

Introduction

In the Name of God, the Compassionate the Caring
 Do you see him who calls the [day of] reckoning a lie?
 He is the one who casts the orphan away
 who fails to urge the feeding of one in need.
 Cursed are those who perform the prayer unmindful of how they pray
 who make of themselves a display but hold back charity.

Qur'an 107¹

In the summer of 2005, Tariq Fischer was killed in a car accident. His parents pledged a generous gift in memory of their son to Swarthmore College, the Pennsylvania school in the United States where Tariq had just completed his first year of study. Describing their donation, his parents wrote: "It is not often that a college is given the responsibility to invest the inheritance of one of its young students, and we consider this a special and serious commitment. Tariq loved his friends at Swarthmore. He loved his involvement in sports. He loved writing for *The Phoenix* [the college newspaper]. And he loved Islam. We will have some peace if his inheritance is invested by Swarthmore to honor these things that he loved." Most of the Fischers' gift was directed to support the new Islamic Studies program at the college. As Tariq's mother, a physician originally from Pakistan, explained: "There is a tradition in Islam called Sadaqa-e Jariya, where Muslims are encouraged to set up educational facilities or programs that will continue to benefit people even after the donors are gone . . . We hope this endowment will continue to benefit students, many of whom will become future leaders, in understanding Islam and Muslims and bring harmony between the people of the world."²

On the face of it, the Fischers' gift fits seamlessly into US philanthropic traditions rooted in Judeo-Christian ethics and American history, traditions that have inspired generations of donors to support public and private education, medicine, poverty relief, religious buildings and services, the arts, literature,

¹ Qur'an verses in this book are cited mainly from Arthur J. Arberry, trans., *The Koran Interpreted* (New York: Macmillan, 1955), unless otherwise indicated. The translation here is that of Michael Sells, *Approaching the Qur'an: The Early Revelations* (Ashland, OR: White Cloud Press, 1999), 124, except for the word "charity," for which he prefers "small kindness."

² <http://www.swarthmore.edu/news/releases/05/fischer.html> (accessed 6 February 2006).

2 Charity in Islamic Societies

and a host of civic societies and endeavors ranging from veterans associations to the protection of animals, from local town initiatives to nationwide and transnational organizations. Yet the Fischers framed their donation within another tradition as well, that of Muslim beliefs and practices, which have likewise inspired charitable giving throughout the fourteen centuries of Islamic history. For example, almost five hundred years before the Fischers, the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman I and his wife, Hürrem Sultan, sponsored the construction of a mosque, *madrassa* (college), public kitchen, and tomb in memory of their favorite son and heir, Prince Mehmed (1521–1543), who died of an illness at almost the same age as Tariq Fischer.³ Until today, the buildings of this Ottoman complex, known as Şehzade (“son of the ruler”), remain a vibrant part of life in the center of Istanbul.

From approximately the early 1990s, Muslim charity has attracted growing attention, much of it not in academic circles, and since September 11, 2001, it has received some very bad press, with analysts and observers frequently emphasizing the links between charity and extremist violence. The headline “Defining Hamas: Roots in Charity and Branches of Violence” was a typical one for newspaper stories in the early twenty-first century.⁴ Yet with all the negative ink spilled on the subject by government officials, journalists, pundits, and others, few have stopped long to consider why it is that the discourse and practice of charity are so prominent in Muslim communities, historically and today, except to give passing lip service to the fact that almsgiving is one of the five basic obligations of every Muslim. In the post-9/11 world, where fear of highly visible political Islam represented by radical minorities runs high, one of the challenges for scholars is to examine Islamic societies without feeling compelled either to condemn or to glorify them. Such a critical examination of history strives to discover the particular and the universal within one or more societies in order to understand the commonalities and specificities of diverse peoples and in so doing to appreciate more fully the entire human experience.

Throughout history, the responsibility for social welfare has been distributed variously among individuals, families, governments, and associations of many types. Not all of their efforts might be called charity by everyone, and indeed “charity” has become, and is used here to describe, a wide variety of behaviors. Yet the historical investigation of giving in this broadest sense – whether

³ On Prince Mehmed, see Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 60, 67, 80. Peirce believes that Mehmed died of natural causes, probably smallpox. On the founding of this complex of buildings, see Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, photographs and drawings by Arben N. Arapi and Reha Günay (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 191–207.

⁴ Ian Fisher, “Defining Hamas: Roots in Charity and Branches of Violence,” *The New York Times* (June 16, 2003), A8.

beneficence, philanthropy, welfare, or aid – is integral to interpreting any society or culture. To understand the history of charity means also to understand how notions of entitlement and obligation evolved in societies, creating the networks of responsibility and dependence in which we live today. Without an appreciation of the ways in which states and societies develop effective forms of relief for dependent individuals and groups, one can scarcely comprehend much of contemporary political and economic discourse and culture. The same is true of the past.

The religion of Islam is more than 1,400 years old and its adherents around the world number in excess of one billion people at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Within a century of his death in 632 the followers of the Prophet Muhammad had traveled as preachers, merchants, and conquerors from their first home in the Arabian peninsula to the lands of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Today, Muslims live in most countries of the world, in some as the majority population, in others as minority communities. They are united by a common adherence to the Qur'an as a sacred text which provides the basis for religious belief and the correct way to conduct one's life.

The present work asks what comprises charity in Islamic societies and explores the multiplicity of roles it has played, beginning from its recitation, analysis, and imitation from the teachings and practices of Muhammad, to its reinforcement as the Islamic community (*umma*) expanded and as interpretation and historical experience divided the community into separate polities and distinctive cultures. To be sure, practices have varied tremendously across time and space as they were affected by factors such as class, gender, education, and the environment. Charity in Islamic societies constitutes a rich field of investigation in and of itself, and the study of charitable ideals and practices provides significant insights into the histories and cultures of Muslims. At the same time, however, this study assumes charity to be a universal phenomenon, such that the insights gained in this particular context also provide insights into the experiences of human history in general. This book thus presents a constructive alternative approach to what had been posited so destructively since 9/11 as a nexus between charity and violence among Muslims. It decouples the connection by contextualizing charity within Islamic societies historically. As such, charity becomes not an act that is stigmatized by its association with Muslims but a social practice that travels the globe.

Until very recently, the ideals and practices of charity have been virtually absent from historical discussions of Islamic societies, despite the fact that they permeate the experience of Muslims past and present. While ideologically associated with religious belief, practice, and fundamental notions of social justice, these same ideals and practices have worked historically in as complex and even problematic ways as does charity everywhere. This book is thus conceived as a starting point for further research and thinking about charity,

setting out a basic conceptual framework and analyzing a broad range of examples. My intention is to introduce readers to the rich possibilities offered by reconsidering history through the prism of charity.

What is charity?

A sense of the complexity of ideas implicated in the notion of charity can be gleaned by exploring some of the vocabulary related to charity in other languages and religions. Two relevant points of comparison for Islam are Judaism and Christianity, which preceded Islam and contributed directly and indirectly to its initial formation. The Hebrew term *ṣedāqā* is cognate with Arabic *ṣadaqa* and the two are related to the Semitic root /ṣdq/ meaning “right,” “privilege,” “grant,” or “gift,” and to the idea of giving a stipulated gift as an appropriate course of action. On the other hand, an Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew had a meaning of giving charity or alms. Arabic *sadaqa* thus derived its meaning directly from the Semitic root or else it absorbed the term as a loan translation. *Ṣedāqā* in Hebrew had primarily a moral sense, meaning “justice” or “righteousness.” Scholars understood both justice and righteousness to be acts of religious merit, such that the two became synonymous, expressed simultaneously in the single word. As the Jewish and Aramaic concepts began to fuse in the sixth century BC, the Hebrew also came to refer to concrete, material assistance, “the charity which a Jew is required by law to give to the poor.” In the fifth century BC, the term referred to sums levied for the common welfare and then more specifically for the poor as a result of the circumstances provoked by the Babylonian exile (586 BC). In addition to *ṣedāqā*, Hebrew used the word *hesed* (graciousness) to talk about the manner of extending hospitality and aid to the needy.⁵

Both the moral and religious explanations of charity and the philological discussion consider charity from two perspectives, that of the donor and that of the recipient. On the one hand, charity is a gift or grant required by law; on the other hand, charity represents a right of the poor or a just claim on the community. This duality in charity relationships is important to remember because charitable actions are shaped by the motivations and expectations of both donors and recipients, although the relative influence of either side varies enormously from one charitable occasion or undertaking to the next.

The early Christians evolved general principles concerning charity, which emphasized mutual love and the love of God, together with warnings against the attachment to money and material things. In addition to a communal ethic, Christianity also evolved an emphasis on individual charity and asceticism,

⁵ Franz Rosenthal, “Ṣedaqa, Charity,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950–51): 411–30.

which, among other things, ultimately influenced the creation of monasteries. Monasteries were inseparably linked to charity, subsisting at least in part on charitable contributions while, at the same time, dispensing charity in one form or another to the poor and deserving.⁶ These basic attributes of charity in early Jewish and Christian communities provide points of comparison for our discussion of charity in Islamic societies, and make it clear that charity in Islamic texts and practices derived partly from a prior history of beneficent practice. A full discussion of Jewish and Christian practices and ideas, however, is not the purpose of this book. Moreover, if this book were an investigation into the origins of Islamic charity, it would also be appropriate to explore extensively the contributions of Greek, Roman, Sassanid, Byzantine, and pre-Islamic Arabian cultures to the formation of early Islamic societies.⁷

The words we use to talk about charity are not neutral, and because we are using English here to represent ideas and experiences created in other languages, it is worth taking a moment to consider their meanings. English-language dictionary definitions of charity include both a material aspect, that is, giving substantive assistance to those in need, and a more emotional or philosophical component, namely the love of humankind. The latter aspect derives most immediately from traditional Christian ideas related to the Latin word *caritas*. Actually, the central position of charity in modern Christian thought, at least in the English-speaking world, paradoxically derived from a mistranslation in the King James Bible, first published in 1611. In the New Testament, St. Paul named faith, hope, and love as the three chief virtues, subsequently called the three theological virtues by the Church Fathers in the

⁶ Frederick B. Bird, "Comparative Study of the Works of Charity in Christianity and Judaism," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 10 (1982): 162.

⁷ For a recent general discussion of the early period of Islamic history, see Jonathan P. Berkey, *The Formation of Islam: Religion and Society in the Near East, 600–1800* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003). For discussions of charity in Judaism, see Ephraim Frisch, *An Historical Survey of Jewish Philanthropy* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924; repr. 1969); Abraham Cronbach, "The Maimonidean Code of Benevolence," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 20 (1947): 471–540; Mark R. Cohen, *Poverty and Charity in the Jewish Community of Medieval Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 288. For charity in the classical world, see Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, introd. by Oswyn Murray, trans. Brian Pearce (London: Allen Lane, 1976; repr. 1990); A. R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968); Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002); Maria Macuch, "Charitable Foundations in the Sasanian Period," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, V: 139–42. On Byzantine charity, see Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, Rutgers Byzantine Series (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1968); Judith Herrin, "Ideals of Charity, Realities of Welfare: The Philanthropic Activity of the Byzantine Church," in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. Rosemary Morris, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Manchester Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, 1986 (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham, 1990), 151–64.

6 Charity in Islamic Societies

fourth and fifth centuries.⁸ “Love” in the New Testament was the Greek *agape*, God’s love, or “the nature of God himself.”⁹ *Agape* came into Latin as *caritas*, which also described God’s love for humankind. The King James Bible translation committee rendered “*caritas*” into English by “charity” with the result that the translation actually changed the meaning of the original Greek to focus on the love shown by humans for each other, and so to God, through beneficent acts.¹⁰ With the translation into English, “charity” in the modern sense took on a higher place than before in God’s perceived agenda for people.

Philanthropy, literally “love of man”, is probably the English word most commonly used as a synonym for charity. However, some authors insist on drawing a precise dividing line between the two as distinct phenomena. Charity is then seen as deriving from spiritual or religious motivations while philanthropy describes the nineteenth- and twentieth-century realm of rational, professionalized, secular action. Perhaps this attempt at a distinction arises from the Greek origins of the word “philanthropy” and its place in classical as opposed to Christian texts. A more useful contrast between charity and philanthropy might be found in definitions of charity as relief or “acts of mercy to relieve suffering” and of philanthropy as development or “acts of community to enhance the quality of life and to insure a better future.”¹¹ However, even a brief tour through historical and sociological writings on charity and philanthropy makes clear that distinctions between the two are not universally adopted and are, in any case, unhelpfully rigid. It is not always an easy task to separate “acts of mercy” from “acts of community,” especially when the terms of the discussion are in (or originated from) another language, one which frames these acts differently. Nor is it always possible to untangle religious and secular inspirations in any one place or time or in any one person, since religious teachings are a fundamental aspect of ethical education in many parts of the world, delivered in a variety of devotional contexts, even where schools are organized with a secular and rational outlook. Moreover, the importance of family and community socialization to generous behavior is probably at least as important as any formal instruction. At the same time, projects articulated in

⁸ I Corinthians 13:13. Chapter 13 is the famous passage from the New Testament which begins: “Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity ...” where “charity” throughout the chapter was translated from *caritas* or *agape*.

⁹ Bernard Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (London: Edward Arnold, 1986), 132.

¹⁰ F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

¹¹ Robert Payton, “Philanthropy in Action,” in *Philanthropy: Four Views*, Robert Payton *et al.* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1988), 1. See also the discussion in Robert A. Gross, “Giving in America: From Charity to Philanthropy,” in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, ed. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 29–48, which describes a chronological development of philanthropy in the course of the nineteenth century.

religious language may be motivated by forces not even remotely religious. Some preference seems to be retained in current American usage for choosing “philanthropy” when talking about the donations of wealthy individuals, referred to as philanthropists, in particular when referring to cultural projects in contrast to efforts to ensure basic human welfare, especially those effected through faith-based organizations. Yet in the UK it is the “Charities Commission” that oversees all philanthropic contributions and organizations.¹²

Many other words exist in English as partial or whole synonyms to the word charity, like altruism, beneficence, benevolence, or munificence. This list might be expanded to other languages to include the original Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic of the Bible, New Testament, and Qur’an, not to mention the languages of other holy texts. Modern secular terms used by governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) alike add words to the vocabulary of beneficent giving: aid, development, relief, support, welfare. These words are not fully congruent and each word also carries with it lexical nuances and built-in references to time, place, ideology, and policy, as well as a specific range of meanings that depart from the sense of charity. Ultimately, as we will see, there is no definitive solution to the problem of how to talk about beneficent giving in Islamic societies using the English language. However, it is necessary at the outset to articulate the complex range of terms and meanings that adhere to or intersect with the word charity. In this book charity, beneficence, and philanthropy will be used interchangeably.

After reviewing some of the vocabulary associated with charity, it is worth considering the meaning of charity. In one sense, “charity” or “philanthropy” is an answer to the larger question: what are the proper uses of wealth? That is, different belief systems respond in distinct ways to the accumulation and spending of material wealth. Some encourage charitable giving by both condemning wealth and praising giving, others by emphasizing the plight of the needy and the responsibility of the rich. It is frequently the case that people are encouraged for religious reasons to divest themselves of property, in part or in full, for the benefit of others. Meanwhile, some pagan belief systems hold that objects have their own essence and must be passed on to prevent them working against their owners.

While this book does not cover the economic histories of Islamic societies or even the more limited contemporary field of “Islamic economics,” it contributes in some measure to each of these fields. At some level, discussions of charity in

¹² For the meanings and etymologies of “philanthropy,” see *Oxford English Dictionary* (online edition). See the discussion of terms and meanings in W. Ilchman, S. N. Katz, and E. L. Queen, eds, *Philanthropy in the World’s Traditions* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), x and Kevin C. Robbins, “Philanthropy,” in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol. IV, ed. Maryanne Cline Horowitz (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2005), 1757–58.

all societies are about economics, because they explain how people have come to define acceptable uses of wealth acquired and held by individuals. Most obviously in the contemporary world, capitalism advocates the private accumulation of wealth and different national legal systems make laws requiring people to share their wealth (for example, through direct taxation) or provide inducements for them to distribute it (for example, by allowing tax deductions for philanthropic giving). Today, varying tax rates reflect, among other things, where responsibility is assigned for social welfare. Higher tax rates, such as in Scandinavia, are typical of states with a highly centralized and developed public service and social welfare sector. Lower tax rates, such as in the United States, partly result from the belief that citizens with means (larger and smaller), who believe it is important to fund one endeavor or another, will do so from their own monies and with the cooperation of like-minded individuals, thus strengthening civil society through the proliferation of non-governmental organizations. In an era when market forces seem to rule economic decision-making at the micro and macro levels, a study of charity pauses to examine what appears to be a prevalent, non-market factor influencing economic decisions. At the same time, it may reveal to what extent charity has also become a marketable commodity.

What else does charity mean? One useful definition is “voluntary action for the public good.”¹³ *Action* includes an individual giving money or material goods or rendering services in the form of donated time and expertise, as well as the formation of associations that both collect and disburse these same commodities. Understood in this broad sense, we can identify similar kinds of actions across time and space around the globe. *Public good*, in contemporary western terms, defines a sphere of action outside the family. Similarly, in Islamic thought the key idea of *maslaha* is usually translated as “public interest” or “public welfare” and reaches beyond the immediate family to include extended family, neighbors, fellow subjects or citizens, and the Muslim *umma* altogether.¹⁴

It is important to recognize that beneficence is not benign, either in its motivations or in its effects. Countless endeavors owe their existence to donations from individuals inspired by love and honor for a beloved family member, by the memory of hardships overcome, or by dedication to ideas and causes. Yet the less generous motivations of self-promotion and economic self-interest are also prominent factors in motivating beneficence. Charity may be an act to be admired and praised but at the same time cogent critiques exist about what

¹³ Robert Payton, as cited in Ilchman *et al.*, *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions*, x.

¹⁴ See Madjid Khadduri, “*maṣlaḥa*,” in *EP*, VI:738–40; Charles Tripp, *Islam and the Moral Economy: The Challenge of Capitalism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 24–26, 49–51, 68–76.

charity is, what it achieves, and how harmful it can be. Thus the study of charity is not only about well-meaning assistance offered to people in need; it also explores how charity is used for personal gains of power and status, and how givers manipulate recipients, and, in turn, are themselves manipulated.¹⁵ A question related to that of motivations for giving is the ability of any charity to achieve its stated goals. Critiques of donations squandered owing to mis-conceived projects and mismanaged resources appear repeatedly in historical sources. Among the critical themes in these sources that resonate even in the present is the problem of money diverted before it reaches its targets, as well as the problem of donations promoting further dependence among recipients. As a component of human endeavor, charity is susceptible to the best and worst impulses and foibles of human beings, as well as the unintentional corruption of well-intentioned projects.

Ideas about giving

Muslim law makes a clear distinction between charity and gifts. However, the immediate context of any single act together with the status of the giver and recipient may influence more the way an action is perceived as well as its impact. Thus the practical line between charity and gifts is blurred, even if a legal separation exists in theory. This means that the ideas of the sociologist Marcel Mauss (1872–1950) about gifts are important when we consider the significance of charity. Based on his own observations of Pacific Island societies and those of Pacific Northwest America, Mauss posited that all giving is obligatory and reciprocal. Gifts of all kinds are signs of status and convey the assertion of superiority, the recognition of parity, or an acknowledgment of inferiority or subservience. According to Mauss, it is the continuous exchange of gifts between individuals that creates social order and stability, while an interruption or distortion of gift-giving signals a challenge to or breakdown in the established system.¹⁶

From Mauss' perspective, then, what we identify as charitable giving in Muslim contexts really belongs to the pervasive, ongoing gift exchanges that make societies cohere. Different belief systems refer to giving with a variety of names and compel believers to give within the context of distinct theologies.

¹⁵ An interesting discussion of the motivations for charity can be found in S. Cavallo, "The Motivations of Benefactors: An Overview of Approaches to the Study of Charity," in *Medicine and Charity before the Welfare State*, ed. J. Barry and C. Jones (London: Routledge, 1991), 46–62. For a thoughtful critique of the motivations that steer contemporary aid and development organizations, see Tony Vaux, *The Selfish Altruist: Relief Work in Famine and War* (London: Earthscan, 2001).

¹⁶ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. W. D. Halls, foreword by Mary Douglas (London: Routledge, 1990), originally published 1925.

However, giving also constitutes a universal of human behavior. Almsgiving, for Mauss, is a special case of his general theory of gift. He posited that alms appeared at a specific moment in the history of a society, when the “ancient morality of the gift” became a “principle of justice” such that people with a surplus of wealth and good fortune were obliged to be generous and share what they have. What had previously been destroyed in sacrifices to the gods and spirits was now given to serve the poor and children.¹⁷ Mauss’ discussion of almsgiving refers to shifts from potlatch-like destruction to almsgiving that occurred repeatedly in human history, one stage in the development of societies. Potlatch as destructive sacrifice was transformed to large-scale philanthropy.¹⁸ Altogether, Mauss offered a sociological explanation for the existence and power of charitable giving. And he presented a sociologist’s answer to the question: why does charity exist?

Altruism is another idea that overlaps with charity, sometimes even used as its synonym. The *Oxford Concise English Dictionary* defines altruism as “selfless concern for the wellbeing of others” or “behaviour of an animal that benefits another at its own expense,” thus emphasizing the aspect of self-sacrifice or risk entailed by a specific donation. Some, however, will question the extent to which any behavior that appears selfless, precarious, or even harmful to a donor really is so. Cynics are quick to raise an eyebrow at the notion of altruism. Here, the “handicap principle,” an idea from the world of biology, explains altruism in a way that merges usefully with Mauss’ ideas about the role of gift-giving in human societies.

Biologist Amotz Zahavi coined the phrase “handicap principle” to describe his hypothesis about why animals engage in risky behavior or have extravagant physical features. Examples include the peacock’s large and colorful tail, the stotting of gazelles (when they first leap up into the air when threatened by cheetahs instead of immediately running away), and the giving away of food. Zahavi suggests that dangerous, flamboyant, or altruistic behavior in animals is a means to signal strength and claim status and prestige; thus ultimately, these features or behaviors are “cost-effective” in terms of immediate survival or perpetuation of a species and they may entail no real sacrifice at all.¹⁹ Zahavi studied babblers, a kind of bird that lives in communal groups in the Israeli and

¹⁷ Mauss, *The Gift*, 17–18.

¹⁸ *Potlatch* is an Indian word from the American Pacific Northwest used to describe a traditional ceremony or event at which the host lavished gifts of many kinds on his guests, differing in quantity and quality according to the status of each guest. These occasions sometimes entailed even the destruction of goods, as a way to demonstrate the wealth and power of the host. Mauss was one of the first anthropologists to discuss this phenomenon: see the discussion in *The Gift*, viii–ix, 6–7, 8, 18, 38–39.

¹⁹ Amotz and Avishag Zahavi, *The Handicap Principle: A Missing Piece of Darwin’s Puzzle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), xv–xvi; Richard Conniff, “Why We Take Risks,” *Discover* 22 (2001): 62–67.