

The *Vakif* Institution in 16th-Century Istanbul: An Analysis of the *Vakif* Survey Register of 1546

HAYASHI Kayoko

1. Introduction

The present paper aims at analyzing some aspects of the *vakif*¹⁾ institution that developed in mid-16th century Istanbul, as a case study describing their evolution in a specific time and space. The source utilized here is the *vakif* survey register of 1546 published by Ö. L. Barkan and E. H. Ayverdi in 1970²⁾.

In Ottoman urban societies, the *vakif* institution was so widespread that most of the urban population was connected with it as either *vakif* founders or beneficiaries. Nevertheless, what we know about its evolution is still too limited. For example, it has not been made clear what kind of people founded *vakifs*, which *vakif* size was most popular, or what kinds of property were endowed for what purposes? The survey register which records all *vakifs* of Istanbul in 1546 may answer some of these questions, though no systematic analysis of it has yet been made, with the exception G. Baer's contribution to the study of *vakifs* founded by women³⁾. The present paper will classify the vast information contained in this register according to *vakif* founders, *vakif* property, and the purpose of founding, in the hope that the results will suggest some general criteria for the further quantitative study of the *vakif* institution.

The survey register of 1546 contains 2515 *vakifs* in 219 *mahalles* (city quarters), which, except sultanic *vakifs* and a few *vakifs* not investigated because of the accidental absence of the *vakif* managers, constituted all the *vakifs* that were functioning within the walls of Istanbul when the survey was made.

Sultanic *vakifs* of the Ottoman Empire are clearly distinguished from privately-held *vakifs*, as H. Gerber has pointed out in his study of *vakifs* in Edirne⁴⁾. Under the Ottoman *mîrî* (state) land regime, the sultan canonically possessed all the land, and he was the only person who could endow *mîrî* land to his *vakifs*. This kind of *vakif* property is the main characteristic of the sultanic *vakifs*. Because of such differences, analysis of sultanic *vakifs* and privately-held *vakifs* should be conducted separately. The present paper will concentrate upon the latter.

The Ottoman central government carried out several *vakif* surveys in

Istanbul⁵⁾. The purpose might have been to grasp the overall conditions of *vakıfs* in Istanbul. The actual survey was carried out by a delegation consisting of *kâtıbs* (scribes) and deputies of the *kadı* (judge) of Istanbul. *İmam* (prayer leader) of each *mahalle*-mosque⁶⁾ also collaborated with them. The founder's name, *vakıf* property, expenditures, and comments on the present conditions of each *vakıf* were recorded in the register, along with references to the endowment deed and the former survey register. We can see how the survey was conducted through some notes written by the *kâtib*: e.g., "because the manager said that the endowment deed was lost, we wrote these items according to what he told us"; "this *vakıf* was recorded in the former survey register, but no one knows about it today"; "they couldn't show us the endowment deed, but the *imam* said that this *vakıf* has been used in this manner for a long time", etc. Because *imam* of each *mahalle*-mosque joined in the survey, those *vakıfs* beneficial to the *mahalle*-mosque tended to be recorded in detail.

As a historical source, the main characteristic of this register is that it contains a vast variety of smaller *vakıfs*, the endowment deeds of which are usually not expected to have remained. Since such *vakıfs* take up the major portion of this register, analysis could be rather different from that of former studies based on endowment deeds or other historiographical sources⁷⁾.

Founders' social class, types of *vakıf* property and purposes of founding will be the major concerns of this paper. To make the analysis effective from a quantitative point of view, I have classified the *vakıfs* into three categories according to size. *Vakıfs* whose annual incomes were more than 10,000 *akçe* are classified as "large", *vakıfs* with the incomes more than 1000 *akçe* but less than 10,000 *akçe* are considered "medium-sized", and those with incomes less than 1000 *akçe* "small". Out of 2447 *vakıfs* of our sample, the annual income of 673 is not indicated; but since 92.4% of these *vakıfs* contain property of only one or two houses, we may conclude their size classification to be "small".

After classifying all the *vakıfs* in our sample of 2447 according to size, we find that 5.0% of the total were large *vakıf*, 20.0% were medium-sized and 75.0% were small. Therefore, we can see that *vakıf* income is inversely proportional to their

Table 1 *Vakıf* size¹

Size	Number	%	Total income (<i>akçe</i>)	%
Large	123	5.0%	6,982,430	78.8%
Medium-size	488	20.0%	1,460,142	16.5%
Small	1836	75.0%	422,528	4.7%
Total	2447	100.0%	8,865,100	100.0%

¹ A total of 68 *vakıfs* could not be classified due to an absence of indicative information about income or amount of property (see note No. 11).

number, as shown in table 1.

Though sultanik *vakıfs* have been excluded from this study, we can assume that the few large *vakıfs* in our sample exerted considerable influence on the economic aspect of the institution as a whole. On the other hand, the huge number of small *vakıfs* might suggest the deep permeation of the *vakıf* institution into the urban society of Istanbul and a distinct function different from that of the large *vakıf*.

2. Types of *vakıf* founder

Let us examine the types of *vakıf* founder, in which two different categories must be considered: the ratio of male to female founders; and the founder's social class, i.e., tax-exempt ruling elite (*askerî* class) or ordinary citizens (*reaya*).

G. Baer has already made an important analysis concerning female *vakıf* founders using 500 cases chosen at random from the *vakıf* survey register of 1546⁸⁾. Baer showed that in mid-16th century Istanbul, one-third of all the *vakıfs* were founded by women for the purpose of retaining inherited property; but over time, these *vakıfs* were transferred to male beneficiaries and put under the control of male managers (*mütevelli*). As a result, Baer argues that the *vakıf* institution in fact weakened the economic position of women.

This conclusion reached through a detailed analysis of changes in beneficiaries by generations is very suggestive, but unfortunately it is difficult to say anything more about female *vakıfs*, because information on the social class of the female founders is entirely lacking.

Table 2⁹⁾ contains the results of my analysis using all the data from the survey register of 1546. It shows the number of *vakıfs* founded by men and women according to size. The proportion of female founders to male founders for each size category is not significantly different from the results of Baer's analysis. In sum, 37.1% of all the *vakıfs* were founded by women in Istanbul, but the

Table 2 Male and female founders by *vakıf* size

Founder	Large <i>vakıf</i>	Medium-size <i>vakıf</i>	Small <i>vakıf</i>	Total
Male founder	109	382	1048	1539
	7.1%	24.8%	68.1%	100.0%
	88.6%	78.3%	57.1%	62.9%
Female founder	14	106	788	908
	1.5%	11.7%	86.8%	100.0%
	11.4%	21.7%	42.9%	37.1%
Total	123	488	1836	2447
	5.0%	20.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

percentage of women decreases as the *vakif* size grows. Women founded 42.9% of the small *vakifs*, but only 11.4% of the large ones. Thus, women's *vakifs* are concentrated in the small *vakif* category. Incidentally, the characteristics of the small *vakifs* generally, as will be shown later, are remarkably similar to those founded by women.

As for the social class of *vakif* founders, we must take account of the essential distinction between the tax-exempt ruling elite (*askerî* class) and ordinary citizens (*reaya*) under the Ottoman regime. Out of 2447 *vakifs*, 971 contain information about the founder's social class. All of them were founded by men, and correspond to 63.1% of all male-founded *vakifs*. (All female *vakifs* are excluded because there is little information about founder's social class.)

We find the larger the size of a *vakif*, the more information about the founder. This is because many large *vakif* founders included their titles with their names. We have information about the social class for 95.4% of the large *vakif* founders, while we know the class of only 55.1% of the small *vakif* founders.

Table 3 Social class by *vakif* size

Founder	Large <i>vakif</i>	Medium-size <i>vakif</i>	Small <i>vakif</i>	Total
<i>askerî</i> class	79	205	364	648
	12.2%	31.6%	56.2%	100.0%
	76.0%	70.7%	63.1%	66.7%
<i>reaya</i> class	25	85	213	323
	7.7%	26.3%	66.0%	100.0%
	24.0%	29.3%	36.9%	33.3%
Total	104	290	577	971
	10.7%	29.9%	59.4%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3 shows the proportion of *askerî* class and *reaya* class among the three *vakif* sizes. The percentage of the *askerî* class is higher in the case of large *vakifs* than small ones, though the difference is not so remarkable. The point that should be noticed is rather the high percentage of *reaya* who founded large *vakifs*. *Vakifs* founded by *reaya* occupy 24.0% of the total number of the large *vakifs*. However, if we look at the founders of the largest *vakifs*, with annual incomes of more than 20,000 *akçe*, we find such titles of high ruling officers as *vezir* (minister) or grand-*vezir*. The proportion of *reaya* founders in this category is very low.

When our data is analyzed according to occupation of founder, we obtain a somewhat different image (see table 4).

The core ruling class group is the military-administrative establishment (*askerîs* in a narrow sense), people with titles of *beğ*, *paşa*, *ağa*, *çelebi* and so on. They founded about half the *vakifs* of each size category. We can therefore identify

Table 4 Occupation of founders by *vakıf* size

Founder	Large <i>vakıf</i>	Medium-size <i>vakıf</i>	Small <i>vakıf</i>	Total
Military members	56	154	246	456
	12.3%	33.8%	53.9%	100.0%
	53.8%	53.1%	42.6%	47.0%
<i>Ulemas</i>	15	29	46	90
	16.7%	32.2%	51.1%	100.0%
	14.4%	10.0%	8.0%	9.2%
Professional <i>sufis</i>	5	11	62	78
	6.4%	14.1%	79.5%	100.0%
	4.8%	3.8%	10.8%	8.0%
Bureaucrats	3	11	10	24
	12.5%	45.8%	41.7%	100.0%
	2.9%	3.8%	1.7%	2.5%
Large merchants	14	24	26	64
	21.9%	37.5%	40.6%	100.0%
	13.5%	8.3%	4.5%	6.6%
Craftsmen	11	61	187	259
	4.2%	23.6%	72.2%	100.0%
	10.6%	21.0%	32.4%	26.7%
Total	104	290	577	971
	10.7%	29.9%	59.4%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

them as the main utilizers of the *vakıf* institution.

Vakıfs of *ulemas* and professional *sufis* occupy around 10% of the total. We find that *ulemas*, who carry with their names such titles as *mevlânâ*, founded 14.4% of the large *vakıfs*, a relatively high rate. This is no doubt due to the existence of elite *ulemas* who enjoyed the patronage of sultans. On the other hand, most *vakıfs* founded by professional *sufis*, who were called *şeyh*, *halife*, *ahi*, *derviş dede* etc., were small in size. This might mean that the economic condition of professional *sufis*, like attendants of *zaviye* (*sufi* lodge), were generally similar to that of ordinary citizens.

As for the *reaya* class, it is remarkable that large merchants, called *hoca*, *tacir* or *sarrağ* (money changer), were so rich that they founded 13.5% of the large *vakıfs*, though many also founded small *vakıfs*. This means that some large merchants were economically comparable to the ruling class elites.

Craftsmen and merchants who were members of guilds founded one-fourth of the *vakıfs*, and most of them were medium-size or small in size. This number is more than I had expected. It may be derived from the inclination of this register to emphasize small *vakıfs*. As mentioned above, information about the social class of small *vakıf* founders is relatively scarce, so, the actual proportion of craftsmen

and merchant *vakif* founders to the whole sample could be more than what table 4 shows¹⁰⁾.

3. Types of *vakif* property

1) *Vakif* property and size

We find four types of property acting as the sources of *vakif* income in the register. These are urban commercial estates, urban dwellings, rural estates, and cash. It is true that both commercial estates and dwellings may be regarded as urban real estate; however, their utilization and their characteristics as *vakif* property are rather different, so we will deal with them as separate elements¹¹⁾.

Table 5 shows the remaining *vakifs* in terms of each type of property, and table 6 indicates the various combinations of property included in each *vakif*.

Table 5 Types of *vakif* property

<i>Vakif</i> property	Number	% to the 2447 total
<i>Vakif</i> including cash	1167	47.7%
" " dwellings	1365	55.8%
" " urban commercial estates	438	17.9%
" " rural estates	72	3.0%

Table 6 Property of each *vakif*

Property of each <i>vakif</i>	Number	%
Cash only	866	35.4%
Dwellings only	989	40.4%
Cash and dwellings	141	5.7%
Commercial estates only	140	5.7%
Commercial estates and dwellings	105	4.3%
Commercial estates and cash	54	2.2%
Commercial estates, cash and dwellings	80	3.3%
Rural estates only	4	0.2%
Rural estates and other property	68	2.8%
Total	2447	100.0%

From these tables, we can see that *vakifs* which include only dwellings or cash occupy the majority, together accounting for 75.8% of the total. *Vakifs* which include rural estates number only 72 (3.0%). *Vakifs* containing commercial estates only are fewer, and they tended to be endowed together with other types of property.

Now, how is type of property related to *vakif* size?

Table 7 lists what kind of property was found in each size category, and table 8 shows sources of income of each *vakıf* classified according to its size.

Many large *vakıfs* with income greater than 10,000 *akçe* contain all the types of property. Among them, however, commercial estates and rural estates seem to be their characteristic property, since the proportion of the large *vakıfs* with commercial estates or rural estates is much higher than that of the small or medium-size *vakıfs* having similar property (see table 7). It is quite probable that both commercial estates and rural estates yielded large incomes, which enabled the larger *vakıfs* to be maintained.

What should be noted about the medium-size *vakıfs* is the high proportion of those with cash property. Table 7 shows that 63.3% of the medium-size *vakıfs* included cash as their property. 35.7% of the medium-size *vakıfs* had only cash as their property.

Few of the small *vakıfs* contained commercial estates or rural estates (7.0%

Table 7 Type of property by *vakıf* size¹

<i>Vakıf</i> property	Large <i>vakıf</i> (123 <i>vakıfs</i>)	Medium <i>vakıf</i> (488 <i>vakıfs</i>)	Small <i>vakıf</i> (1836 <i>vakıfs</i>)	Total
Including cash	73(59.3%)	309(63.3%)	785(42.8%)	1167
" dwellings	88(71.5%)	226(46.3%)	1051(57.2%)	1365
" commercial estates	103(83.7%)	206(42.2%)	129 (7.0%)	438
" rural estates	44(35.8%)	18 (3.7%)	10 (0.5%)	72

¹ Percentages are based upon the total numbers of each *vakıf* size.

Table 8 Property of each *vakıf* by size

Property of each <i>vakıf</i>	Large <i>vakıf</i>	%	Medium-size <i>vakıf</i>	%	Small <i>vakıf</i>	%	Total
Cash only	12	9.7%	174	35.7%	680	37.0%	866
Dwellings only	0	0.0%	52	10.7%	937	51.0%	989
Cash and dwellings	7	5.7%	53	10.9%	81	4.5%	141
Commercial estates only	6	4.9%	51	10.4%	83	4.5%	140
Commercial estates and dwellings	19	15.4%	64	13.1%	22	1.2%	105
Commercial estates and cash	8	6.5%	30	6.1%	16	0.9%	54
Commercial estates, cash and dwellings	27	22.0%	46	9.4%	7	0.4%	80
Including rural estates	44	35.8%	18	3.7%	10	0.5%	72
Total	123	100.0%	488	100.0%	1836	100.0%	2447

and 0.5% of all the small *vakıfs*, respectively). Here, cash and dwellings are most common. 51.0% of the small *vakıfs* had only dwellings and 37.0% only cash.

From the above observations, we can conclude that cash and dwellings were included in each size category, though these two types of property, especially dwellings, are most dominant among the small *vakıfs*. These two types of property may be considered to be the most familiar to the urban dwellers of Istanbul. Rural estates characterized the large *vakıfs*, while commercial estates were generally included in the large and medium-size *vakıfs*.

2) The characteristic features of each type of *vakıf* property

Now, let us consider the characteristics of each type of *vakıf* property and compare approximate amounts of each type endowed in 16th-century Istanbul.

Cash

As is mentioned above, cash was the most common type of *vakıf* property in 16th-century Istanbul, in spite of arguments on the legality of the "cash *vakıf*" among scholars of Islamic law. Some 1167 *vakıfs* (47.7% of the total) contain cash among their property, and in 866 cases cash constitutes the only *vakıf* property. Small and medium-size *vakıfs* tend to contain only cash, while more than half of the large *vakıfs* contain cash together with other property.

Cash *vakıfs* were so common probably because of their liquidity factor. For example, the amount of endowed cash differs between 100 *akçe* (e.g., no. 1849) to 1,200,000 *akçe* (no. 2493: the *vakıf* of Rüstem Paşa) according to the founder's lot. In some cases, real estate was purchased with the cash already endowed¹²⁾. In other cases, old abandoned *vakıf* houses and shops were sold and the cash proceeds used in place of them¹³⁾. Changing the status of *vakıf* property, *istibdâl*, was often carried out with the permission of the *kadı* of Istanbul¹⁴⁾.

But liquidity sometimes causes lack of stability. Actually, cash *vakıfs* were very easy to lose and tended to decrease more in size. According to the analysis of Ö. L. Barkan, 71.6% of cash *vakıfs* of this register were lost during the time till the next survey in 1580¹⁵⁾. Among the descriptions in the register, I found fifty *vakıfs* with comments added by *kâtib* saying that the endowed cash had been lost or had decreased¹⁶⁾.

Most endowed cash was loaned at 10% interest; but there were a few cases in which the founder ordered it to be loaned at 12.5% or 20%¹⁷⁾.

Table 9 shows the amounts of cash endowed. *Vakıfs* of the 1000 *akçe* level (that yielded about 100 *akçe* annually) and 4000 *akçe* level (that yielded about 400 *akçe* annually) are relatively numerous, but we can also state that all the cash *vakıfs* were dispersed rather evenly over all levels, so we cannot discern any characteristic distribution pattern. The average amount of endowed cash is 174,281 *akçe* in the case of large *vakıfs* (numbering 73), 22,471 *akçe* in the case of 309 medium-size *vakıfs*, and 3292 *akçe* in the case of 785 small *vakıfs*. The average amount of all the cash *vakıfs* is 19,066 *akçe*.

To understand the value of such an amount of money, it may be useful to show some real estate prices referred to in the register. Urban dwellings are mentioned selling for 14,000 *akçe* (no. 1346), 9000 *akçe* (no. 1819), 6000 *akçe* (no. 1256), 5500 *akçe* (no. 402), 3000 *akçe* (no. 237), 1500 *akçe* (no. 467), 1000 *akçe* (no. 173), etc. Cultivated land (*mezraa*) is mentioned being bought for 40,000 *akçe* (no. 1806). As we will see later, the average annual rent for a shop was 250 *akçe* and for a dwelling, 881 *akçe*.

Table 9 Amount of endowed cash

Amount of cash (<i>akçe</i>)	Number	%
200000 <	15	1.3%
100000 – 199999	25	2.1%
50000 – 99999	61	5.2%
40000 – 49999	24	2.1%
30000 – 39999	30	2.6%
20000 – 29999	40	3.4%
15000 – 19999	36	3.1%
10000 – 14999	116	9.9%
9000 – 9999	8	0.7%
8000 – 8999	33	2.8%
7000 – 7999	20	1.7%
6000 – 6999	36	3.1%
5000 – 5999	86	7.4%
4000 – 4999	194	16.6%
3000 – 3999	105	9.0%
2000 – 2999	84	7.2%
1000 – 1999	169	14.5%
1 – 999	85	7.3%
Total	1167	100.0%

Urban dwellings

Urban dwellings are included in 1365 *vakıfs* (55.8% of the total) and the number of endowed dwellings reaches 1829 if we include those in Istanbul and Galata¹⁸). 989 *vakıfs* (40.4% of the total) have only dwellings as their *vakıf* property. Out of them 953 *vakıfs* have only single dwellings. In these cases, it could be assumed that the founder assigned his own dwelling to his *vakıf* property.

The characteristic feature of dwellings as *vakıf* property is that they are very common in the small *vakıfs*. 57.2% of the small *vakıfs* contain dwellings (see table 7), and 51.0% of them contain only dwellings as property (see table 8).

Table 10 shows how endowed dwellings were utilized. Some were rented out, and the others were inhabited by *vakıf* beneficiaries. Dwellings included in the small *vakıfs* were generally used in the latter manner (66.8%). One of the main reasons for endowing dwellings was to give one's own family the right to live

Table 10 Utilization of endowed dwellings

Utilization	Large <i>vakif</i>		Medium-size <i>vakif</i>		Small <i>vakif</i>		Total	%
		%		%		%		
Rented out	252	69.2%	231	64.7%	368	33.2%	851	46.5%
Lived in by beneficiaries	112	30.8%	126	35.3%	740	66.8%	978	53.5%
Total	364	100.0%	357	100.0%	1108	100.0%	1829	100.0%

Table 11 Rent of dwellings

Total			Less than 1000 <i>akçe</i>		
Rent (<i>akçe</i>)	Number	%	Rent (<i>akçe</i>)	Number	%
5000 <	13	1.5%	900 – 999	23	3.6%
4000 – 4999	8	0.9%	800 – 899	12	1.9%
3000 – 3999	20	2.4%	700 – 799	94	14.9%
2000 – 2999	33	3.9%	600 – 699	49	7.7%
1000 – 1999	145	17.0%	500 – 599	39	6.2%
1 – 999	632	74.3%	400 – 499	61	9.6%
			300 – 399	185	29.3%
			200 – 299	60	9.5%
			100 – 199	99	15.7%
			1 – 99	10	1.6%
Total	851	100.0%		632	100.0%

there. However, this usage was mostly common with dwellings of the small *vakıfs*. Dwellings included in the medium-size and large *vakıfs* were usually rented out, just like other urban real estate.

Table 11 shows the distribution of annual rents from 851 *vakıf* dwellings. Most are under 1000 *akçe*. The most common rates are 360 *akçe*, i.e., one *akçe* per day, or 720 *akçe*, i.e., 2 *akçe* per day.

Average rent per dwelling differs to some extent according to *vakıf* size: large, 1456 *akçe*; medium-size, 977 *akçe*; small, 429 *akçe*. The average rent of all the *vakıf* dwellings is 881 *akçe*.

Compared to the annual rent from shops or rooms, house rent seems to have been rather expensive. It is also interesting that there was a demand for rent of dwellings in 16th-century Istanbul. By means of privately-held *vakıfs*, at least 851 dwellings were supplied for that purpose.

As mentioned above, 1829 dwellings were endowed in Istanbul as *vakıf* property. Then, how common it was to endow dwellings? In 17th-century Bursa, according to H. Gerber, one-fourth of the dwellings were assigned to *vakıf*¹⁹⁾.

With regard to 16th-century Istanbul, we have no exact data, though we can still get some idea through the analysis of this register. Since the location of a *vakif* dwelling was recorded by the four buildings surrounding it, we can estimate the relative proportions of the different statuses of real property in the city. In locating a dwelling, distinction was made among private houses, *vakif* houses, public buildings (e.g., *mescid*, *cami*, *mektepe*) and streets. Excepting streets, the percentages of each type appearing in the register are as follows:

private property	80.9%
<i>vakif</i> property	15.5%
public buildings	3.6%

Thus, 15.5% of all the buildings in the Muslim quarters may be assumed to be *vakif* property. Although this is a very rough estimation, this breakdown leads one to believe that to endow a house as *vakif* property was not an unusual custom, but was generally practiced in the society of Istanbul.

Urban commercial estates

Besides dwellings, most of the endowed urban real estate consisted of non-residential commercial estates. This type included shops, rooms for rent, *hammam* (public baths), *han* (inns), storehouses, etc. They were generally rented out to craftsmen or merchants by the year. Rent revenue was considered as the most stable source of income. We find some notes in the register saying that a *vakif* founder stipulated that urban commercial property was to be purchased with the money that he endowed.

The commercial estates endowed in Istanbul are as follows²⁰:

Shops (*dükkan*): In Istanbul and Galata around 4430 shops were endowed as *vakif* property²¹. Average annual rent of a shop was around 250 *akçe*. Annual rents differ according to their location and size, but normal shops in *bazars* were rent out approximately for this amount in the 16th century. However, rents for some special shops, like *başhane*²² and *bozahane* (shop of *boza* maker), were very expensive. The average rent of the former was 1778 *akçe* and the latter, 856 *akçe*.

Rooms for rent (*hücre*): *Hücre* means “room” in general, but *hücre*s in commercial districts usually meant rooms for the temporary lodging of bachelors, ateliers for craftsmen, or storehouses for merchants. In Istanbul and Galata, around 5630 rooms for rent were endowed as *vakif* property²³. Rent came to on the average 150 *akçe* per room. Some rooms were used as the *vakif* beneficiary’s dwellings as many *vakif* houses were; but in most cases they were rented out as commercial property.

Baths (*hammam*): 35 *hammams*, not including the *vakif hammams* of sultans²⁴, were constructed as *vakif* property inside Istanbul up to the mid-16th century. Actually *hammam* brought in much income as an urban commercial estate. In half of the cases, annual rent from proprietors of *hammams*

amounted to more than 20,000 *akçe*, the highest being 65,000 *akçe* (no. 2167). The average rent was about 24,600 *akçe*. It may be supposed that the construction of *hammams* was very costly and that only the richest of urban dwellers could build them. Out of 33 *vakıfs* that included *hammams*, 27 *vakıfs* belonged to the large *vakıfs*, and the founders of 29 (87.9%) were *askerî* members or court women.

Inns (*han*): Like *hammam*, *han* was a feature of the large *vakıf*. In Istanbul and Galata a total of 28 *hans* were constructed as *vakıf* property. 82.1% of them belonged to the large *vakıf*, and 75.0% of their founders were of *askerî* class.

Storehouses (*mahzen*): 130 storehouses were included in 57 *vakıfs* and their average of rent was about 610 *akçe*. In Galata district we can even find some three-storied *mahzens*.

Baking ovens (*firm*): Baking ovens were also often endowed as *vakıf* property.

The average rent for the 68 baking ovens in our sample was 1680 *akçe*, which seems very expensive, but in some cases rooms or storehouses were attached to baking ovens, meaning that the rent was not only for the oven itself.

Urban landed property for rent: A few pieces of landed property (*zemin-i maktu*) and gardens (*bağ* or *bahçe*) on private land in the city were rented out. *Zemin-i maktu* was unoccupied land rented out inside or around commercial districts. Some 96 *vakıfs* contained *in toto* about 120 pieces of land in Istanbul and Galata. The amount of rent differed considerably, but averaged around 710 *akçe*. 36 *vakıfs* included gardens amounting to 45 pieces of land. Most of them were probably gardens attached to mosques. Vineyards and vegetable gardens outside Istanbul have been classified as rural estates²⁵).

Other commercial buildings: We also find other kinds of commercial estate, such as grain mills, stables and cellars, endowed as waqf property.

Proportions of income from each item to the total income from commercial estates in Istanbul are shown in table 12. We can assume that the large numbers of shops and rooms, on the one hand, and the expensive rent of *hammams*, on the

Table 12 Income from each type of commercial estates

Type of commercial estate	Income(<i>akçe</i>)	%
Shops	1,102,744	34.4%
Rooms for rent	749,978	23.4%
<i>Hammams</i>	786,603	24.5%
<i>Hans</i>	254,967	7.9%
Landed property for rent	120,211	3.7%
Storehouses	75,647	2.4%
Baking ovens	98,924	3.1%
Others	20,164	0.6%
Total	3,209,238	100.0%

other, make the incomes generated by them significant.

In addition to *vakıfs* with commercial estates in Istanbul and Galata, 49 *vakıfs* contain commercial estates in other cities, such as Edirne, Bursa, Silivli, Sofya and Filibe. Out of these 49 *vakıfs*, 34 belong to the large *vakıf*, and their total income is extraordinarily high at 976,300 *akçe* and equal to one-third of the total income from all the commercial estates in Istanbul. These *vakıfs* were recorded in this register, which was exclusively concerned with *vakıfs* in Istanbul, because their founders' mosques or other institutions existed in Istanbul, but their private property or, at least part of it, endowed to *vakıf* was located outside Istanbul. The percentage of *askerî* class founders holding such *vakıfs* is 79.6%.

Rural estates

Rural estates are rather special *vakıf* property in this register. To consider the relationship between rural estates and the urban dwellers of Istanbul, I classified them into two groups: landed property in the environs of Istanbul and that out in the countryside of Trakya or Anatolia.

The number of *vakıfs* including the former "sub-urban" type of property is only 38 (1.6% of the total) and their income comes to 0.8% of the total. 46 vineyards, vegetable gardens and pastures around Istanbul were included in 23 *vakıfs*. 9 of these *vakıfs* contained a total 12 pieces of cultivated land (*çiftlik* or *mezraa*). Many of them were located outside the city wall, on the outskirts of Galata and in other suburbs like Istinye and Kağthane. We can find also some grain mills in the suburbs being endowed (12 *vakıfs*). As S. Faroqhi has pointed out, in Anatolian cities it was a general phenomenon that urban dwellers possessed agricultural land around the city as private property and turned this land into *vakıf* property²⁶). To the contrary, it seems quite an exceptional case for 16th-century Istanbul.

Although *vakıf* property in the countryside is small (45 *vakıfs*, or 1.8% of the total), the amount of the income it generated is extraordinary high (20.7% of the total). Villages were endowed in 29 *vakıfs*; cultivated land (*mezraa*) and pasture were included in 13; 19 *vakıfs* contained grain mills in the countryside. 11 *vakıfs* contained only grain mills; the remaining 34 had agricultural land (village or *mezraa*) in the countryside. Out of these 34 *vakıfs*, 28 belong to large *vakıf* and most of their founders were elites of the *askerî* class, or women of the imperial court: that is to say, ten *paşas*, four *beğs*, six *ağas*, four elite *ulemas* or *şeyhs*, six court women, two large merchants and one *kâtib*. During the classical period of the Ottoman Empire, when one wanted to endow rural land as *vakıf* property, the first prerequisite was to possess it as private property under a grant from the sultan (*temlik*). Through the analysis of *vakıfs* in Istanbul, it can be concluded that *temlik* were very rare in 16th-century Istanbul, and that the founders of rural *vakıfs* were, in principle, very privileged people.

According to the studies of H. Gerber on rural *vakıfs* of Edirne and Bursa²⁷), it was very common to endow agricultural land in 15th and 16th-century Edirne,

but in 17th-century Bursa only one rural *vakif* property could be found in non-sultanic *vakifs*. Our observation about Istanbul is similar to Gerber's observation about Bursa. Some *vakifs* founded by ruling class elites or court women contained vast rural estates, but it was very exceptional. Whether in the suburbs of Istanbul or in the countryside, urban dwellers of Istanbul seldom possessed agricultural land as private property enabling them to found *vakif*.

As the result of my analysis of *vakif* property, the shares of each type of property in terms of its income are made clear as shown in table 13.

Table 13 Income from each type of property

Source of income	Income (<i>akçe</i>)	%
Interest on loans	2,020,744	22.8%
Dwellings in Istanbul	749,604	8.5%
Commercial estates in Istanbul	3,209,238	36.2%
Commercial estates besides Istanbul	976,300	11.0%
Rural estates in suburban of Istanbul	73,293	0.8%
Rural estates in the countryside	1,835,921	20.7%
Total	8,865,100	100.0%

4. The purposes for founding *vakifs*

Concerning the purposes for founding *vakifs*, two motives must be considered. One stems from charitable or religious reasons, and the other stems from private interest in benefiting one's family. Actually, most *vakifs* seem to have been founded with both purposes in mind, though which was given priority differs from *vakif* to *vakif*. Here, I have classified *vakifs* into three categories using a somewhat simplified standard for determining the purpose for founding *vakifs*.

The first category includes *vakifs* whose income was used to maintain charitable institutions established by *vakif* founders themselves. The second category includes *vakifs* whose income was dedicated to some specific charity, such as paying for candles or carpets of a *mahalle*-mosque, having an *imam* read the Koran, or carrying water to the fountain of a *mahalle*. *Vakifs* of the third category are those usually called "family *vakif*"; i.e., *vakifs* whose sole purpose was to benefit the founders themselves or their families for a period of time specified by the founders. After that period expired (in most cases, after the offspring had died out), the *vakifs* would be transferred to specific charities already prescribed by the founders²⁸⁾.

Table 14 shows the numbers of *vakifs* of each category according to size, and table 15 indicates the kinds of property that *vakifs* of each category include²⁹⁾. The characteristics of each category of *vakif* may be summarized as follows.

1) *Vakıfs* for charitable institutions

297 *vakıfs* (12.3% of the sample) have been put into this category. 85.3% of the large *vakıfs* and 34.4% of the medium-size *vakıfs* are included (see table 14). As table 15 shows, commercial estates and rural estates are very common kinds of

Table 14 Purpose for endowment according to *vakıf* size¹

Purpose	Large <i>vakıf</i>	Medium-size <i>vakıf</i>	Small <i>vakıf</i>	Total
For charitable institutions	104	166	27	297
	35.0%	55.9%	9.1%	100.0%
	85.3%	34.4%	1.5%	12.3%
For specific charities	16	280	1008	1304
	1.2%	21.5%	77.3%	100.0%
	13.1%	58.0%	55.8%	54.0%
Family <i>vakıf</i>	2	37	773	812
	0.2%	4.6%	95.2%	100.0%
	1.6%	7.6%	42.7%	33.7%
Total	122	483	1808	2413
	5.1%	20.0%	74.9%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹ There are 102 *vakıfs* for which the purpose for endowment or *vakıf* size is unknown.

Table 15 Purpose for endowment and type of property

Property of each <i>vakıf</i>	For charitable institutions		For specific charities		Family <i>vakıf</i>		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Cash only	34	11.5%	790	60.6%	29	3.6%	853
Dwellings only	14	4.7%	259	19.9%	701	86.3%	974
Cash and dwellings	14	4.7%	85	6.5%	42	5.2%	141
Commercial estates only	32	10.8%	88	6.7%	17	2.1%	137
Commercial estates and dwellings	65	21.9%	28	2.1%	12	1.5%	105
Commercial estates and cash	27	9.1%	25	1.9%	1	0.1%	53
Commercial estates, cash and dwellings	58	19.5%	19	1.5%	2	0.2%	79
Including rural estates	53	17.8%	10	0.8%	8	1.0%	71
Total	297	100.0%	1304	100.0%	812	100.0%	2413

property for this category.

The charitable institutions that *vakif* founders established include 26 *camis* (including some *cami*-complexes, *külliyes*), 173 *mescids*, 9 *medreses*, 13 *mekteps*, 13 *zaviyes* and 3 other institutions. Out of 199 mosques (*cami* and *mescid*), 155 were *mahalle*-mosques.

Most of the founders belong to the *askerî* class, but *reaya* who founded *vakıfs* of this category are not as few as would be expected. 180 founders were of the *askerî* class, 53 founders were *reaya*, the social class of 37 male founders are unknown, and 27 *vakıfs* were founded by women.

It is true that in most of the *vakıfs* of this category the founders gave a share to their offspring or appointed them as *vakif* managers for the sake of private profit. However, the charitable aspect still seems dominant, because each of these *vakıfs* has at least one charitable institution maintained by it.

If we look at the *vakif* institution from the viewpoint of urban construction, *vakıfs* of this category are the most important, because they supplied most of Istanbul's urban facilities; i.e., mosques and schools were built as charitable institutions and commercial buildings were equipped as *vakif* property.

2) *Vakıfs* for specific charities

1304 *vakıfs* (54.0% of the sample) have been put into this category. 58.0% of the medium-size *vakıfs* and 55.8% of the small *vakıfs* are included. In fact, most of the *vakıfs* of this category correspond to those small or medium-size *vakıfs* having only cash as their property. Interest from the cash on loans as well as other income was dedicated to specific charities according to the prescriptions of the endowment deeds. We can classify the specific charities as follows³⁰:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (1) <i>Vakif</i> that benefited their <i>mahalle</i> -mosques (for example, to pay for part of their expenses, such as the cost of candles or carpets, or the pay the <i>imam</i> or <i>müezzin</i> to read the Koran)..... | 935 |
| (2) <i>Vakif</i> that benefited mosques other than their <i>mahalle</i> -mosque | 139 |
| (3) <i>Vakif</i> that benefited certain institutions other than mosques..... | 9 |
| (4) <i>Vakif</i> that benefited <i>sufis</i> or certain <i>zaviyes</i> | 24 |
| (5) <i>Vakif</i> that paid for water supply in the city..... | 115 |
| (6) <i>Vakif</i> that paid for some specific expense like the cost of distributing food on Ramazan nights or paying the <i>avariz</i> (extra tax) for the benefit of the dwellers of their <i>mahalle</i> , etc..... | 65 |
| (7) <i>Vakif</i> that benefited unspecified <i>ulemas</i> , by paying them to read Koran for the salvation of the founders | 160 |

Koran reading at a certain mosque for the salvation of the *vakif* founder was the most common charitable deed prescribed in the *vakıfs* of this category. The reason may be that attendants of mosques were financially supported with the money given as offertories for reading the Koran. It also could be that *vakif*

founders seemed to expect some benefit towards their salvation from such Koran readings.

In addition, some profit was kept for the founder's family by appointing a family member as the *vakif* manager and giving him a salary. But these assignments were rarer than expected. Out of 1304 *vakifs* of this category, 796 *vakifs* had an assigned *vakif* manager, but in only 310 of these *vakifs* was the founder himself or his family appointed manager. In the other cases, we see that *imams* of mosques, *ulemas* or members of *sufi* orders were appointed managers. The salary of a manager cannot be considered to be a very large sum of money. We may conclude that the personal factor in this kind of *vakif* was rather modest.

Mahalle-mosques occupied a dominant place as the object of beneficence. Around 65% of the *vakifs* in this category gave something to their *mahalle*-mosques.

We observe that in 16th-century Istanbul a local administrative system developed which divided the whole city into smaller *mahalles*, each with at least one mosque, where *imam* of the mosque represented the *mahalle* administratively. Actually, the *vakif* survey of 1546 was carried out on the basis of the *mahalle*-mosque system, by which all *vakifs* were registered according to which *mahalle* they belonged. This system should be considered to be one of the urban administrative systems that the Ottoman government enforced in Istanbul. However, through the analysis of this register we now understand that residents had fairly strong ties with the mosque of their *mahalle*. This is partly shown by the fact that, in the *mahalles* of central Istanbul, where the *mahalle*-mosque system had been firmly rooted, many *vakifs* were dedicated to their *mahalle*-mosques. In contrast, in the environs where the system had not been firmly established yet, few *vakifs* were dedicated to these neighborhood institutions. From these observations we may conclude that the *vakif* institution played a role in binding urban dwellers and *mahalle*-mosques together and thus strengthening *mahalle* communities.

3) Family *vakif*

812 *vakifs* (33.7% of the sample) fall under this category. 95.2% of them are small *vakifs*. This category is also dominated by dwellings as the *vakif* property, as 86.3% contain only dwellings.

The close correlation between the family *vakifs* and the small size *vakifs* means that larger *vakifs* carried a charitable function from the very beginning, while almost half of the small *vakifs* suspended charity considerations for a certain period of time. It also should be noted that almost all the family *vakifs* have dwellings occupying at least part of their property. This means that dwellings were the most ideal property for the small *vakif* founders to leave to their families and descendants.

Vakifs of this category did benefit the founders' family in a direct way, but, their charitable function should not be ignored, since their transfer for charitable utilization was most probable. Classifying the charitable clauses pertaining to the

701 *vakıfs* including only dwellings as *vakıf* property (701 *vakıfs* contain 719 dwellings), we find each dwelling was donated for the following purposes:

To an institution that the founder established	6
To their <i>mahalle</i> -mosques	426
To other mosques or schools	100
To <i>sufi</i> orders	26
To the cost of water supply	5
To an unspecified <i>ulema</i> for reading the Koran	114
For other charitable purposes	28
No charitable clause	14

We have information on 528 dwellings out of these 719 concerning how they were used at the time when the survey was made. The founders themselves, their wives, or their children were actually living in 290 houses (54.9%); 83 houses (15.7%) were in the hands of founder's freed slaves or their descendants, while the remaining 155 houses (29.4%) were being used for charitable purposes, especially for the benefit of their *mahalle*-mosques (121 houses, or 22.9% of the cases). Because this register contains *vakıfs* that were founded on various dates, the tendency of transfer from private utilization to charitable utilization can not be judged very easily, but it can be said that the charitable clauses appearing were not only words, but were also realized with high probability.

5. Conclusions

Through the above analysis of the *vakıf* survey register, the following points have been made clear on the non-sultanic *vakıfs* in mid-16th century Istanbul.

1. As for the social classes of *vakıf* founders, member of the *askerî* class occupied around 70% of each size category (large, medium-size and small). Military members were the main founders of *vakıfs*, as they founded half of the total. As for *reayas*, large merchants founded considerably large *vakıfs*. Craftmen also take part in founding *vakıfs*, occupying 26.7% of the total.

2. Very large *vakıfs*, yielding income amounting to more than 20,000 *akçe*, were generally founded by people to whom the Sultan had given privileges, i.e., the elite members of the ruling class or court women. These *vakıfs* often contained villages located in the countryside that brought in quite a large amount of income. *Vakıfs* that contain agricultural land number only 34, but the sum of their incomes occupies about 20% of the total income from all the *vakıfs*.

3. For the ordinary *vakıfs*, cash, dwellings and commercial estates were the main sources of income. Commercial estates are found both in the large and medium-size *vakıfs*. Within commercial estates, shops and rooms for rent are most numerous, but *hammams* also brought in much income.

4. Cash was one of the most common types of *vakıf* property because of its

liquidity. 47.7% of all the *vakıfs* included cash as *vakıf* property.

5. Dwellings were also very common. 55.8% of all the *vakıfs* included dwellings. It should be noted that 51.0% of all the small *vakıfs* contained only dwellings as their property. 66.8% of the dwellings within such kind of *vakıfs* were used by the appointed beneficiaries. In most cases, the beneficiaries were the founders themselves or their offspring. This kind of *vakıf* has been classified as the “family *vakıf*”.

6. As for the purpose for founding *vakıfs*, we have distinguished three categories: *vakıfs* for charitable institutions established by *vakıf* founders, *vakıfs* for specific charities, and family *vakıf* for personal benefit. The distribution of *vakıfs* according to these categories comes to 12.3% for charitable institutions, 54.0% for specific charities, and 33.7% for personal benefit. 85.3% of the large *vakıfs* and 34.4% of the medium-size *vakıfs* were founded for charitable institutions. They seem to have contributed significantly to urban construction, because they offered *vakıf* property to the city as many public and commercial facilities.

7. *Vakıfs* for specific charities are usually found among small and medium-size *vakıfs*. They contain cash as their major or sole *vakıf* property. In most cases, *vakıf* incomes were donated to their *mahalle*-mosques.

8. Almost all family *vakıfs*, which suspended charity donations for a certain period of time, were small *vakıfs*. As for property, dwellings were dominant and were used by the founder’s family for a specific period, though it is quite probable that transfer from private utilization to charitable utilization did take place afterwards. In most of these cases, the donations were made to *mahalle*-mosques.

9. *Mahalle*-mosques were benefited by the *vakıf* institution. Attendants of a *mahalle*-mosque, such as *imam* and *müezzin*, were economically supported not only by the *vakıf* endowed for maintaining their mosque, but also by other smaller *vakıfs* endowed by various *mahalle* dwellers. Moreover, the *imam* of a *mahalle*-mosque played an important role in the administration of the *mahalle* as a person managing the *vakıf* institution.

10. The role played by the *vakıf* institution in Istanbul may be understood in the following way. One half of the small *vakıfs* benefited founders’ families for a certain period of time, while the other half and more than half of the medium-size *vakıfs* were donated to some specific charity; for example, to support their *mahalle*-mosques. 85% of the large *vakıfs* and 34% of the medium-size *vakıfs* supported the charitable institutions and commercial estates of Istanbul. The few very large *vakıfs* brought the surplus produced in the countryside to the city of Istanbul.

Notes

- 1) The word *vakıf* (pl. *evkaf*) is a Turkish rendering of the Arabic origin *waqf* meaning religious endowment.
- 2) Ö. L. Barkan & E. H. Ayverdi, *Istanbul vakıflar tahrîr defteri: 953 (1546) târîhli*, Istanbul, 1970. I have examined dwellings that were endowed as *vakıf* property using the same register in another paper entitled, "Houses in the vakıf system: A case of 16th-century Istanbul", *The memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture*, No. 118, 1992 (in Japanese). In the present paper, some quantitative results have been revised because of the application of new criteria.
- 3) G. Baer, Women and waqf: An analysis of the Istanbul tahrîr of 1546, G. R. Warburg and G. G. Gilbar (ed.), *Studies in Islamic society: Contributions in memory of Gabriel Baer*, Haifa, 1984.
- 4) H. Gerber, The waqf institution in early Ottoman Edirne, Warburg and Gilbar (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 29.
- 5) Barkan & Ayverdi, *op. cit.*, pp. V–VIII.
- 6) The term *mahalle*-mosque is a translation of *mahalle mescidi* (mosque of the quarter), which is frequently used in this register. In 16th-century Istanbul, the whole city was administratively divided into smaller *mahalles*. Each *mahalle* had one mosque, which was named after it. For example, a *mahalle* with the mosque *Ishak Paşa Mescidi* (or *Mescid-i Ishak Paşa*) was called *Ishak Paşa Mescidi Mahallesi* (or *Mahalle-i Mescid-i Ishak Paşa*). *Imams* of the *mahalle*-mosques represented the *mahalles* administratively.
- 7) B. Yediylidiz has discussed the *vakıf* institution of 18th-century Istanbul in *Institution du waqf au XVIII^e siècle en Turquie*, Ankara, 1985. For *vakıfs* of 15th and 16th-century Edirne, see Gerber, *op. cit.*, and for *vakıfs* of 17th-century Bursa, see idem., Chapter 8: Religious endowment(*wakıfs*), *Economy and society in an Ottoman city: Bursa, 1600–1700*, Jerusalem, 1988.
- 8) Baer, *op. cit.*
- 9) In tables 2, 3, 4 and 14, three numbers are given in each cell. They indicate the number of *wakıfs* counted for each cell, the percentage of occurrences in each *wakıf* size, and the percentage of the column category in the total.
- 10) We find members of around sixty different guilds as *wakıf* founders in this register. They include *attar* (druggist), *hayyam* (tent maker), *hayyat* (tailor), *haddad* (black-smith), *harrat* (turner), *naal* (sandal maker), *hassab* (butcher), *köfteci* (maker and seller of meat balls), *şerbetçi* (maker and seller of sweet fruit drinks), *hammamî* (keeper of a public bath), *sakka* (water carrier), etc.
- 11) Besides these four types of property, some movable assets (such as books especially copies of the Koran, kettles and cauldrons, for example) were often endowed as *wakıf* property. They were to be used by the people of a *mahalle*, *deriviş* of the *sufî* order, or muslim people in general. Usually movable assets were endowed with other types of property. *Wakıfs* including only movable assets are so rare that we find only 34 cases out of the 2515 total. Because they did not bring any income to the *wakıf*, we exclude these 34 *wakıfs* from our analysis of *wakıf* property, as well as another 34 *wakıfs* lacking any information about their property. So, our sample is 2447 *wakıfs* (see table 1).
- 12) E.g., no. 473, 622, 2339 and 2408.
- 13) E.g., no. 237, 296, 402, 1256 and 2317.
- 14) E.g., no. 1061, 1075 and 1819.
- 15) Barkan & Ayverdi, *op. cit.*, p. VIII, p. XXXI. Barkan shows the amount of cash *wakıfs* in the table on p. XXXI, but it is erroneous because the number of the cash *wakıfs* given for such regions as Davud Paşa Nahiyesi is obviously wrong.
- 16) E.g., no. 131, 360, 583, 985 and 1231.
- 17) E.g., no. 1469, 1790 and 2209.
- 18) Galata is the district located on the opposite side of the Golden Horn from Istanbul.
- 19) Gerber, *op. cit.*, p. 161.
- 20) Here we exclude commercial estates in other cities besides Istanbul. Also, we can not know the exact number of each item, because some entries indicate neither the number of each item nor the

place where they were located. Moreover, some dwellings contain shops or rooms for rent in them. We have generally excluded these cases from the analysis of commercial estates.

- 21) In addition, there were 476 shops included in dwellings.
- 22) *Başhane* means a storehouse for sheep heads and trotters.
- 23) In addition, there were 524 rooms for rent included in dwellings.
- 24) For example, Sultan Mehmed the Second constructed 11 *hammams* as the *vakıf* property of the *Fatih* Mosque in Istanbul.
- 25) Here, we regard the city wall as the boundary delineating whether landed property should be classified as urban or rural estates. Therefore, some vineyards in the inner vicinity of the city wall have been classified as urban estates and those in the outer vicinity of the city wall as rural estates, no matter how close they may have been to each other. This part of our classification of landed estate may not reflect reality very well.
- 26) S. Faroqhi, *Towns and townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, crafts and food production in an urban setting, 1520–1650*, Cambridge, 1984, pp. 242–266.
- 27) Gerber, The waqf institution in early Ottoman Edirne, pp. 38–41, idem., *Economy and society in an Ottoman City: Bursa*, pp. 153–155.
- 28) In the research literature, the term “family *vakıf*” has been used in two different ways. In one sense it means *vakıf* assigning more benefit to the family of the founder than to charity. In another sense it means *vakıf* suspending charity donation for the period specified by the founder. Here, we use this term only in the latter sense.
- 29) For some *vakıfs*, classification into one category is difficult because there were several types of property to which founder assigned different usages. Thus, the categories introduced above partly overlap: the number of *vakıfs* having both property of the first category and the second category is 75, of the first and the third, 24, of the second and the third, 99, of all three categories, 15. But in order to classify a *vakıf* into one category, priority is given to the first category, and then to the second category, according to its charitable character.
- 30) *Vakıfs* are not counted in an exclusive way, except no. 7.