William R. Jones

PIOUS ENDOWMENTS IN MEDIEVAL CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

The endowment of religious, charitable, and educational enterprises by the establishment of trusts in land, the income from which could be devoted to such uses, was an immensely popular form of pious expression in both medieval Christendom and the Islamic world. The motives for, and applications of such endowments differed markedly, however, between the two religious cultures. The endowment of prayers and masses for beneficiaries, living and dead, exemplified the *sacramental* and *sacerdotal* quality of pre-Reformation Christianity. This ritualistic and ecclesiastical use of endowments in Latin Christian Europe and the Orthodox East, a use dependent on the existence of a sacramental system and an institutional church, contrasted sharply with the broader application of the Muslim *waqf*, by means of which pious individuals and groups sponsored a wide variety of charities, explicitly life-oriented and quite unconnected with a corporate clerical establishment. The infinite multiplication of private acts of charity by devout Muslims manifested the *moralistic* bent of Islam, which aspired to recast society according to the norms of the Qur'an and sacred law. The contrasting uses to which the two religious systems put the gifts and legacies of the

23

faithful reflected the operation of fundamentally different religious premises, whereas the institutionalization of these premises in a shared legal fiction, the trust, assured their enforcement in society and life.

Modern scholars have tried, without much success, to find a common origin or historical connections between the charitable foundations of Christians and the later Muslim *waqf*; but the fully developed, classic form of pious endowment in each culture differed significantly in motivation and objective. Although they may have had a common grounding in archaic religious practice and occasionally show continuity from one cult to the other, their individual histories reveal sharp differences between the two faiths which employed them as vehicles of religious expression.

The first to appear historically, the Christian charitable foundation, apparently had no precedent in the ancient world. The idea of the charitable trust, capable of receiving endowments in its own right and possessed of a "juristic personality," was unknown to the ancient Greeks and Romans who supported various philanthropic activities by making gifts or bequests to individual persons or communities under the stipulation that the latter fulfill the donor's wishes. The perpetuation of the charity was assured by the acceptance of legacies by municipal authorities on behalf of the towns. A variety of Christian-sponsored charities were established in the post-Constantinian era; but not until the age of Justinian is there clear evidence of the existence of the concept of trusteeship, which became attached to the office of the Christian bishop, as administrator of legacies to God or the Church, or for such "pious causes" as the relief of the poor, the care of the sick, and the ransoming of prisoners of war. By the time of the Justinian Code there existed in the Christian East at least a vague idea of the charitable trust, capable of receiving gifts and legacies in the name of prospective beneficiaries, or for certain specified good works, and possessing, in the view of the Roman law, some of the attributes of the corporate foundation. Subsequently the practice of founding Christian charities spread with the establishment of innumerable poorhouses, orphanages, and hospitals throughout the Christian East, whence they were introduced into late Roman and early

24

medieval Europe, often under such original Greek names as *xenodocheia*.[1]

The various philanthropic foundations of medieval Byzantium were usually attached to churches or monasteries and were therefore subject to ecclesiastical supervision and control, although their legal identity and financial independence were recognized by allowing them to receive gifts and legacies to be administered by their own officials under their corporate seals. The creation of charitable foundations, wholly or partially independent of local churches and religious houses, was for a long time delayed in early medieval Europe as a result of the preference shown by pious benefactors for endowing churches and monasteries, which would perform such services but which merged the gift or legacy with their own endowments, and also possibly as a result of the continued popularity of such imported charitable institutions as the city of Rome's famous "diaconate" and the *matricula pauperum* of the churches of Frankish Gaul, the support of which was made a regular imposition on the congregation of the diocese. But the decline and eventual disappearance of these ancient charitable institutions, which were closely tied to the civic religion of late antiquity, was promoted by the economic disruptions and confiscations of ecclesiastical properties in the later Frankish period and the increasingly rural character of European society. There was apparently no connection between the incidence of founding charities and changing levels of poverty and social distress; rather, new charities reflected the increased affluence of European society. With the material revival of Europe from the eleventh century forward, a growing number of pious clergy and laymen became the founders or patrons of

[1] A.R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aids in Greece and Rome*, Ithaca, New York, 1968, p. 18; P.W. Duff, "The Charitable Foundations of Byzantium," in *Cambridge Legal Essays Written in Honour of and Presented to Doctor Bond, Professor Buckland and Professor Kenny* by G.G. Alexander *et al.*, Cambridge, 1926, p.p. 83-99; Evelyne Patlangean, "La pauvreté Byzantine au VIᵉ siècle au temps de Justinien," in *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, ed. Michel Mollat, Publications de la Sorbonne, série "Études," t. VIII, pp. 72-73; G. Le Bras, "Les fondations privées du Haut Empire," in *Studi S. Riccobono*, Palermo, 1936 t. III, pp. 23-67; Robert Feenstra, "Le concept de fondation du droit romain classique jusqu'à nos jours," in *Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité* 3ᵉ série, III, 1956, pp. 245-63; Feenstra, "L'Histoire des fondations," in *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, XXIV 1956, pp. 381-448.

25

hospitals, asylums, and almshouses, whose independent endowment and legal identity were protected by the church and recognized by canon law. The Roman law concept of the charitable trust, which had been implied in Justinian's Code and which circulated in the West in the Latin redaction of the *Epitome Juliani*, was further elaborated by medieval canonists like Innocent IV, perhaps as a result of the struggle to defend the integrity of ecclesiastical benefices against the proprietary claims of lay patrons. What is most significant in the development of the uses of pious endowments in later medieval Europe, however, was their increasingly sacramental orientation, an application which dated back to the anniversary prayers and private memorials of the early Christians and which may have an analogy in the funerary cults of pagan Rome, but which attained perfect expression in the endowed chantries of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The charitable foundations of medieval Christendom had always been essentially and explicitly religious institutions: their creation was a gesture of personal piety; they invariably provided for the spiritual succor of their inmates, whose prayers were viewed as especially persuasive with divinity; and they were regarded as ecclesiastical organizations subject to canonical discipline and the supervisory authority of the church. The prominent use of endowments to support the devotional and liturgical activities of medieval Christendom merely represents the operation of a compelling and distinctive assumption of the religious culture, prefigured in Christian cosmology itself and provided with an increasing number of opportunities to vent itself by the material changes of the high middle ages.[2]

Because of the similarity of the Muslim *waqf* with earlier Byzantine endowments, it has been suggested (on the basis of

[2] Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1968; Michel Rouche, "La matricule des pauvres," in *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, ed. Mollat, pp. 83-110; Pierre Gillet, *La personalité juridique en droit écclésiastique spécialement chez les Décrétistes et les Décrétalistes*, Malines, 1927; R.M. Clay, *The Medieval Hospitals of England*, London, 1909; Jean Imbert, *Les hôpitaux en droit canonique*, L'Église et l'état au Moyen Age, t. VIII, ed. H.-X. Arquillière, Paris, 1947; Émile Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété écclésiastique en France*, Mémoires et travaux des Facultés Catholiques de Lille, fasc. 6, Lille-Paris, 1910, t. I, pp. 370ff.

26

rather thin evidence) that Muslims adopted the form of the *waqf* from eastern Christians and, further, that they may have transmitted it to Europeans by way of the later Franciscan missions in the East. On the other hand, the best scholarly opinion on the history of the *waqf* has stressed its origin in internal social and legal developments of early Islam itself. Such apparently "primitive" aspects of the *waqf* as the gift of weapons and transport for use in the holy war, and the creation of temporary reversionary trusts for the benefit of certain named persons, constituted stimuli for legal innovation of that kind. The family *waqf* (*waqf ahli* or *dhurri*), which always coexisted with the charitable or public *waqf* (*waqf khairi*), probably arose from the desire to evade the Qur'an's new laws of inheritance in favor of female relatives, thereby assuring that its founder's estate would devolve intact to heirs of his choice. Subsequently the charitable benefactions of the early Muslims themselves and possibly the example of eastern Christian charities suggested additional uses of the institution. It would appear that later Muslim legal opinion subsumed under the general designation *waqf* a variety of different forms of gift or conveyance for benevolent purposes which were either invented by Muslims or introduced into their new faith by converts to Islam. The whole question of origins is obscured by the paucity of evidence and the tendency of medieval scholar-jurists to project their own views of the proper form and use of the *waqf* backward to the age of the Prophet. The most that can safely be said about its origins is that, from the time of its appearance in the century or two after Muhammad, the *waqf* grew enormously in popularity, emerging during the Seljuk period as one of the great cosmopolitan institutions of the Islamic world.[3]

[3] Art. "Waqf," *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. H.A. Gibb and J. H. Kramers, Ithaca, New York, pp. 624-28; Claude Cahen, "Réflexions sur le Waqf ancien," in *Studia Islamica*, XIV, 1961, pp. 37-56; Joseph Schacht, "Early Doctrines on Waqf," in *Fuad Köprülü Armagani/Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, Istanbul, 1953, pp. 443-52; Schacht, *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford, 1964, p. 19; W. Montgomery Watt, *Islam and the Integration of Society*, London, 1961, p. 191; N.J. Coulson, *A History of Islamic Law*, Edinburgh, 1964, p. 28; Henry Cattan, "The Law of Waqf," *Law in the Middle East*, ed. Majid Khadduri and Herbert J. Liebesny, t. I: *Origin and Development of Islamic Law*, Washington, D.C., 1955, p. 203; Maurice Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Muslim Institutions*, tr. John P. MacGregor, London, 1950, p. 144.

27

The form of the *waqf* that captured the imagination of pious Muslims through the ages owed its success to the "strongly marked impulse to charitable deeds which is characteristic of Islam."[4] Despite differences of opinion on particular details, the several schools of sacred law tended to agree on the public *waqf*'s basic nature and intent. Normally it entailed the gift of real property, either urban shops and homesteads or rural farmland, to God or to some class of deserving beneficiaries (e.g. the poor), who were to enjoy in perpetuity the income produced by the endowment. Once established, the property constituting the endowment became inalienable and nonheritable —in "dead hand" as the English common lawyer would say. Only the usufruct was available for expenditure by the administrator (*nazir* or *mutawalli*) according to the founder's declared intent. Such endowments were viewed as permanent and perpetual, although they never acquired the corporate status and identity of the European trust. A *waqf* could conceivably be established for any purpose compatible with Islam; and during the middle ages the income from such endowments was employed to support mosques, *madrasahs*, libraries, hospitals, cemeteries, caravanseries, waterworks, bridges, and occasionany for the benefit of the two holy cities. In Damascus there even existed a *waqf* providing for the replacement of a vase accidentally dropped and destroyed by a hapless slave-boy. As a legal institution, the *waqf* was firmly grounded in the law and traditions of Islam; and as a form of good works, it enjoyed tremendous popularity throughout the Muslim world from the middle ages to the modern period.

In comparison with the other great confessional religions, Islam's most distinctive characteristic is its pervasive moralism —its vision of the true faith as living the virtuous life. "Islam aims," Gustave von Grunebaum has said, "at comprehending life in its totality. It posits the ideal of a life in which, from the cradle to the grave, not a single moment is spent out of tune with, or merely unprovided for by, religious ruling."[5] The differ-

---

[4] *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, p. 626a. I am indebted to my colleague Professor John O. Voll for guidance in the bibliography of Islamic history.
[5] Gustave E. von Grunebaum, *Medieval Islam*, Chicago-London, 1946, p. 108.

28

ence between the most important forms of social behavior and the routine of daily life disappears; and the distinction between the "sacred" and the "profane" becomes meaningless. "Thus, by accepting Islam, the believer accepted a ready-made set of mandatory answers to any question of conduct that could possibly arise. As long as he obeyed sacred custom, the Muslim's life was hallowed down to its irksome and repulsive episodes, and he would be fortified by the assurance of his righteousness."[6] One of the most available means for demonstrating this social conscience and commitment to personal piety was the act of founding a *waqf*. The "good work" exemplified by the establishment of an endowment for some benevolent purpose represented, accordingly, an attempt by the devout Muslim to place himself in a right relationship with God by applying divinely revealed ethical norms in daily life. In this way he might comply with the Qur'an's injunction to perform the high religious duty of "*zakat*," a word translatable simultaneously as "purity" or "righteousness" and as "benevolence" or "charity."[7] Within the context of the ethical, as distinguished from the purely ritualistic, obligations imposed by the Qur'an and sacred law, the intent of such a gesture was to fulfill God's call to live the good life in a way most pleasing to Him.

The most distinctive use of pious endowments in late medieval Europe was their contribution to the fulfillment of the sacramental and intercessory role of the church. Devout Christians had long been accustomed to endow monasteries and churches in order to share vicariously in the benefits of prayer; and even ostensibly humanitarian and philanthropic institutions like hospitals and schools made provision for prayers and commemorative masses for their patrons and benefactors. Both theology and Christian folklore tended to substantiate public confidence in and appreciation for the sacramental role of pious foundations. Official acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which

---

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Art. "Zakat," *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, p. 654a; Maulana Muhammad Ali, *The Religion of Islam*, New Delhi, n.d., pp. 457ff. The Aramaic-Arabic word "*Qurban*," signifying a "pleasing" gesture or an "approach" to God and implying an act of "charity," was used by Christian Arabs to designate the eucharistic service.

29

equated the host after consecration with the body of Christ, exalted the mass as the symbolic rehearsal of the supreme act of redemption, the Crucifixion. The popularization of the cult of purgatory and intercessory prayer and the evolution of the view of the mass as a thing of almost quantitative, calculable, and therefore assignable, value had the effect of reinforcing and publicizing the idea of the sacrament as the highest form of "good work" and as a vehicle for the operation of divine grace. Medieval theology had long subscribed to the Augustinian concept of *"caritas"* as signifying that love of God which, working in both directions, draws the soul to its Creator and also fulfills God's promise of redemption.[8] The *caritas*-theology, which subsumed under the idea of mystical love the correlative notions of divine sacrifice, saintly and human merit, and the economy of salvation, provided the *rationale* for one of the most popular institutions of medieval Christianity, the endowed chantry.

The purpose of the chantry was to memorialize its founder and other beneficiaries, both living and deceased, by providing for the recitation of commemorative masses for their temporal and spiritual wellbeing.[9] A chantry could come into being in one of several ways: through the bestowal of property on a parish or collegiate church or a monastic house which then assumed responsibility for the performance of such services; through the creation of a separate ecclesiastical benefice for a chantry priest who would be appointed by the patron and instituted by the bishop; or, increasingly in the later middle ages, through the establishment of income-producing property for the employment of a stipendiary priest and for the building and decoration of an altar. The founder or patron might be a private person or a group such as a craft or religious guild. Communal chantries vested the powers of administration in a body of trustees composed of parishioners, local clergy, guild officers, or municipal authorities, whereas the chantry priest, at

---

[8] Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, tr. Philip S. Watson, New York-Evanston, 1953, pp. 476ff.
[9] K.L. Wood-Legh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain*, Cambridge, 1965; W.R. Jones, "English Religious Brotherhoods and Medieval Lay Piety," in *The Historian*, XXXVI, 1974, pp. 646-59.

30

least in England, acquired such privileges of the "corporation sole" as the right to defend the interests of the chantry in a court of law. The purpose of founders and benefactors of chantries was always to create a permanent memorial in the form of a perpetual liturgical celebration, the continued performance of which was assured by an endowment in lands or rents under the protection of canonical authority.

The multiplication of private and communal chantries in late medieval Europe and, to some extent, in Byzantium, represented an extension of the system of pious endowments whereby prelates and aristocrats of the early middle ages had sought to benefit from monkish prayer. The growth of the European economy from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had the effect of bringing the devotional activities of the church within the grasp of an increasing number of laymen who, individually or through guilds and fraternities, employed their new wealth to enhance their role in medieval religion. Parish churches became encircled with a fringe of privately endowed chapels and chantries dedicated to the endless repetition of the eucharistic service in memory of former and current benefactors. Many of the distinctive characteristics of pre-Reformation Christianity—the proliferation of altars and shrines, heightened devotion to the mass, and the increased popularity of saints' worship—were the product of this new lay piety through which large numbers of medieval men and women captured control of the devotional machinery of the church and thus showed their desire to assume partial responsibility for their own salvation. Although individual chantry foundations sometimes provided such purely philanthropic services as the care of the sick, the relief of the poor, or the education of the young, their primary purpose was always to maintain the operation of the church's sacramental system in favor of certain designated beneficiaries. The performance of prayers and requiem masses was invariably the duty of clerics who staffed hopitals and grammar schools; and even the endowed lectureships of medieval colleges and universities had prominent liturgical functions attached to them.[10] In contrast to the pre-

---

[10] For chantry schools, see Wood-Legh, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-70; A.W. Parry, *Education in England in the Middle Ages*, London, 1920, pp. 157-69; Nicholas Orme, *English Schools in the Middle Ages*, London, 1973, pp. 6, 194ff; and

ference shown by some medieval heretics and later Protestant reformers for socially beneficial acts of charity like alms-giving and teaching, the medieval church asserted the preeminence of the sacrifice of the mass as a "good work" *par excellence* and also as a channel of divine grace.

Contrasting the theological premises of medieval Christianity and Islam, Marshall Hodgson noted the distinction between Pauline Christianity's call for *"personal responsiveness to redemptive love in a corrupted world"* and the Qur'an's *"demand for personal responsibility for the moral ordering of the natural world."*[11] Hodgson goes on to explain that, "The central event of history for Christians was Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, which most decisively evoke a sense of God's love in him who opens himself to their impact, and lead him to respond to others in the same spirit;" whereas, Hodgson says, "The central event of history for Muslims was the descent and preaching of the Qur'an, which most decisively evokes a sense of God's majesty and his own condition in him who opens himself to its norms."[12] Expressed in less theological terms, this is the difference between Christianity's institutionalized system of sacramental redemption, which offers communicants both a chance to do good and the hope of salvation, and Islam's expectation that believers will take responsibility for applying the Qur'an's moral teachings in their daily lives—the distinction between *caritas* and *zakat*. Further, their different theologies shaped their perception of their respective religious communities. For Christians, this was a vision of a "redemptive fellowship, a special sacramental society," within which "some have been ordained to offer again the tokens of God's love to the rest in recurring reenactment of Christ's sacrifice;" whereas for Muslims, it was the shared experience of life in a "total society", comprehending the whole of earthly existence "and built upon standards derived from the prophetic vision."[13]

for the religious role of the university teacher, A.B. Cobban, *The Medieval Universities*, London, 1975, pp. 124-25; E.F. Jacob, "Founders and Foundations in the Later Middle Ages," in *Essays in Later Medieval History*, New York, 1968, p. 157.

[11] Marshall G.S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, Chicago, 1974, II, p. 337.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 338.
[13] *Ibid.*

32

Although other forces, equally or even more compellingly than theology, contribute toward shaping human societies in time, there do exist clearly identifiable points of contact and interaction between belief and behavior. Thus, the social and political implications of divergent religious premises reveal themselves in the differing internal structures and external configurations of the two cultures. Even though Christian opinion admitted that divine grace could operate immediately and directly in creation, it insisted that the sacraments of the church constituted its most predictable and accessible path. The church's monopoly of the sacraments provided the *rationale* for its presumed mediatorial role between God and man; and it was the priestly control of the machinery of salvation, often described in the metaphor of the Pseudo-Dionysius' *schema* of angelic and ecclesiastical hierarchies, that gave the corporate church its dominant role in Christian society.

Many scholars have remarked on the "corporativist" nature of medieval European society, composed as it was of a hierarchy of more or less autonomous and discrete corporate entities such as the church and the office of the priesthood.[14] Marshall Hodgson has contrasted this "corporativist" and "hierarchical" organization of Latin Christian society with what he characterized as the "contractualist" and "occasionalist" quality of Islamicate society.[15] By this Hodgson meant a relatively undifferentiated social order, composed of a multitude of privately arranged relationships, legitimatized by personal contract rather than by the possession of office and reflecting the ideal of status by achievement rather than by ascription. In opposition to European insistence on making a clear distinction between public acts and private conduct and its preference for deriving legitimate authority from the exercise of office, medieval Islamic society "denied any special status to public acts at all, stressing egalitarian and moralistic considerations to the point where it ruled out all corporate status and reduced all acts to the acts of personally responsible individuals."[16] In short, the *vertical* articulation of

---

[14] This has been the focus of the work of Émile Lousse, *La société d'ancien régime: Organisation et représentation corporatives*, Paris-Louvain, 1943.

[15] Hodgson, *op. cit.*, pp. 342 ff.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 347.

33

European society, which arranged itself according to an idealized scheme of legally and socially defined corporate entities, stood in sharp contrast to Islamic *horizontalism*, which characterized a social order composed of an intricate network of lineage and clientage, professional associations, and religious solidarities, all tending to coalesce. The "corporativist" quality of medieval Christianity, as exemplified by the existence of the *Ecclesia* and the office of the priesthood, derived from the latter's unique responsibility to dispense divine grace through the manipulation of the sacramental system, whereas the Islamic ideal of the equal and compelling necessity for all communicants to maintain moral standards in the world promoted the infinite multiplication of acts of personal piety, of which the founding of a *waqf* was among the most fashionable. It was from its role as a conduit of saving grace that the Christian clergy drew prestige and authority and justified its historical existence. Although the Qur'an's call to personal piety militated against the formation of a separate, specialized vocation like the Christian priesthood, nevertheless the fact of Muslim sponsorship of *madrasahs*, mosque-schools, and Sufi monasteries had the effect of assuring the survival and social prominence of that class of religious notables, the *ulama,* who were the traditional bearers of the message of Islam. By means of a system of pious endowments the Muslim community perpetuated its distinctive ideology across the ages by maintaining the succession of religious mentors authorized to transmit its values to future generations. Moreover, their role in Muslim society was political as well as moral and theological. In the Mameluke cities of the later middle ages the religious notables, including the endowed professoriate of the schools of sacred law, occupied an influential position in the urban power structure by serving as arbiters of law and custom, the foci of community loyalties, and as counterweights to the *amirs* or military commanders.[17]

Endowments and the charitable trust played an important role in sustaining higher education in the two cultures. In a series of

---

[17] A sensitive description of the structure of Mameluke urban society is given by Ira Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967, pp. 107 ff. Cfr. Hodgson, *op. cit.,* II, 62-151.

34

provocative articles on Muslim education Professor George Makdisi extended the "corporativist-contractualist" distinction to explain the different organizational models adopted by institutions of higher learning in medieval Europe and the Muslim world.[18] The European university came into being, he argued, through its acquisition of corporate status, whereas its counterpart, the *madrasah* or school of religious sciences, originated in the establishment of a charitable trust. It should be noted, however, that the multitude of endowed colleges at Oxford, Paris, and elsewhere, *not* the corporate university, constituted the closest approximation of the Muslim *madrasahs*.[19] Both the European college, the educational importance of which increased at the expense of the university during the later middle ages, and the *madrasah* were pious foundations supported by endowments of land and rents. More important, however, the European college, by virtue of its responsibility to offer prayers and masses for the spiritual comfort of members and patrons, revealed the sacramental orientation of the charitable trust among medieval Christians.

Explicitly philanthropic institutions, wholly independent of church control and divested of any religious role, came only very late in European history. The English common law of trusts, which made possible the many secular charities of modern Anglo-American society, was an invention of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, although it doubtlessly had medieval antecedents. The Protestant Reformation, which either abolished pious foundations or stripped them of their sacramental functions, permitted a secularized version of the charitable trust to survive in the form of a purely commemorative institution like the endowed professorship of modern England and America. In Catholic

---

[18] George Makdisi, "Madrasah and University in the Middle Ages," in *Studia Islamica*, XXXII, 1970, pp. 255-64; "The Madrasah as a Charitable Trust and the University as a Corporation in the Middle Ages," in *Ve Congrès Internationale d'Arabisants et d'Islamisants*: *Correspondance d'Orient*, No. 11, Brussels, 1970, pp. 329-37; "Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam," in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum, Wiesbaden, 1971, pp. 75-88.

[19] For the development of the European college in the late middle ages, see Cobban, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-59; Astrik L. Gabriel, "The College System in the Fourteenth Century Universities," in *The Forward Movement of the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Francis Lee Utley, Columbus, Ohio, 1961, pp. 79-124.

35

Europe, however, the charitable trust retained its religious character even when associated with such humanitarian activities as poor relief and education.[20]

The interconnection which has existed historically between the religious conscience and styles of cultural organization is by no means direct and obvious; nevertheless, there do exist important areas of human experience where ideology and behavior analysis. Differences of motive and objective for the founding of a chantry or the establishment of a *waqf* implied the existence of fundamental differences of theological orientation between Christianity and Islam and also determined the individual and collective religious behavior of the two communities. To the end of the middle ages pious Christians subsidized the Church's sacramental responsibilities in the conviction that the sacrifice of the mass represented that supreme act of *caritas*, encompassing and transcending all other virtuous acts, whereas Islam's commitment to personal piety prompted generations of Muslims to contribute portions of their livelihood and fortunes to making the prophetic vision a social reality.

[20] J.A.F. Thomson, "Piety and Charity in Late Medieval London," in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XVI, 1965, pp. 178-95; Cissie C. Fairchilds, *Poverty and Charity in Aix-en-Provence: 1614-1789*, The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 94th series, Baltimore-London, 1976; Brian Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice*, Cambridge, 1971; W.K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England: 1480-1660*, New York, 1959; E.H. Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History*, Oxord, 1969, pp. 49-50; Paul S. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships*, Stanford, 1970; Phyllis Allen, "Scientific Studies in the English Universities of the Seventeenth Century," in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, X, 1949, pp. 225-27, 239, 245; Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition: 1558-1642*, Oxord, 1959, pp. 70-71.