Pouzet, *Damas au VII^e-XIII^e: vie et structures religieuses d'une métropole islamique* (Beyrouth, 1991).

[57] Lapidus, p. 73-78.

on the growth emergence of the *madrasa* and other educational institutions in the Eastern regions (Iraq and Persia). He elaborates on the subject of the Sunni revival and the major role played by the *madrasa* in this process.[58]

Šīʿism aroused in Syria a direct, widespread and conscious reaction, especially in the Zangid and Ayyubid periods, a reaction, which took a more active form in the Northern areas where Šīʿism's hold was stronger. As a result, acute conflicts developed in those areas, between Sunnī and Šīʿī adherents, such as when the first Sunnī *madrasa* al-Zajjājiyya was established in Aleppo at the beginning of the 6th/12th century. In the southern parts of Syria and in Egypt, however, this phenomenon was much less apparent; in other words, local circumstances had a crucial impact on the underlying motives for the establishment or development of religious institutions.

The rulers' policies and their personal affiliation with one of the orthodox schools of Islam were major factors in the context of dedicating educational institutions. In addition, their political and military activities aimed at promoting the orthodox schools and their reinforcement. Meanwhile, the rulers of Syria and Egypt, had a crucial impact on this issue. In addition, they acted against the remains of Šīʿī habits and innovations.

The Ayyubid rulers belonged to the Šāfiʿī rite, with the exception of al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā, who was a Ḥanafī (unlike the rest of his dynasty). The majority of the Mameluke rulers, however, were of the Ḥanafī school. Both the Ayyubid and the Mameluke rulers, endeavored to strengthen the school of Islam to which they belonged, although they were tolerant of the other orthodox schools, at times even to the extent of establishing institutions for their use.[59]

The Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn began by founding educational institutions for the Šāfiʿī school, which was his own and also the most prevalent school of Islam in Syria. His *madrasa* in Jerusalem, the al-Ṣalāḥiyya, occupied a central and leading position among the educational institutions subsequently erected, both in terms of the magnitude of its *waqf*, its organization and structure, as well as its having the best of instructors and *ʿulamā'* chosen to serve on its staff. The sheikh of the al-Ṣalāḥiyya *madrasa* was referred to by the title, "*Šayḫ al-Islām*", and his position was considered to be one of the three highest and most important in the city, the others being Jerusalem's governor and the official supervising the holy sites there. In recognition of the exalted status of the instructor of the al-Ṣalāḥiyya *madrasa* (*Šayḫ al-Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya*), its incumbent was appointed upon the direct authority of the Sultan in Cairo.

The adherents of the Ḥanafī school of Islam in Jerusalem enjoyed the support of the Ayyubid ruler al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā, governor of Damascus (al-Šām), who himself was a Ḥanafī, as noted above.[60] He endeavored to strengthen the Ḥanafī rite in the areas of Syria under his dominion, by allocating endowments, erecting educational institutions, and granting

[58] G. Makdisi, *The Rise...*, p. 9-10; G. Makdisi, *History and Politics in Eleventh Century Baghdād* (Great Britain, 1990); G. Makdisi, "Muslim Institutions of Learning in Eleventh Century Baghdād", *BSOS* 24 (1961), p. 1-56.

[59] Many rulers used their endowments and appointments to offices as a means of increasing their influence within the Muslim community. See: Peri, "The Waqf..."; Lapidus, p. 107-115, 130-142, 189-190.

[60] About the higher education of al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā and his contributions to the field of education, see: Ibn al-Aṯīr, 9: p. 374; Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 403, 584.

financial aid and support to Ḥanafī students and scholars. The most Ḥanafī significant endowments designated by the Sultan al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā were those of his two *madrasa*-s: al-Muʿaẓẓamiyya in Damascus and al-Muʿaẓẓamiyya in Jerusalem. In addition, he also built the al-Nāṣiriyya and al-Naḥawiyya *madrasa*-s in Jerusalem.[61] During the Mameluke period, the majority of new *madrasa*-s erected by the rulers were for the followers of the Ḥanafī rite. This was demonstrated in the case of al-Madrasa al-Tankiziyya, founded by the ruler of Damascus, the emir Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz (r. 712-740/1312-1339).[62]

The Mālikī school of Islam's supporters, whose origins were mainly in North Africa (Maġāriba) or Andalusia (Muslim Spain), were well integrated into the Jerusalem population and received the necessary governmental backing to foster their existence there. During the Ayyubid period, the ruler al-Malik al-Afḍal ibn Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (d. 622/1225) was supportive of the Maġribī Jerusalemites. In the year 592/1195, he built a *madrasa* for them, known by his name, al-Afḍaliyya. He furthermore created a separate residential neighborhood in Jerusalem, called the Ḥarat al-Maġāriba, for the absorption of Maġrib residents, and dedicated *waqf* as a source of livelihood and funding for the community's institutions.[63]

Jerusalem's population continued to absorb wanderers and visitors from the Maġrib and Andalusia until the end of the Mameluke period. Due to its holiness and relative stability in terms of the political framework and security matters, Jerusalem became a place of refuge to many Maġribī-s and Andalusians who were escaping eastward. Maġribī immigrants found offices and positions of employment in the fields of education and religion, in the institutions belonging to the Mālikī school of Islam.[64]

The status of Jerusalem's Maġribī and Andalusian residents rose even higher during the Mameluke period, when the community was given autonomy in managing its legal affairs, upon the appointment of an independent Mālikī *qāḍī* in the year 802/1399. Similarly, the sheikh Mūsā al-Maġribī (d. 800/1397) succeeded in obtaining a separate praying area for Maġribī-s, who were adherents of the Mālikī rite. This area was located in the courtyard of the al-Aqṣā mosque, on its western side, and later developed into a separate mosque for the Maġribī population, which was given the name, Jāmiʿ al-Maġāriba.[65]

In addition to these institutions and positions, the Maġribī-s in Jerusalem were organized as a separate social entity, administered by one of the notable figures within the Jerusalem Maġribī community. The position was titled, "*Mašyaḫat al-Maġāriba*" ("Sheikh of the Maġribī-s"). The Sheikh of the Maġribī-s was responsible for administering the community's affairs in the social, religious and educational spheres. This position became more prominent

[61] See regarding the institutions of al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā: Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 583-585; Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 34; Kurd ʿAlī, 6: p. 117; Al-ʿĀrif, p. 240; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 1: p. 351-358; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Ḥaraka...*, p. 121, 122.

[62] See the *waqf* deed (*waqfiyya)* of the emir Tankīz for his *madrasa* in Jerusalem (al-Tankiziyya*)*: Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯā'iq...*, 1: p. 108-121.

[63] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 46; regarding the Maġribī neighborhood in Jerusalem, see H. Luṭfī, p. 235-236; ʿAlī, *Al-Quds...*, p. 77-79; See also regarding the good relations enjoyed by the Maġribī in Damascus and other areas of Syria: Muḥammad bin Aḥmad ibn Jubayr, *Riḥlat ibn Jubayr,* (Beirut, 1984), p. 258, 259, 261; Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Riḥlat ibn Baṭṭūṭa: Tuḥfat al-Nuẓẓār wa-ʿAjā'ib al-Asfār* (Beirut, 1985), p. 104-105; See also the study of ʿAlī Aḥmad, *Al-Andalusiyyūn wal-Maġāriba fi Bilād al-Šām* (Damascus, 1989).

[64] Regarding the endowments of the Maġribī-s in Jerusalem, see: Gideon J. Weigert, "ʿAl Heqdesh abū Madyan ha-Magribi bi-Yerushalayim", *Cathedra* 58 (2001), p. 25-34.

[65] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 244.

at the end of the 8th/14th century, beginning with the regime of the Mameluke Sultan al-Ẓāhir Barqūq. It was he who made this position a direct political appointment by the Sultan in Cairo, as was done with other high-level offices in the State.[66]

There were relatively few adherents of the Ḥanbalī school of Islam living in Jerusalem during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods. The Crusader conquest resulted in a massive emigration of Ḥanbalī adherents from the Jerusalem area, such as that of the Banū Qudāma to the city of Damascus in the year 551/1155. On the other hand, the Ḥanbalī-s did not receive the requisite support and sustenance from the government, as was the case with adherents of the other orthodox Islamic schools. The rulers of the Zangid dynasty were themselves Ḥanafī and endeavored to strengthen that school of Islam in Syria, although they provided support to institutions of the Šāfiʿī rite as well. In contrast, as noted above, the Ayyubid rulers were Šāfiʿī and directed their efforts toward reinforcing that school, as was done by the Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.[67] The Mamelukes, for their part, were Ḥanafī and directed their support accordingly. Therefore, it was clear that of the four orthodox schools of Islam, the two most prevalent in the area of Syria were the Šāfiʿī and the Ḥanafī. This was the case in terms of the number of adherents as well as the number of institutions and the *waqf* funds supporting them, compared with the other Islamic institutions of that time.

The Ḥanbalī-s in the region of Syria lacked a political patron. For *waqf* support to fund their community's needs, they had to rely almost entirely upon their own resources or upon contributions from the wealthy and the merchant class. A review of the various institutions and endowments for the Ḥanbalī-s in the Syrian cities reveals that the majority were established by Ḥanbalī *ʿulamāʾ*, merchants, and wealthy supporters. Even though an independent *qāḍī* was appointed in Jerusalem in the year 804/1401 to serve the needs of the Ḥanbalī-s, there were few adherents of this rite in the city, as noted by the historian Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī.[68]

If we follow Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī's review and group the *ʿulamāʾ* of Jerusalem according to their affiliation, we notice the sizeable advantage of the Šāfiʿī rite in number of adherents. The number of Ḥanbalī is clearly the smallest by far. (See Table 3).[69]

School of Law (Maḍhab)	Number of ʿUlamāʾ	Percentage of total
Šāfiʿī	213	62%
Ḥanafī	78	23%
Mālikī	38	11%
Ḥanbalī	13	4%
Total	**342**	**100%**

Table 3. Distribution of Jerusalemite *ʿulamāʾ* in the city during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods, according to their affiliation to one of the four orthodox schools of Islam.

[66] About the sheikhs who held the position of "Sheikh of the Maġribī," see Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 252, 254, 364.

[67] See regarding this context: Fraenkel, "Kinnun Heqdesh...".

[68] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 32, 263.

[69] Data for this table were taken from the same source as Table 2.

b. *Establishing Educational Institutions as a Means of Strengthening Political Status*

The political, economic and military options available to the rulers enabled them to establish institutions as a means of strengthening their political status. Such was the case with religious and educational institutions. The offices of these institutions and the endowments supporting them served as a device for enhancing the influence of the rulers within the various sectors of the population.[70] The major cities served as administrative centers, which helped strengthen the control of the adjacent areas. Thus major Syrian cities served as the core presence of Ayyubid, and later Mameluke authority, being the location of most of the governmental, economic, public, educational and religious institutions.[71]

The job positions and offices in the educational and other governmental institutions were an arena for competition and power struggles among the educated sector. As most of these institutions were set up by the ruling class, some researchers posit that the educated sector developed a dependency on the ruling class and its institutions. This influenced public opinion among the Muslim population. The dependency was a result of two primary factors. First: the officials in charge of the *waqf* set the policy for filling these posts, but the actual authority for appointments and dismissals resided in the Sultan or his representative in the person of the regional governor. Therefore, it often occurred that political considerations influenced the appointments and dismissals process. The second factor was that during the Ayyubid and Mameluke regimes, the majority of educational institutions were established by the ruling class. This situation afforded the rulers great power in dominating the sizable stratum of intellectuals and clerics, through whom the rulers' influence extended to the remaining sectors of the population.[72]

The posts exciting the most competition and power struggles were primarily those in the fields of teaching, management, the judiciary and the various religious offices. This is not to say that such competition was devoid of illegitimate influences and corruption. The funds for filling these positions were mainly derived from *waqf* assets, thus creating an economic dependency upon the ruling political incumbents on the part of the *'ulamā'* and the educated class.[73]

By studying the example of Jerusalem during the Ayyubid and Mameluke periods, one may conclude that the majority of the city's educational institutions were founded by the ruling class. This includes Sultans and Kings (11 institutes), emirs and various military officers (35 institutes), princesses (4 institutes). Nevertheless, a significant number of institutions were founded by citizens (20 institutes). It should be noted that these latter were primarily of the Sufi *zāwiya* type, whose founders were various clerics, merchants and wealthy individuals.

The major Syrian cities, which attracted the attention of Ayyubid and Mameluke rulers for building educational and religious institutions, were: Damascus, Aleppo, Jerusalem, Hamat, Homs, Tripoli, Safed, Gaza and Hebron. The great majority of these institutions

[70] Fraenkel, "Kinnun Heqdesh...", p. 66-67.

[71] Several researchers have seen the *madrasa* as an urban phenomenon. See for example, Berkey, p. 9.

[72] See: Peri, p. 47; Lapidus, p. 73-113; Chamberlain, p. 91-100.

[73] See regarding the competition and struggles for positions and posts among the *'ulamā'* and members of the educated class: Chamberlain, p. 91-107; Lapidus, p. 107-115, 130-142, 189-190.

were built in those cities, which served as governmental and administrative centers. Jerusalem was the third-ranked among the cities in Greater Syria (*Bilād al-Šām*) in number of educational institutions, after Damascus and Aleppo.[74]

Based upon a review of Mameluke-period sources, it may be claimed that political considerations played a significant part in the building of educational institutions in Jerusalem by Mameluke rulers. In general, the number of endowments and institutions of a particular ruler was an expression of his political power and dominion over the state. During the regime of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz as governor of Damascus (r. 712-740/1312-1339), the force of his authority was prominent throughout the areas of Syria, in addition to his strong position in the court of the Sultan Muḥammad bin Qalāwūn in Cairo. The relatively lengthy period of Tankīz's rule afforded him an ample period of time and influence to found a large number of institutions in the fields of education, religion, economics, health and society, and governmental institutions. He established these in various areas of the Mameluke domain, mainly in Syria.[75]

The institutions of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz served as a powerful instrument with which to base his rule in Syria, both economically and politically. He built a large number of institutions in Damascus, among them the mosque that bore his name, Jāmiʿ Tankīz, which also served later as a *madrasa*. He also dedicated a bathhouse (*ḥammām*) and a burial place (*turba*) for himself beside the mosque. In addition to these, Tankīz built a mausoleum (*turba*) for his wife and a *madrasa* for the study of Islamic law (*fiqh*) and the traditions of the Prophet (*ḥadīṯ*). This institution, named for him, was known as Dār al-Ḥadīṯ al-Tankaziyya, to distinguish it from his *madrasa* or his mosque.

The *madrasa* of Tankīz in Jerusalem was a religious-educational and a social institution serving various purposes. In its size, structures and procedures, the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* reflected the power of Tankīz in comparison with similar Mameluke institutions during the period under discussion. The large number of office holders enjoying the support of this *madrasa's waqf*, demonstrates the extent of Tankīz' influence upon a wide range of population sectors. This applied not only to Jerusalemites, but likewise to foreigners who were supported by the *waqf*. The al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem was founded in the year 729/1328, and included on its grounds a complex of different institutions. Among them were a *madrasa* for the study of Islamic law according to the teachings of the Ḥanafī rite, (*al-fiqh al-Ḥanafī*), a Sufi hostel (*ḫānqāh*), a facility offering lodgings for travelers, foreigners, women and the poor (*ribāṭ*), and a mosque for prayer and worship within the *madrasa*.[76]

[74] About the educational institutions of the city of Damascus, see Al-Nuʿaymī. On the educational institutions in the city of Aleppo (Ḥalab), see Ibn Šaddād; Kamāl al-Dīn ʿUmar ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Buġyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīḫ Ḥalab* (Damascus, 1988); Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn al-Šaḥna, *Al-Durr al-Muntaḫab fī Tārīḫ Mamlakat Ḥalab*, (Damascus, 1984); and to compare between these institutions in the cities of Syria, see Maḥāmīd, "Ha-Hinnukh ha-Islami...", chapter 3.

[75] Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba, 2: p. 150-151. See also regarding the qualities and activities of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz: Muḥammad ibn Ṣaṣrā, *Al-Durra al-Muḍi'a fī al-Dawla al-Ẓāhiriyya* (California, 1963), p. 183-184; Ibn Ḥajar, 1: p. 520-528; Ibn Ṭūlūn, *I'lām al-Warā...*, p. 38-41.

[76] About the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem, see Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯā'iq...*, 1: p. 108-121; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 121-122, 124-131; Maḥāmīd, "Ha-Hinnukh ha-Islami...", p. 109.

In the city of Safed, Tankīz constructed commercial and public institutions, among them a merchants' inn (*ḫān*) and a hospital (*māristān*). In addition to these, he built many projects for supplying water in Jerusalem and also in Damascus. His efforts providing for the renovation of many religious and educational institutions included renewing and maintaining their *waqf*.[77]

The broad range of institutions of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz in the area of Syria provided him with a wide economic, religious-educational and public base that reinforced his political status. His rule extended over a 28-year period, during which he succeeded in bringing order, stability and security to the region. With Tankīz achieving a strengthened position in Syria, there were increased apprehensions on the part of the Sultan ibn Qalāwūn, a situation which eventually resulted in Tankīz being deposed and arrested in the year 740/1339. What is more, his extensive property was seized, that which he had acquired during his reign and which had served as the base of his economic and political power.[78]

Parallel to the regime of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz, the emir ʿAlam al-Dīn Sanjar bin ʿAbdallāh al-Jāwulī (d. 745/1344) served as governor of Jerusalem in the years 711-720/1311-1320. Besides Jerusalem, Al-Jāwulī had dominion over the cities of Gaza, Hebron, Nablus, and the areas along the coastal plain.[79] As was the case with Tankīz and other Mameluke rulers, Al-Jāwulī endeavored to reinforce the authority of his reign by means of institutions he constructed in the region. Among these was the Jerusalem *madrasa* known by his name, al-Jāwuliyya.[80] The historian Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba contends that Gaza developed and flourished as an urban center as a result of the initiative of al-Jāwulī, who sought to make it the seat of his regime. He built various governmental and public institutions there, including a palace, a mosque, a bathhouse (*ḥammām*), a *madrasa* for adherents of the Šāfiʿī rite, a hospital, a commercial center and merchants' inn (*ḫān*) and a military training camp (*al-mīdān*).[81]

In addition to holding political and military positions, al-Jāwulī was also known as a religious scholar, well versed in the field of *ḥādīṯ*, and its instruction. In his case, one can notice a mixture of motives for establishing his religious institutions, one example being the *madrasa* he erected in Cairo. There were several other Mamelukes with religious qualifications whose endowments in Jerusalem appeared to be motivated by complex political and religious considerations, as was the case of the emir Ṭaštamur al-ʿAlāʿī (d. 784/1382). Al-Jāwulī's letter of appointment (*sijill*) shows that he was a high-ranked emir, rightly entitled to the position of governor of Gaza, Jerusalem and the surrounding areas. The document mentions his military and religious qualifications, and describes the importance of the areas under his jurisdiction, particularly the holy places. The manner in which al-Jāwulī had been

[77] About the institutions of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz, see: Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba, 2: p. 148-149; Ibn Ḥajar, 1: p. 521-524; Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: p. 123, 125-126.

[78] See regarding the confiscation of Sayf al-Dīn Tankīz' property: Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʿlām al-Warā...*, p. 41.

[79] See the *sijill* of Al-Jāwulī's appointment: Al-Qalqašandī, 12: p. 209-212.

[80] See regarding the al-Jāwuliyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem: Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 38; Kurd ʿAlī, 6: p. 119; Al-ʿĀrif, p. 243; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 116; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 1: p. 19-21.

[81] Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba, 2: p. 426-429. See regarding Al-Jāwulī: Ibn Ḥajar, 2: p. 170-172; Ibn Aybak al-Dwādārī, *Kanz al-Durar Wa-Jāmiʿ al-Ġurar* (Cairo, 1960), 9: p. 390; Maḥmūd ʿAlī ʿAṭāllāh, *Niyābat Ġazza fi al-ʿAṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Beirut, 1986), p. 280-283.

dismissed in 720/1320, serves as an indication of his high status. The rivalry that arose between him and the emir Tankīz, the governor of Damascus, brought Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad bin Qalāwūn to dismiss al-Jāwulī from his office.

A more pronounced political consideration in building educational institutions in Jerusalem occurred in the cases in which a Mameluke emir would erect a *madrasa* in honor of his Sultan. The objective of these emirs was primarily political, in order to strengthen their standing at court on the one hand, and to maintain their high offices on the other. An important additional objective was their desire to receive support from the Sultans who would then endow the *waqf* for the *madrasa*-s that were built for them. Such appeared to be the intentions of the emir Sayf al-Dīn Manjak (d. 776/1374) in commencing the construction of a *madrasa* in honor of the Sultan Ḥasan in Jerusalem in the year 762/1360-1361. However, upon the death of the Sultan in that same year, Sayf al-Dīn Manjak associated the *madrasa* with his own name, calling it al-Manjakiyya.[82]

Similarly, during the reign of the Sultan al-Ẓāhir Barqūq (784-801/1382-1398), a Jerusalem *madrasa* was built in his honor by Šihāb al-Dīn al-Ṭūlūnī. After Barqūq's demise, this *madrasa* received many contributions from his son and heir, the Sultan al-Nāṣir Faraj bin Barqūq. In the year 815/1412, the *madrasa* was the location of the tomb (*turba*) of the princess Ḫūnda Sāra, daughter of the Sultan Barqūq. The al-Ṭūlūniyya *madrasa* attained a greater importance than the other Jerusalem *madrasa*-s, due both to its having appointed the best teachers, and the magnitude of the *waqf* designated to support it. However, after the death of the Sultan Faraj in the year 815/1412, this *madrasa* went into a decline, eventually resulting in its sale in 833/1429 to al-Mawlā al-Fanarī al-Rūmī. These developments led to the *madrasa* being referred to by several names in the various sources: al-Ṭūlūniyya (al-Ṭaylūniyya) and otherwise al-Fanariyya.[83]

The size of an educational institution and its endowments generally reflected the status and political clout of its founder or that of the w*aqf* administrator. This can be seen in the various processes and changes undergone by the al-Ašrafiyya (al-Sulṭāniyya) *madrasa* in Jerusalem. The manner of its building and the allocation of its *waqf* offer ample evidence of the political considerations involved in the erection of educational institutions during the period under discussion. In the year 872/1467, the emir Ḥasan al-Ẓāhirī, governor of Jerusalem, built a *madrasa* to commemorate the name of Sultan al-Ẓāhir Ḫušqadam. For these efforts, the emir gained considerable political status and prestige in the court of the Sultan. Upon the death of Ḫušqadam and the ascension of the Sultan al-Ašraf Qāytbāy, the emir Ḥasan was deposed as Jerusalem's governor. This motivated Ḥasan to work toward achieving a closer association with the Sultan Qāytbāy in an attempt to maintain his own political status. For this purpose, he shifted the orientation of the *madrasa* he built in Jerusalem to align it with al-Ašraf Qāytbāy, including its bearing the new Sultan's name: al-Ašrafiyya or alternately, al-Sulṭāniyya. When the Sultan Qāytbāy visited Jerusalem in

[82] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 37-38; Al-ʿĀrif, p. 248-249. Regarding the al-Manjakiyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem, see Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 208-212; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 2: p. 76-77. About the emir Manjak, see Ibn Ḥajar, 4: p. 360-361; Al-Nuʿaymī, 1: 600-602.

[83] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 40; Al-ʿĀrif, p. 252; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 269-270; ʿAbd al-Mahdī, *Al-Madāris...*, 2: p. 106.

the year 880/1475 and saw the *madrasa*, he viewed it as ill-befitting his political stature and commanded that it be razed and rebuilt anew. The historian Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-ʿUlaymī praises the majestic power and beauty of the *madrasa*, viewing it upon the completion of its construction in the year 887/1482. He describes the al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* as the "third pearl" in Jerusalem's crown, joining the splendor of the al-Aqṣā mosque and the Dome of the Rock.[84]

The status of the al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem was outstanding not only for its size and beauty, but also in the magnitude of the sources of the endowments dedicated to it. The *waqf* deed of the *madrasa* details more than fifty sources of funding, including agricultural lands, houses, stores and extensive property. These endowments served as a principal source for the maintenance of the *madrasa* as well as for covering the expenses of salary payments (*jāmikiyya and jirāya*) to the *madrasa*'s staff including instructors, students, Sufis and various office holders.[85]

Practices and Policies in Jerusalem's Educational Institutions

Through an examination and study of several *waqf* deeds of educational institutions in Jerusalem, one can see their similarity with equivalent documents in different areas of the Mameluke regime.[86] The conditions and limitations imposed by the *waqf* administrators on their institutions disallowed the lodging of a greater number of students beyond what was stipulated in the *waqf*. The large number of rooms in the residential quarters and various facilities within the *madrasa* complex reflected the status and magnitude of its *waqf*, which corresponded the status of the *waqf* owner. The *waqf* deed generally set forth the terms of admission for those seeking to study or reside in the *madrasa*, as well as the qualifications required from applicants for positions of office. These details specified such conditions as belonging to a particular Islamic rite or school, social standing and marital status, and sometimes also ethnic origin. The Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, for example, included in his Jerusalem *ḫānqāh* a varied population of Sufis from different countries, among whom were adults and the elderly, married and single, Arabs and foreigners, on a permanent or a limited-term basis. The conditions of the *waqf* established by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn also restricted entrance to the *ḫānqāh* exclusively to Sufis.[87] In contrast, the *waqf* deed for the Al-Mārdīnī *ribāṭ* in Jerusalem specified an ethnicity restriction, allowing admittance only to those with origins in the Mārdīn region of Northern Syria.[88]

[84] See the description of the al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem in Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 36, 315, 329.

[85] See details of the endowments of al-Ašrafiyya: Abšarlī and Tamīmī, p. 39-41; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 161-162; regarding the institutions of the Sultan al-Ašraf Qāytbāy, see: Muḥammad bin Aḥmad ibn Iyās, *Badāʾiʿ al-Zuhūr fi Waqāʾiʿ al-Duhūr* (Cairo, 1984), 3: p. 329-330; Kurd ʿAlī, 6: p. 131; Abšarlī and Tamīmī, p. 14; ʿAṭāllāh, p. 245-246.

[86] To compare between different *waqf* documents during the Mameluke period, see Abšarlī and Tamīmī; Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯāʾiq...*, 1; Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn, *Al-Awqāf wal-Ḥayāt al-Ijtimāʿiyya fi Miṣr, 648-923/1250-1517* (Cairo, 1980).

[87] See the *waqf* deed of Al-Ḫānqāh al-Ṣalāḥiyya in Jerusalem: Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯāʾiq...*, 1: p. 93-94; see also Fraenkel, "Kinnun Heqdesh..."

[88] Al-ʿUlaymī, 2: p. 42.

The *waqf* deed of the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem also set limitations and definitions for the *madrasa*. Privileges were specified for adherents of the Ḥanafī school of Islam, with preference given to foreigners over local inhabitants, whether they were students, instructors or Sufis. Within the al-Tankiziyya complex were 22 rooms divided into two levels: eleven rooms on the lower storey reserved for 15 students of Ḥanafī jurisprudence (*al-fiqh al-Ḥanafī*), and another eleven rooms on the upper storey designated for 15 Sufis. The *madrasa* also included 20 students of *ḥadīṯ*, in addition to instructors and various functionaries.[89]

A comparison of the studies done by Leonor Fernandes, Doris Behrens Abouseif, Gary Leiser and others, reveals a great similarity in practices and procedures of the endowment-supported *madrasa*-s throughout the various areas of the Mameluke domain. Some minimal differences may be distinguished between them, mainly relating to the size of the *waqf* and the setting of particular qualifications, but not in the overall practices and procedures set forth by the *waqf*.[90]

One feature significantly distinguishing the present study from other works dealing with similar issues in the Mameluke cities is the emphasis on the influence that Jerusalem's religious status, and the political eagerness and religious qualifications of the *waqf* owners had on the establishment of educational and religious institutions in the city. In her study "*Mameluke Politics and Education*", Leonor Fernandes indicates that in endowing and erecting religious and educational institutions, Mameluke Sultans and their emirs were motivated by their eagerness to attract to their capital, al-Qāhira (Cairo) as many prominent scholars as possible from other Muslim countries, so as to secure its status as the center of the Muslim world.[91] Behrens Abouseif on the other hand, focused her work on the manner in which the living quarters of *ḫānqāh*-s and *madrasa*-s in Cairo became integrated within the layout of the religious complex. She refers to the changes that occurred in the inner organization of such institutions, and in the activities of students and Sufis, whose status became less exclusive and more flexible. The present study reaches similar conclusions, such as in the case of al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem. Similarities in the *waqf* documents and the organization of the *madrasa*-s can be found also between the present study and Gary Leiser's work on the endowment of al-Ẓāhiriyya *madrasa* in Damascus.

The practices of the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa*, for example, in such matters as the division of students into various levels as well as the distribution of salaries and grants to its office holders, were similar to the procedures at *madrasa*-s throughout Syria and Egypt during that period. Students of *fiqh* in the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* were divided into three levels: senior students (*muntahūn*), intermediate students (*mutawassiṭūn*) and beginners (*mubtadi'ūn*). The level of stipends and grants (*jāmikiyya* and *jirāya*) received by the students was linked

[89] See the *waqf* deed for al-Madrasa al-Tankiziyya in Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯā'iq...*, 1: p. 108-121.

[90] To compare among the practices of different educational institutions in the periods under discussion, see Fernandes, *The Evolution...*, p. 68-95; Fernandes, "Mameluke Politics and Education: The Evidence from Two Fourteenth-Century Waqfiyya", *AnIsl* 23, (1987), p. 87-98; Gary Leiser, "The Endowment of the al-Ẓāhiriyya in Damascus", *JESHO* 27, (1984), p. 33-55; G. Leiser, "Notes on the Madrasa in Medieval Islamic Society", *MuslWorld*, 76 (1986), p. 16-23; Doris Behrens Abouseif, "Change in Function and Form of Mameluke Religious Institutions", *AnIsl* 21, (1985), p. 73-93; Abdul-Laṭīf Ṭībāwī, "Origin and Character of al-Madrasa", *BSOS* 25, (1962), p. 225-238.

[91] See: Fernandes, "Mameluke Politics and Education...", p. 98.

to the level of their studies. Thus, advanced students (*muntahūn*) received the highest payment. An additional consideration related to the content of their studies. Students of *ḥadīṯ* received lower stipends and grants than did those studying *fiqh*. This attests to the high status and importance accorded to the study of the legal profession and the regard in which it was held during this period. A similar phenomenon in the majority of *madrasa*-s throughout the areas of Syria and Egypt has been noted in various studies covering the period under discussion. An additional rule in practice at the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* was a limitation of the period of an individual's study there to four years. It was expected that a student would complete the obligations of his program during that time, and then make way for another student.[92]

There are, however, other cases of differences between the various *madrasa*-s in the *waqf* terms and conditions set by their sponsors. These include differences in the level of salaries and in the list of office-holders. In one Jerusalem institution, known as the *Turba* (Tomb) of Ṭāriq, the *waqf* conditions favored students and teachers who were adherents of the Šāfiʿī rite. Some of the students were studying the precepts of the law according to the Šāfiʿī doctrine while others studied the Quran.[93] In contrast, the al-Ḥasaniyya *madrasa* in Jerusalem had *waqf* terms oriented towards foreign Muslim pilgrims (al-Afāqiyya) who had come to the city to study *fiqh*.[94]

The following table (Table 4) presents an example of the composition and characteristics of several of the educational institutions in Jerusalem during the Mameluke period. A comparison of the numbers in the table reveals various differences: in the number of students, professions and fields of study, and the diversity of the institution's objectives.

Students and Apprentices	Al-Tankiziyya *madrasa* 729/1328	The *Turba* of Ṭāriq 763/1361	Al-Ḥasaniyya *madrasa* 837/1433	Al-Ašrafiyya *madrasa* 887/1482
Students of *fiqh*	15	19	10	9 (among the Sufis)
Students of *Ḥadīṯ*	20	–	–	–
Students & Readers of Quran	1	24	4	4
Sufis (*Ṣūfiyya*)	25 (15 permanent, 10 short-term)	–	10	30 (two groups: 9 + 21)
Women	22 (12 aged/permanent, 10 poor/short-term)	–	–	–
Orphan-students	–	10	10	–

Table 4. Differences between educational institutions in Jerusalem.

[92] See the *waqf* deed of the emir Tankīz in Al-ʿAsalī, *Waṯā'iq...*, p. 108-121; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 121-122, 124-131.

[93] See the *waqf* deed of the *Turba*: Abšarlī and Tamīmī, p. 26.

[94] Abšarlī and Tamīmī, p. 29-30; Al-ʿAsalī, *Maʿāhid...*, p. 215-216; Jalāl Asʿad Naṣir, *Al-ʿImāra al-Mamlūkiyya al-Jarkasiyya fi Bayt al-Maqdis 784-922/1382-1517* (Cairo, 1983), p. 182-185.

Comments and Conclusions

The processes of change and their effects on establishing the various kinds of Islamic educational institutions in Jerusalem during the medieval period began with the city's liberation from Crusader rule by the Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī in the year 583/1187. However, records show that the pace of building these institutions was relatively slow in Ayyubid Jerusalem, compared with that occurring in the other cities of Syria and Egypt during the same period. Two key factors had a negative impact on the dedication of educational facilities: the continued Crusader threat in the region, and particularly in Jerusalem, and the struggles for succession within the Ayyubid regime itself.

A turning point came with the rise to power of the Mamelukes. Through their victories in the Syrian territories over the Mongols, the Crusaders and the Šīʿī remnants, the Mamelukes gained and consolidated great political power and legitimacy for their rule. In addition to stabilizing their political and governmental power, the Mamelukes strived to entrench their social and religious standing through the allocation of financial endowments and the construction of educational and religious institutions in all the cities of their domain, in proportion to these cities' centrality. Jerusalem was one of the most significant cities in Syria, attracting special attention from Mameluke rulers of all levels, both for its holiness and its position in the Mameluke scheme of reinforcing the security and stability of Greater Syria's southern regions (Palestine and the coastal area).

The rate of increased building of educational institutions in Mameluke Jerusalem was similar to the rate of building in the other cities under Mameluke dominion. However, the implications of historical circumstances were somewhat different, and favorable, in the case of Jerusalem. This was primarily the case after the last Mongol incursion into Syrian regions in the year 803/1400, and the political and economic crises that occurred during the 15th century and until the Ottoman conquest. As a result, Jerusalem's educational institutions appeared to be better preserved and maintained through the end of the Mameluke period, when compared to those institutions in the cities of Northern Syria, such as Damascus and Aleppo.

It may likewise be concluded that Jerusalem attracted the attention of foreign powers, notably Ottomans and various Anatolian rulers, who also took part in the process of constructing educational institutions in Jerusalem during the 15th century. This raises a question for a later study: Did the Ottomans see to the development of education and its institutions in Jerusalem after assuming the hegemony there from the year 1516, as the Mamelukes had done in their time?

The endowments system, *waqf* deeds, practices and conditions of the educational institutions of Jerusalem were similar to those of other such institutions elsewhere in the Ayyubid State and subsequently in the Mameluke Empire. The developments and changes in considerations regarding the building of such institutions throughout those regions were likewise similar. As with other educational institutions in the Mameluke domain, those in Jerusalem underwent processes of change both in their architecture and in the function designated for them. Thus by the late Mameluke period, these institutions were perceived as comprehensive facilities with diverse educational, religious, Sufi, social and charitable functions, as exemplified by the al-Tankiziyya *madrasa*, the al-Ašrafiyya, and others.