

he expresses his faith in the sultan's sense of justice and mentions that he would be satisfied with a post even in India. Āli, and Latîfi, argue that the *kaside* beginning with the line *Cām-ı Cem nüş eyile ey Cem bu Frengistandır* in Cem's *divan* actually belongs to Sadi. However, it is highly probable that this *kaside*, which was written in the *hasbihal* (*hasb-i hāl*, poetry talking about his life) form and which, according to the biographers, was read out in entertainment circles in Nice (in France), belongs to Cem Sultan and that the two couplets at the end of *kaside* written for Beyazid II were added later by Sadi.

Most of his poems were composed in the form of *nazires* (*nazîres*, imitative poems) to Cem's poems, and his own works were similarly imitated by important poets of the time such as Necatî [Necâtî], Zati [Zâtî], Hayali [Ĥayālî], Muhibbi [Muĥibbî], Meali [Me'ālî], Mesîhi [Mesîhî], and İshak [İshāk] Çelebi. Sadi's poems, which highlight the prince's sufferings and attempt to depict realistically his inner conflicts, regrets, and longing for his country and family, are outstanding examples in classical Ottoman poetry. Apart from his friendship with Cem Sultan, Sadi also became famous for his poetry devoted to wine and taverns.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Āli [‘Ālî], *Künhü'l-ahbâr'ın tezkiire kasmı*, ed. Mustafa İsen, Ankara 1994; Āşık [‘Āşık] Çelebi, *Meşâr üş-şu'arâ* or *Tezkere of Āşık Çelebi*, ed. Glyn Munro Meredith-Owens, London 1971; Hatice Aynur, Cem şairleri, *İlmî araştırmalar* (Istanbul 2000), 9:33–43; Hatice Aynur, Sa'dî-i Cem, *TDVİA*, 35:403–4; Cavid Baysun, Cem, *IA*, 3:69–81; Beyani [Beyânî], *Tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ*, ed. İbrahim Kutluk (Ankara 2012), 40; Cemil Çiftçi, *Maktul şairler*, Istanbul 1997; Tuba İşinsu Durmuş, *Osmanlı'nın sürgün şairleri*, Ankara 2012; Kafzade Faizi (Qāfzāde Fā'izī), *Şubdetü'l-eş'ār*, Ankara, Milli Kütüphane, MS Yz. A 679;

Osman Horata, Cem şairleri: Bir kader birliğinin anatomisi, *Bilig* (Ankara 2000), 15:91–109; Osman Horata, Cem şairleri, *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul 2006), 2:91–7; Kınalızade Hasan Çelebi, *Tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ*, ed. İbrahim Kutluk (Ankara 1978), vol. 1; Latîfi [Laţîfî], *Tezkire-i Laţîfî*, Istanbul 1314 (1898); Riyazi [Riyādî], *Riyādî'ş-şu'arâ*, MS, Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, MS Es'ad Efendi, 3871; Sehî, *Tezkire-i Sehî*, ed. Mehmed Şükri, Istanbul 1325 (1907).

OSMAN HORATA

Chapar b. Qaidu

Chapar b. Qaidu (r. c. 702–10/1303–10) was the last ruler of the Mongol Ögödeid *ulus* (state, people), and great-grandson of Ögödei (r. 1229–41), son and successor of Chinggis Khān. Although Chapar was Qaidu's firstborn son, he was not the one to whom his father intended to bequeath the throne. Unlike the case with the sovereign's other sons, there is no record of Chapar's whereabouts during his father's lifetime. After Qaidu's death, the Chaghataid *khān* Du'a (Duwā, r. 681–706/1282–1307), the deceased ruler's right-hand man and far and away the most powerful figure in Central Asia at that time, orchestrated Chapar's accession, probably with the objective of weakening the house of Ögödei. Despite some resistance, the Ögödeids ultimately accepted the succession, and Chapar was solemnly enthroned in Imil (modern-day South Kazakhstan) in late 702/spring 1303. Under Chapar, the Ögödeids maintained their own army (estimated at 400,000 riders by Het'um, the Armenian monk and historian, d. after 1307, also known as Hayton), diplomatic corps and administrators. The Ögödeid sedentary subjects were ruled from Kāshgar by the sons of Mas'ūd Beg, the experienced administrator of Mongol Central

Asia. Chapar treated his Muslim subjects favourably and apparently conducted diplomatic relations with Mamlūk Egypt.

Whereas Qaidu had been locked in combat with the Yuan for more than thirty years, soon after his coronation, Chapar joined Du'a in pursuing peace with the Ögödeids' long-time rivals. In 704/1304, this policy resulted in a peace agreement between all the Mongol *uluses*. However, Chapar failed to reap any benefits from the peace and was even forced to cede some territory to the Chaghatayids, whose efforts to supplant the Ögödeids in Central Asia triggered hostilities in Transoxania, Talas, and, most importantly, along the Yuan frontier. By dint of the Yuan support, the Chaghatayids managed to defeat the Ögödeid forces, many of whom deserted to the neighbouring Mongol states. In desperation, Chapar surrendered to Du'a towards mid-706/late-1306. Du'a granted the defeated khan an appanage and salary, but continued to sow dissension amongst the Ögödeids' ranks, and might have even deposed Chapar. It was only Du'a's passing, in 707/1307, that temporarily prevented the complete dismantling of the Ögödeid *ulus*. Soon after, the untimely death of Du'a's successor, Konjeck (Könchek, r. ca.707–8/1307–8), and the ensuing succession struggle prompted Chapar to make an attempt to regain Ögödeid independence. In 709/1309, he launched an attack against Kebek, the Chaghatayid prince (and future *khān*), who had just dethroned Naliqo'a, Konjek's heir (r. 708–9/1308–9). However, Chapar's alliance faltered on the battlefield, and he was thus compelled to submit to the Yuan the following year. Chapar's arrival at the Yuan court was solemnly celebrated in Dadu (Beijing), for Qaidu had refused to make that journey

from as far back as 1264. Chapar received the frozen revenues of Qaidu's appanages and in 1315 was anointed Prince of Running (in Henan, northern China). Chapar's surrender to the Yuan marked the end of the independent Ögödeid *ulus*, as its territories were permanently divided between the Chaghatayids and the Yuan. Though on occasion Ögödeid princes would attempt to take back these realms, their efforts were in vain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

Hayton (Het`um), *La Flor des estoires de la Terre d'Orient*, in Edouard Dulaurier (ed.), *Recueil des historiens des croisades, documents arméniens* (Paris 1869–1906), 2:214; Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il, *al-Nahj al-saḍīd wa-l-durr al-farīd fī mā ba'da ibn al-Amīd* (*Histoire des sultans mam-louks*), ed. and trans. Edgar Blochet (Paris 1919–28), 631–2; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab* (Cairo 1923–97), 27:344–5, 376–8; Jamāl Qarshī, *Mulkhaqāt al-ṣurāh*, in V. V. Bartold (comp.), *Turkestan v epokhu mongol'skogo nashestiia, vol. 1 (texts)* (St. Petersburg 1900), 128–52 (on Chapar, 138–40); Qāshānī, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh b. 'Alī, *Ta'rikh-i Uljāytū*, ed. M. Hambly (Tehran 1969), 31–41, 147–9; Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. Edgar Blochet (London and Leiden 1911), 2:5, 9, 10; Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, vol. 3, ed. A. A. 'Alīzādah, Baku 1957; Rashīd al-Dīn, *The successors of Genghis Khan*, ed. and trans. John Andrew Boyle (New York and London 1971), 20, 24–5; Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. Bahman Karīmī, 2 vols. (Tehran 1959), *passim*; Rashīd al-Dīn, *Rashiduddin Fazlallah's Jami'u't-tawarikh=Compendium of chronicles*, trans. and annotated Wheeler M. Thackston (Cambridge MA 1999), 2:305, 307, 310, 330, 349, and *passim*; Song Lian 宋濂, *Yuan shi* 元史 ["The official history of the Yuan dynasty"], (Beijing 1976), 453, 453, 460, 463, 477, 502, 523–4, 565, 569–70, 740, 2717, 2909, 2951, 3136, and *passim*; Waṣṣāf, *Ta'rikh-i Waṣṣāf [=Tajziyat al-amṣār wa tazjiyat al-aṣār]* (repr. Bombay 1269/1852–3, repr. Tehran 1338sh/1959–60), 450–4, 475–7, 517–19;

Yu Ji 虞集, *Daoyuan xue gu lu* 道園學古錄 [“Yu Ji’s literary collection”] (Shanghai 1937), chap. 23.

STUDIES

V. V. Barthol’d, *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, trans. V. Minorsky and T. Minorsky, 3 vols., Leiden 1956–62; Michal Biran, *Qaidu and the rise of the independent Mongol state in Central Asia*, Richmond, Surrey 1997; Michal Biran, The Mongols in Central Asia from Chinggis Khan’s invasion to the rise of Temür. The Ögödeid and Chaghadaid realms, in Peter B. Golden, N. Di Cosmo, and Allen J. Frank (eds.), *The Cambridge history of Inner Asia*, vol. 2, *The Chinggisid age* (Cambridge 2009), 46–66; Michal Biran, Chaghadaid diplomacy and chancellery practices. Some preliminary remarks, *OM* 88/2 (2008 [2009]), 369–92; Russell G. Kempiners Jr., Vaṣṣāf’s *Taz̤iyat al-amṣār wa taz̤iyat al-aṣṣār* as a source for the history of the Chaghadaid Khanate, *Journal of Asian History* 22 (1988), 160–87; Liu Yingsheng, 劉迎勝, *Chahatai hanguo shi yanjiu* 察哈台汗國史研究 [Studies of the Chaghataid khanate], Shanghai 2006; Liu Yingsheng, 劉迎勝, Shiji’s Wokuotai hanguo monian jishi buzheng 《史集》窩闊台汗國末年記事補證 [Supplements to the history of the late Ögödeid ulus in the *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*. A reconsideration of the peace agreement among the Mongol uluses and the destruction of the Ögödeid ulus], *Yuanshi ji beifang minzu shi yanjiu jikan* 元史及北方民族史研究集刊 10 (1986), 48–59; Liu Yingsheng, 劉迎勝, Yuan dai Menggu zhuhanguo de yuehe ji Wokuotai hanguo de miwang 元代蒙古諸汗國的約和及窩闊台汗國的滅亡 [The peace agreement of the Mongolian khans in the Yuan period and the annihilation of the Ögödeid khanate], *Xinjiang daxue xuebao* 新疆大學學報 (1985/2), 31–43; B. Spuler, Chapar (Čäpär), *EI2*.

MICHAL BIRAN

Charity, modern period

Charity (or philanthropy) has always been an important aspect of Islam, dating back to the principles of *zakāh* (mandatory alms) and *ṣadaqa* (optional charitable

giving) set out in the Qur’ān and of *waqf* (pious endowment) traced back to the life of the prophet Muḥammad. Many Muslims discharge their *zakāh* obligations by giving privately to individuals whom they know, but Islamic charity took on new institutional forms throughout the twentieth century, culminating in the growth, since the 1970s, of “Islamic NGOs” (non-governmental organisations), whose expansion was curbed, in many regions, by geopolitical tensions and the menace of violent extremism.

1. EARLY TO MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

After the decision in 1877 by the International Committee of the Red Cross to allow the Ottoman Empire to use the crescent instead of the cross as an emblem, many Muslim-majority countries established Red Crescent national societies, which, as part of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, are officially non-confessional but have often taken on an Islamic colouring. The oldest major Islamic charity is the Makassed Philanthropic Islamic Society (Jam’iyyat al-Maqāṣid al-Khayriyya al-Islāmiyya), founded in Beirut in 1878, which grew to play an important role in social affairs, health, and education. Two Islamic associations in Muslim-majority countries were founded in 1912: in Indonesia, the reformist Muhammadiyah, which grew to have a huge presence in the country with a network of educational, health, and welfare activities; and in Egypt, the conservative Jam’iyya Shar’iyya, which also developed into a major provider of medical and social services with extensive popular support. But, while the former has been the subject of sustained research, including a centenary conference in Malang in 2012 devoted to its history,