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Abstract
In this essay I argue that an important function of the Muslim waqf in the Near
and Middle Eastern social system between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries was
to support and reinforce social units or groups based on kinship or quasi-kinship
(such as relations between master and freed slave), or on criteria of social class,
profession, territory, religion, linguistic-ethnic identity, and ethnic or national
identification.

THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST, like other societies, have always been
divided into social units according to various criteria. People consider
themselves as belonging to groups based on kinship or quasi-kinship,
territory, profession, social class in the widest sense of the term, and,
last but not least, religion or linguistic-ethnic identity. It is the aim of
this essay to show that an important function of the Muslim waqf sys-
tem was to support and reinforce these social units and their cohesion.
It is our contention that the usual division of the discussion of waqf into
beneficiaries and administration is irrelevant in this context, since both
direct benefit and administration can serve the same social purpose.

Moreover, as we shall see, not only ahli or dhurri awqaf serve a
purpose in the sphere of social relations and kinship, but also so-called
khayri awqaf. For practical reasons, however, two kinds of awqaf will
not be dealt with in this essay. They are: (1) awqaf founded by the
Ottoman sultans, which frequently include provisions similar to those
dealt with by us but merit a special study because of their political
implications; and (2) awqaf whose direct beneficiaries are members of
the founder’s family, because the dominant aspect of these awqaf is the
relation between their provisions and the Muslim law of inheritance.

* Editorial Note: This essay is based on a paper presented at the International
Seminar on Social and Economic Aspects of the Muslim Waqf held in Jerusalem
on 24-28 June 1979. Updated references to the secondary literature, prepared by
Miriam Hoexter and Aharon Layish, appear in the footnotes within square
brackets.
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We do not intend here to arrive at a quantitative estimate of the prevalence of one or another kind of waqf. Our aim, for the time being, is to describe the many different devices and purposes which we have encountered, in order to pave the way for a quantitative analysis at a later stage. Although examples quoted may relate to a specific country or period, that does not preclude the existence of similar phenomena elsewhere and at other times. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to examine whether a correlation exists between the prevalence of certain patterns in specific countries or periods and the characteristic traits of the awqāf in their midst.

There can be no doubt that a founder's primary concern for the position and welfare of his or her family and offspring is reflected in the institution of waqf. A waqf for private or particular purpose, i.e. a "non-charitable" waqf, is called waqf ahli (family waqf) in Egypt and waqf dhurri ("waqf for the offspring") in the Fertile Crescent—even though its income may be assigned to persons outside of the family. The reason for the name is of course that the family and offspring overwhelmingly predominate as beneficiaries of such awqāf. The same is true regarding awqāf for religious or charitable institutions with clauses in favor of particular interests, since the great majority of such clauses favor the family and offspring of the founder.¹

The primary device for guarding the interests of the family and offspring in religious or charitable awqāf is to specify in the waqfiyya or deed of dedication that the administration of the waqf be reserved to members of the founder's family. In the waqf register of Istanbul for the year 953/1546 published by Ömer Lutfi Barkan and Ekrem Ayverdi, we find a very large number of awqāf in favor of a cami, a meşcid, a medrese, a mekteb, a zaviye, an imaret, water supply, orphans, or a combination of two or more of these religious and charitable institutions and purposes, in which the founders stipulate that the administration should be retained by their family and offspring for as long as the family exists on earth.² The same provision prevails in

² Ömer Lutfi Barkan and Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, İstanbul Vakıflar Tahrir Defteri, 953 (1546) Ciltlari (Istanbul, 1970). See, for example, nos. 12, 27, 66, 85, 1037, 1122, 1261, 1346, 1151, 1646, 2208, 2491; [Aharon Layish, "The Muslim Waqf in Jerusalem after 1967: Beneficiaries and Management," Le waqf dans le
Anatolian awqāf of the eighteenth century and probably throughout Ottoman history. In his *Khitat* 'Ali Mubārak recorded many waqfīyyāt which include the same provision: for instance, a waqf in favor of a mosque in Būlāq, founded by an eminent captain of Nile boats at Būlāq anchorage in 1044/1634-35, or the waqf of the famous landowner from Minyā, Muḥammad Pasha Abū Sultān, who lived in the second half of the nineteenth century, in favor of the Riwāq al-Ṣā'āyida at al-Azhar. Mubārak also mentioned dozens of awqāf for public purposes which were in fact administered at the time of writing by members of the founders’ families, often an indication of how long the founders’ wish to keep the waqf in the family remained effective.

The awqāf described above may be divided into three main categories: (1) mosques; (2) zāwiyas; and (3) sabils or public fountains, which generally were combined with a maktab or Qur‘ān school. Mosques that had been established in the nineteenth or even the eighteenth century and were still being administered by the founder’s offspring in the 1870s, when Mubārak compiled his *Khitat*, were probably not unusual. One such example is that of the Timrāz al-Aḥmadi mosque, which was restored in 1190/1776 by the amīr Ḥasan Efendi, a notable of the Tüfeckiyan corps and the son of Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Efendi, who specified in his waqfīyya that the mosque’s waqf be administered by his offspring; and so indeed it was one hundred years later. Another example is that of the ‘Afifi mosque in southern Cairo, which was originally a zāwiya built on the tomb of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-‘Afifi, who died in 1172/1758-59, and which was administered in Mubārak’s time by Aḥmad al-‘Afifi, one of his descendants. In some cases a family’s control of the awqāf of a mosque lasted for a much longer period. For example, the mosque called Jāmi‘ al-Ḥin in Cairo, which was established in the ninth/fifteenth century by the amīr Yūsuf al-Ḥin, was managed by a descendant of the founder,

---


4 ‘Ali Pasha Mubārak, *al-Khitat al-Tawfīqiyya al-Jadida* (Cairo: Būlāq, 1304-05/1886-89), e.g., vol. 4, 57 (21-22), 71 (9), 78 (30-32), 21 (21-22), 117 (29-32); vol. 5, 64 (13), 93 (3-4), 121 (5-8); vol. 6, 60 (16) (numbers in parentheses represent lines on the page).

5 Ibid., vol. 4, 71 (1-2, 9, 12-13); vol. 5, 50 (36)-51(8).
Muṣṭafā al-Ḥin, more than 400 years later. In this and many other cases, the reason that the waqf of a mosque continued under family management for such a long time was that the founder’s tomb was located in the mosque. When the income of such a mosque ceased, a member of the family would restore the property and mosque, thereby keeping the waqf in the hands of the family. Sometimes additional conditions favored the continuity of family administration of a mosque for centuries. For instance, the awqāf of the Demirdāsh mosque outside the Ḥusayniyya quarter of Cairo, whose original founder, al-Shaykh Demirdāsh al-Muḥammadī, died in the 930s/1520s, were managed in the 1870s by ʿAbd al-Rahim al-Demirdāsh. During these 350 years the mosque had become a pilgrimage center and the shaykh’s mawlid came to be celebrated for three days every year. In addition, by the eighteenth century some of the descendants of Shaykh Demirdāsh had become rich and notable citizens of Cairo.

As in the case of mosques, many of the Cairo zāwiyās mentioned in ʿAli Mubārak’s encyclopedia were administered by descendants of their founders. For instance, the Zāwiyat al-Qudsi, restored with a new waqf by a certain Muḥammad al-Qudsi apparently early in the nineteenth century, was administered in the 1870s by his grandson Maḥmūd. Similarly, a certain Muḥammad Yūsuf ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ managed at that time a zāwiyah established by his father, who had been shahbandar of Cairo’s merchant guild. The oldest dated zāwiyah mentioned by Mubārak and administered by the founder’s offspring was Zāwiyat al-Muḥammadī, established in the 1780s. All other zāwiyās of this kind are undated. Family management of zāwiyās apparently did not last as long as that of mosques, perhaps because the zāwiyās themselves had shorter lives. Nevertheless, not only in Egypt, but elsewhere too, zāwiyās often were administered by the descendants of the founders. Thus, Michaux-Bellaire observed in his collection of habous documents from Tangier: “Dans la pratique, les habous des zaouïas échappent effectivement au contrôle du qadi et les descendants du chaïkh les

---

6 Ibid., vol. 4, 102 (9-11).
7 See, for instance, the al-Ramlī mosque in Cairo established in the middle of the sixteenth century. Ibid., vol. 3, 78 (18-22); vol. 4, 119 (12-14, 28).
8 Ibid., vol. 4, 112 (12 – 113 (5). The family maintained supreme leadership in the Demirdāshīyya order, on which see F. De Jong, Turaq and Turaq-Linked Institutions in Nineteenth-Century Egypt (Leiden, 1978), 25 and passim. On şūf orders, see below.
9 Mubārak, vol. 6, 41 (11-12).
10 Ibid., 45 (21-24).
11 Ibid., 44 (12-26).
12 Ibid., 28 (2-3); 33 (31-32); 45 (10-11).
administrent a leur gré."¹³ It should be mentioned, however, that where-
as in Cairo a zāwiyya may have been simply a small mosque, in the
Maghrib it was generally a larger complex, connected with a saint,
which included a mosque. Even in Cairo many of the zāwiyyas housed
the tomb of a saint, as did some mosques. As mentioned, such a
connection may indeed have been conducive to a long period of family
management by the offspring of the shaykh or saint.

Family management of public waqaf was not confined to the founders’
tombs, to mosques, or to zāwiyyas. This is shown clearly by the
large number of awqāf in Cairo for a sabil, often combined with a
maktab, which, Mubārak notes, were managed by the founders’
descendants. Here, too, the oldest dated awqāf of this kind were from
the eighteenth century, as, for example, the sabil and maktab whose
waqf was managed in the 1870s by the descendants of Muḥammad al-
Tūnīsī, who had restored the property in 1125/1713; the waqf al-
Muḥāsibjī for a sabil established in 1139/1726-27; and the sabil and
maktab established by ʿĀ’isha Hānum in 1154/1741-42, whose waqf
was managed by her heirs in Mubārak’s time.¹⁴ Awqāf of this type
established in the nineteenth century were of course more numerous for
the simple reason that more sabils and maktabs were being established
then. For example, the waqf for a sabil and maktab established in
1246/1830-31 by Ḥasan Aghā al-Azraqāṭlī was managed in the 1870s
by his daughter. A year later the amīr Muḥammad Bey established a
similar waqf which continued to be managed by one of his descend-
ants; another waqf for the same purpose was managed in Mubārak’s
time by the amīr Mukhtār Bey, the founder’s grandson. Finally, many
awqāf for a sabil and maktab managed by the founders’ offspring in
Mubārak’s time, but not dated by him, seem to have been established
close in time to the composition of al-Khiṭāṭ.¹⁵

So far our examples have concerned awqāf founded between the
fifteenth and nineteenth centuries. A study of the Jaffa sijill, however,
clearly illustrates that the same device was used by most founders of
awqāf for public purposes in the twentieth century as well. In 1904
Rāghib al-Khālīdī dedicated the income from various items of real

23 (1914), 10. The same seems to have occurred in Algiers, although not as
frequently; see G. Busson de Janssens, “Contribution à l’étude des habous publics
algériens,” Ph.D. thesis (Alger, 1950), 26. I am grateful to Dr. Miriam Hoexter for
all references from this source.
¹⁴ Mubārak, vol. 2, 30 (17-18); vol. 3, 65 (1); vol. 6, 61 (8-11).
¹⁵ Nineteenth century: Ibid., vol. 3, 50 (37)-51 (1), 55 (30-32); vol. 6, 60 (35)-
61 (1); undated: vol. 3, 86 (19-20), 93 (18-19); vol. 6, 62 (5-7), etc.
estate in Jerusalem to a public library in the Silsila quarter of Jerusalem. He assigned the administration to himself and after him to his male descendants according to criteria of preference specified in the waqfiyya. In 1915 Hasan Bey al-Jabi founded a waqf consisting of a grove, shop, and store, in order to establish a mosque and a school, and he stipulated the same condition for its management. In 1933 Ali Khamis and Maryam Qabtan created a waqf for the establishment of a mosque, to be managed by their offspring after their death. A year later the income from one-eighth of a house was dedicated by Hajja Safa, the daughter of Hasan al-Dajani, with provisions to buy Qur’ans for the Great Mosque of Jaffa, to support the orphanage in Jerusalem, to feed the poor during Ramadhan, and to provide for the performance of dhikr in a zawiyah in Jaffa. The waqf was to be administered by the founder and her family after her. In 1945 another Hajja, Amina al-Qtub, designated some real estate owned by her as a waqf in favor of the poor of Mecca and Medina, stipulating that after her death the best (or most pious—aslah) of the offspring of Hajj Khalil al-Qtub should be appointed as administrator. It is interesting to note that the awqaf mentioned above constitute almost all those for public purposes whose waqfiyya are recorded in the Jaffa sijill in the Mandatory period.

In various Muslim cities certain notable families have functioned throughout modern history as the traditional administrators of important public awqaf. This was particularly prevalent in cities such as Damascus and Jerusalem, where a local class of notables played an important socio-political role. In Jerusalem, for instance, the al-Dajani family were the traditional administrators of the waqf of Nabi Da’ud; the al-Husayni family were, since Ottoman times, the administrators of the Nabi Musa waqf and for some time also of the Haseki Sultan waqf; and the ‘Alamis traditionally served as mutawallis of the Haramayn waqf and the Bimaristan al-Šalahi. However, the hereditary right to administer these rich and prestigious awqaf was not necessarily the result of the awqaf having been established by their ancestors or of

---

16 Sijill of Jaffa, 223/537 (10 September 1942—at that time Râghib al-Khâlidî was a resident of Jaffa); 216/239 (19 May 1940); 201/464 (19 October 1933); 205/623 (19 November 1934); 234/757 (23 October 1945). [aslah = most suitable in economic terms; see fn. 56 below].

17 Israel State Archives (hereafter ISA), K/18/40, K/96/37.

18 See Utri M. Kupferschmidt, The Supreme Muslim Council. Islam under the British Mandate for Palestine. (Leiden, 1987), 68, fn. 61, 113 and passim; G. Baer, “Jerusalem’s Families of Notables and the Waqf in the Early 19th Century,” in Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period, ed. D. Kushner (Jerusalem, 1986), 111-12; for the ‘Alamis, see, for example, Sijill of Jerusalem, 288/73 (June 1806); 293/136 (August 1827).
an explicit provision in a waqfiyya. For example, one document of the Jerusalem sharif'a court dated 1 December 1934 states that the administration of the waqf in favor of the Madrasat al-Qurrâ‘ al-Salâmiyya in the Silsila quarter of Jerusalem was transmitted from father to son in the al-Khâlidî family for generations, but another indicates that the family acquired this right in 1789 from the al-Imâm family in return for a down payment of 360 zolotas. In Damascus the qâdi appointed as administrator (tawliya) of public awqâf prominent members of notable families of that city—for instance, Ismâ‘îl al-Maḥâsînî in 1674 and ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Safarjalâni in 1737. Al-Murâdi relates that when his father died, all posts of this kind held by him—al-waqâ‘îf wa’ll-tawlî wa’ll-rawâtîb—were transferred to his uncle by order from Istanbul. Early in the eighteenth century one of the rich local notables of the Falâqînsî family succeeded in concentrating the administration of a vast number of awqâf in his own hands.

All this shows that the administration of public awqâf has for centuries been viewed as an important asset in terms of furthering the interests of a family. There are several explanations for such an attitude. First, a waqf administrator usually received a considerable portion of the waqf’s income. The normal rate was 10-15 percent, but we have encountered much higher percentages. Moreover, the administrator usually had extensive powers over the disposal of the residual income after all the beneficiaries had received their shares as stipulated in the waqfiyya. There were many ways to increase the administrator’s share, especially in the case of awqâf for public purposes. A charitable or religious institution, or “the poor” for that matter, had little power over the family administrator, and recurrent government attempts to impose such control failed completely until the middle of the twentieth century, not least of all because the provisions established in waqfiyyât were often ambiguous. Administrators also were able to provide members of their family with material advantages deriving from the waqf, such as

---

19 Document included in the Jerusalem Land Registry (hereafter JLR), 44.84/444/930, lines 4-7.
20 Document dated Şafar 1204 [1789], included in ibid., lines 3-4, 10-11, 14-17. (A zolota was equal to 30 paras of three-quarters of a kurush).
22 Ibid., vol. 2, 71.
23 Ibid., vol. 3, 135. [On Damascus and Aleppo, and for additional examples of ways to provide material benefits to notable families and preserve their social prestige, see Ruth Roded, “The waqf and the Social Elite of Aleppo in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” Turcica, 20 (1988), 71-91].
the perpetual lease of waqf property. For example, the landed properties dedicated to the Madrasa Salāmiyya, whose administration was acquired by the Khālīdīs in 1789, became a hikr of that family. Another way to favor the family was to do business with them; thus, the Director of the Jerusalem Muslim Orphanage, Tawfiq al-Ḥusaynī, purchased wood for the orphanage from Ḫūrām al-Ḥusaynī at a much higher price than he would have paid elsewhere.

Material benefit was not the only advantage to be obtained from the administration of a waqf. At least as important was the social status and influence attached to the position. Many different groups were dependent upon the administrator of a public waqf for the benefits due them—religious functionaires, ṣūfis and dervishes, teachers, students and pupils, people who read part of the Qurʾān or prayed for the founder, servants of all kinds, and people who benefited from the public services supplied by the waqf (such as water). The beneficiaries of a waqf managed by a certain family were subject to their influence so long as the family continued to manage it. Depending upon the size of the waqf, this sometimes had important social and political implications.

The stipulation that a public waqf be administered by a member of one’s family and their offspring was only one of the devices used by a founder to secure the interests of his family. As discussed in our study of the waqf in Egypt, al-awqāf al-khayriyya al-khāṣṣa (private khayrī awqāf) were a type of endowment providing for direct allocations to poor family members. Similar provisions are found in some Palestinian awqāf; for example, according to the Land Registry in Palestine, both the awqāf of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Dajānī in Bidya (Nablus District) and of Wali Ḥuṣaynsh in Jabaʿ (Jenin District) were recorded as “Khayrāt confined to his children and heirs.” Moreover, descendants of founders of public awqāf often argued that even if their ancestor had dedicated the income to charity, they were the worthiest possible candidates for it. Thus, in a controversy over the administration of the Ṣidnā ‘Ali waqf (north of Jaffa), when the Supreme Muslim Council claimed

---

24 Document dated Ṣafar 1204, included in JLR, 44.84/444/930, line 7. [See also p. 289].
25 Memorandum of Abdullah Mukhless, ex-Chief Accountant of the Supreme Moslem Council, and Yacoub Abu Al Hoda, ex-Mamur of Wakfs, Jerusalem, to the High Commissioner, 5 November 1923, ISA, CS 189.
27 ISA, K/18/40. For allocations to “the poor of the family” see also Sijill of Jaffa, Waqf Ḫūrāybi, 216/31 (20 March 1940); Waqf Ṭāhir, 237/479 (1 July 1946).
that the waqf was dedicated for charitable purposes (‘alā wujūh al-
birr), the family replied, quoting the Qurʾān and the New Testament, 
that even if this were true they were worthier than anybody else of 
receiving these gifts. In fact, the Prophet is quoted as having said that 
“the most excellent sadaqa [gift made with the hope of heavenly 
reward] is that which a man bestows upon his family,” which shows 
that Muslims clearly included such provisions in their understanding of 
the notion of beneficence (birr).29

Another way to perpetuate the family’s benefit from a public waqf 
was to stipulate that only family members, or even specific family 
members, be appointed to certain posts created by the waqf. Such stipu-
lations were quite frequent in the Ottoman empire. For the sixteenth 
century we have, for instance, the waqf of Pir Mehem b. İlyâs in 
Istanbul, whose founder stipulated that first priority for the position of 
readers of certain prayers, for whose upkeep he provided, should 
be granted to his own sons.30 Bahaeddin Yediyıldız mentions a consider-
able number of such cases in eighteenth-century Turkey, where the 
waqfiyyāt that he studied frequently assigned the post of müderris of a 
medrese to the founder, his son, or a relative of the founder, and after 
them to the most learned of their offspring, generation after generation. 
In cases in which a specific person, a non-relative, was named as 
müderris the founder restricted the post to the descendants of that 
person. In one typical case, related in detail by Yediyıldız, the founder of a medrese in Reha (Urfa) in 1138/1726 stipulated that the admin-
istrator, the müderris, the waʿiz (preacher), the shaykh al-qurrdʿ (chief 
instrutor in the recitation of the Qurʾān), and the mujawwīd al-Qurʾān 
(the person who teaches the rules for melodious recitation of the 
Qurʾān) should all be appointed from among his sons and their descen-
dants. The founder calls God’s vengeance upon anyone who might 
usurp one of these posts or be appointed by the sultan or the qāḍī, 
thereby violating his will.31 Other Ottoman awqāf of this kind are those 
of Muṣṭafā Aghā (1747) and ʿUthmān Aghā (1798).32 The only

28 Mudir al-Awqāf al-ʿAmm to Supreme Muslim Council, 8 May 1940, and 
Muḥammad Saʿdi al-ʿUmari to British Vice Consul, Damascus, 21 November 
1940, ISA, K/158/39.

29 For discussion of this question, see J.N.D. Anderson, “The Religious 
Element in Waqf Endowments,” Royal Central Asian Journal (October 1951), 292-
99.

30 Barkan and Ayverdi, 314, no. 1832.

31 Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, Institution du Vaqf au xviie siècle en Turquie-Étude 

32 Vakiflar Dergisi, vol. 9, 376; vol. 10, 173.
Egyptian waqf which we have come across with such provisions is that of 'Ali Ketkudä Qayşarlî (1724), himself a prominent Janissary. In 1786, when Ahmad Pasha Jazzâr established the waqf in favor of the madrasa in his mosque in Acre, he stipulated that a certain person should be appointed reader in the mosque and, after him, his son, his grandson, and so on.

As noted, founders of waqāf were as much concerned about the social prestige of the family as about its material benefit. Some founders, not satisfied with having appointed a member of the family as administrator, wanted to ensure that the waqf would in fact be used for this purpose. They therefore assigned the waqf’s income for the upkeep of the family guest house, in consideration of the social norm that the more guests a family can entertain the greater its influence and prestige. Provisions of this kind seem to have been particularly common in Egypt. Jabarti says that benefactors of former times (ahâlī al-khayr al-mutaqqaddimîn) endowed the so-called rizqâ aḥbâsiyya, i.e., landed waqf property, in favor of the needy and “the owners of open houses and guest houses for the purpose of feeding the guests...” (‘alâ al-fuqara’ al-muḥtâjiin wa-dhawi al-bayt wa-l-dâwâr [pl. of dawwâr] al-μaftûhâ al-mu‘adda li-‘ifâ‘îm al-‘a‘âm li-l-dîfân...). For instance, in Sühaj (Upper Egypt) the house of a famous notable called Shaykh ʿÂrif was open to guests of all classes as well as to the poor, whose needs he satisfied and whom he supplied with grain, butter, honey, dates, and sheep. His ancestors had done the same, and the maintenance of his guest house was paid for by the income of a rizqâ mursada, i.e., a waqf, of 600 faddâns. According to Jabarti, similar family guest houses existed in Girgâ, Asyût, Manfalût, Farshût, and elsewhere, apparently mainly in Upper Egypt. When Muhammad ʿAli confiscated the rizqâ aḥbâsiyya, these guest houses were all ruined (kharibat dârhum wa-maṣâyifuhum). The same arrangement persisted in Egypt into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. A number of endowments of this kind were made in the nineteenth century, among them the waqf of Ahmad al-Badrāwî from Samannûd (Gharbiyya) and that of Muḥammad Abûl-Maʿâli al-Jawhari, founded in 1856-57.

---

33 Mubârâk, vol. 5, 93 (4).
36 On this endowment and similar ones, see al-Ahrâm, 4 April, 21 May 1953;
his study of Sîrs al-Layyân (Minûfiyya), Jacques Berque also found
that the dawwâr, the mansion of the family where meetings took place
and guests were entertained, was maintained by a waqf: “Il arrive,
dans les villages du Delta, moins fréquemment il est vrai que dans ceux
de Şa‘îd, que la fondation et l’entretien d’un dawwâr fasse l’objet de
dispositions testamentaires ou d’un waqf.” Thus, Hâjj Salîm Zahrân (of
Sîrs) had established a waqf of two faddâns, one for a mosque and the
other for the dawwâr.37 Such awqâf seem to have been widespread in
Egypt. In 1953, when a law was enacted transferring the administration
of all khayrî awqâf to the Ministry of Awqâf, except those whose
nâzîrs were their founders, the Ministry reserved the right to decline
management of awqâf dedicated to a private charitable purpose (e.g., a
family guest house, the poor of the founder’s family). Six months later
the Ministry of Awqâf decided conclusively that awqâf khayrîyya
khâṣṣa dedicated to a guest house whose income was less than £E 400
per year should continue to be managed by a member of the family.38
Connected with the family guest house were provisions for Qur’ân
recitations (khatma), celebrations on festive occasions, mûlîds, etc. to
be held in the founder’s house; in some cases this also involved the
distribution of food to the poor. Such provisions, intended to reinforce
the influence and social importance of the founder or his family, were
abundant in Egyptian awqâf of the eighteenth and nineteenth cen-
turies.39

In the early periods of the Ottoman empire awqâf for the mainte-
nance of guest houses were established by sultans and high officials or,
in the course of the expansion of the empire, by colonizing dervishes for
their zavîyes, which served as guest houses for the poor and for
travelers. In later periods, however, one also encounters some awqâf
for maintaining family guest houses. Two examples, one dating from
15 Rebi‘îlahar 1170/January 1757 and the other from 21 Zîlkade 1338/
August 1920, have been published by H.B. Kunter.40 Although there
were probably more awqâf of this type in the Ottoman empire, one gets

37 Jacques Berque, Histoire sociale d’un village égyptien au xxe siécle (Paris,
1957), 48-50.
38 al-Ahrâm, 21 May 1953; 2 April 1954.
39 See, for instance, Mubârak, vol. 5, 118 (19, 21-22), 120 (23-24) (‘Abd al-
Rahmân Ketkhuda, 1760-1761); vol. 6, 61 (26) (‘Abdallâh Ketkhuda ‘Azabân,
1726-1727); vol. 3, 124 (29-36) (‘Ali al-Bakri, mid-nineteenth century); vol. 4, 78
(22-23) (al-Jawhari, 1856-1857).
1, 124-125 (nos. 26, 27).
the impression that they were not as prevalent there as they were in Egypt. This point, like so many others, requires further investigation.

Next to the family, the social group most frequently supported by founders of awqāf from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries was that of freed slaves (‘utraqā’, s. ‘atiq, also mu’taq). Slaves played an important role in the Ottoman empire, both in the military and the civilian administration, as well as in domestic life. On the other hand, manumission is regarded by Islam as an act of almsgiving that deserves a reward in heaven. Frequently, a strong sentimental tie developed between a slave and the master he had served for many years. Thus, a former slave might remain attached to his emancipator even after his manumission through a lasting bond of patronage (walā’). But since Islamic law does not grant the freedman the right to inherit the property of his patron, even if the latter died without heirs, other ways had to be found to provide for him. An accepted way to do this was through a waqf, which had two important advantages: it ensured the loyalty of the freedman to his former master, and it averted the danger that the former master’s heirs, who had no sentimental attachment to the freed slave, would neglect him and abandon him to his fate.

Like members of the family, freed slaves were provided for in waqf deeds in three ways: as direct beneficiaries, as recipients of posts in institutions established by the founder, and as administrators (guest houses are obviously irrelevant in this context). Here we take into account awqāf whose income was wholly or in part earmarked for the benefit of freed slaves. We have not found any awqāf khayriyya khāṣṣa—the only category of direct allocations which we discussed in connection with members of the family—for the benefit of freed slaves. The principal type of direct benefit to freed slaves came from waqf provisions allocating them the income and use of houses, or simply the right to live there. This was of course their most pressing need after having lived for many years in their masters' houses and possessing no dwellings of their own. A random sample of waqf deeds published by Ömer Lutfi Barkan and Ekrem Ayverdi indeed shows that in sixteenth-century Istanbul practically all provisions for the direct benefit of freed slaves consisted of either the allocation of waqf income and the use of
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houses, or simply the right to live in them. There were, however, many Turkish awqaf which included other direct provisions favoring freedmen. Awqaf in Egypt have included provisions for the benefit of freed slaves, although in many cases the exact form of such benefit is unknown. Jabarti tells us that the famous Riḍwān Bey al-Faqārī, who was amīr al-hajj almost uninterruptedly between 1631 and 1656, established a waqf in favor of his freed slaves. In a waqfiyya dated 1171/1758, the coffee merchant Muṣṭafā Jaʿfar designated two buildings as awqaf and assigned the income in four quarters to his son, his freed slave, and two freed female slaves (his wives) and their offspring. From the nineteenth century onward, landed property became the main object of waqf deeds in favor of freed slaves (as in the case of awqaf for other purposes). In 1804 Mūḥammad Abūʾl-Anwār al-Sāḍāt, head of the Wafāʾiyya order and one of the most prominent public figures of his time, established a large waqf exclusively in favor of his freed slaves and their offspring; he explicitly excluded all his relatives from any benefit from this waqf. ‘Ali al-Bakrī, head of a rival family and of the Bakriyya order two generations later and naqīb al-ashrāf from 1855 to 1880, established a waqf consisting of 937 faddans of agricultural land, real estate in Cairo, and two houses in Ṭanṭā in favor of his descendants, his freed slaves, his father’s freed slaves, and many public purposes. Finally, freed slaves were provided for in some of the large nineteenth-century awqaf established by princesses of the Mūḥammad ‘Ali family, e.g., the Shāwa waqf established by Zaynab, the daughter of Mūḥammad ‘Ali,

42 Barkan and Ayverdi, e.g., nos. 252, 253, 353, 768, 948, 1397, 1988 (after the children), 2096.
43 See, for instance, ibid., no. 1727. See also waqf of ‘Ali Ketkhude Qaysārī (1724) in Mubārak, vol. 5, 93 (5).
44 See, for instance, Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. 10, 173 (Osman Ağā, 1798), 340 (Sinan Paşa, 1524-1525); vol. 11, 60 (Mehmet Ağā, 1814), 65 (the same, 1817).
45 Jabarti, vol. 1, 91. For a biography of Riḍwān Bey see P.M. Holt, Studies in the History of the Near East (London, 1973), 210-13. For similar provisions in other Egyptian awqaf prior to the nineteenth century, see, e.g., Mubārak, vol. 4, 81 (30); vol. 5, 75 (35), 77 (8), 91 (24), 93 (3), 95 (36), 108 (22), 120 (25); vol. 6, 65 (13).
consisting of approximately 11,000 faddāns in Daqahlīya province, and Shamm Nūr Hānum’s waqf, consisting of 4,500 faddāns in Sharqiyya province.\(^{49}\)

In Ottoman Turkey, the practice of assigning posts created by a waqf to freed slaves of the founder appears to have been as common as the assignment of such posts to members of the founder’s family. In some cases, in fact, assignment to freed slaves assumed much greater proportions than anything encountered in this study in connection with family members. Thus, the founder of the large Firuz Ağa b. Abdülhay waqf in sixteenth-century Istanbul stipulated that all Qurān readers, teachers, imāms, and other posts in his two mosque-schools and elsewhere be filled by his freed slaves and their descendants, and none of them were able to do so should someone else be appointed.\(^{50}\)

The waqf of Ibrahim Paşa b. Halil Paşa, with an annual income of 135,800 akçes, maintained a Friday mosque (cami) in Istanbul, another in Iznik, a medrese in Istanbul, and employed a large staff of fee collectors, clerks, administrators, and so on. All of the posts created by this waqf were to be occupied by the founder’s freed slaves and their offspring (ve şart-ı vàkif oldur ki külliyen ehl-i vezâf ve erbab-i cihat ‘utakasından ve ebnâ-ı ‘utakasından ola ebeden mâ tenâsêlu).\(^{51}\) The same stipulation concludes the waqfiyya of ‘Ali Paşa, written in 915/1509, in which he established a waqf with an annual income of 471,998 akçes to provide for the tomb of the Prophet, a medrese, four Friday mosques, an imaret, five schools (mu'allimhane), and a staff of administrators, fee collectors, and clerks.\(^{52}\)

In many of the Turkish awqāf freed slaves were appointed as administrators. For instance, the Istanbul register for 1546 lists awqāf whose founders assigned the administration first to their children and then to their freed slaves.\(^{53}\) To the examples mentioned in note 52 should be added the huge waqf of Mahmud Paşa, founded in


\(^{50}\) Barkan and Ayverdi, no. 156.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., no. 450. Similar provisions in other large Turkish awqāf of the sixteenth century are included in the awqāf of Kara Ahmet Paşa (1554-55) and Sinan Paşa (1524-25); see Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. 2, 95; vol. 10, 338, 341.

\(^{52}\) Barkan and Ayverdi, no. 395. See also reference to the large waqf of Mahmud Paşa in Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. 5, 74.

\(^{53}\) See, for instance, Barkan and Ayverdi, nos. 27, 874, 2167.
878/1473, which generated an income of 606,513 akçes in 1546, as well as a large number of Turkish and Egyptian awqāf of the Ottoman period. Another frequently encountered stipulation was that the founder himself be lifetime administrator of the waqf, to be succeeded after his death by the most suitable (aşlah) of his freed slaves. This was also the stipulation of Sinan Paşa, beylerbey of Damascus and several times Grand Vizier, who had strong connections with Palestine and Syria. In a large waqf established in 1004/1595-56, in which he dedicated the income of various estates, among them villages in Palestine, to the Sinan mosque in Damascus, he reserved for himself the post of mutawalli; after his death it was to go to the most competent of his freed slaves (liʿl-arshad faʾl-arshad min ʿutaqāʾ al-waqīf), and then to their children, who continued to manage this waqf until at least the seventeenth century. Finally, in some of the Turkish awqāf of the sixteenth century the administration was assigned directly to the freed slaves of the founder. This was the case, for instance, in the above-mentioned waqf of ‘Ali Paşa, who gave them preference over his own relatives, as well as in the waqf of Kâtîb Şemsüddin, dated 909/1503, who assigned the administration to a freed slave called Abdī, after him to the most competent of his sons and their offspring, and after them again to the most competent of his freed slaves.
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55 See, for instance, Vakıflar Dergisi: vol. 2, 95 (Kara Ahmet Paşa, 1554-55); vol. 5, 211 (Ümümülgilüm Hatun, 1750); vol. 8, 193 (Reşid Efendi, 1797); vol. 9, 376 (Mustafa Ağa, 1742); vol. 10, 167 (Osman Ağa, 1793), 340-41 (Sinan Paşa, 1524-25); Mübarek, vol. 5, 18-19 (Ibrâhim Ağha); vol. 6, 60 (16) (Sitt Shûkâr, 1771-72).
56 For instance, Barkan and Ayverdi, nos. 768, 913, 944, 1136, 2202. See also M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, xv-xvi Asırlarda Edebi ve Paşa Liyası (Istanbul, 1952), Vakfiyeler, 208 (Sinâniyyûn Yusuf Ağa Vakfiyesi, 1502). [aşlah—most suitable in economic terms; see fn. 58 below).
58 For the waqfyya of Sinan Paşa, see ISA, K/60/32. [al-arshad faʾl-arshad = the most competent in economic terms. See Layish, “The Muslim Waqf in Jerusalem after 1967: Beneficiaries and Management,” 159 and the sources mentioned in fn. 63].
60 Barkan and Ayverdi, nos. 395, 982. [Similarly, Khîdr Paşa, who served as governor of Algeria several times during the last decade of the sixteenth century and the first years of the seventeenth, designated his freed slave Sulaymân as administrator (with a handsome salary) of the Paşa’s endowment for the mosque bearing his name. After Sulaymân, the most competent of the Paşa’s freed slaves was to replace him. See A. Devoux, “Les édifices religieux de l’ancien Alger,” Revue Africaine, 13 (1869), 24-25].
Freed slaves continued to be appointed as administrators of awqāf until the nineteenth century. In the 1870s, when Mubārak wrote his encyclopedia, a freed slave of the famous amīr Sulaymān Aghā al-Silahdār, the powerful official of Muḥammad ‘Alī, managed the awqāf in favor of the al-Aḥmar mosque, which had been restored by his master. Similarly, a certain Muḥammad Abū al-Ma‘āli al-Jawhari restored the former zāwiya of his grandfather and built a mosque, which was to be maintained by extensive awqāf he had established for this purpose. In the waqfiyya, dated 1273/1856-57, he reserved the administration to himself for life, and assigned it after his death to Ḥasan Aghā al-Jawhari Ibn ‘Abdallāh, the freed slave of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Jawhari, his uncle. In nineteenth-century Egypt freed slaves often managed a wakāla (caravanserais), an important source of income for some awqāf.

It is interesting to note that some founders tried to use their awqāf to perpetuate the connection between their freed slaves and their own families, even after their own death. They did this by means of stipulations which linked the benefits of their offspring to those of the freed slaves. For example, in a waqf that he established in 933/1527, Haydār Çelebī b. Abdurrahman assigned a house to his children and their offspring as well as to his freed slaves, on the condition that they all occupied the dwelling. Similarly, Davud Paşa stipulated that his substantial waqf (which generated a yearly income of 378,886 akçes) be administered by one of his sons, but that his agent or deputy be the most competent of his own or his son’s freed slaves. In addition, both his children and their offspring and his freed slaves and their offspring should be employed in the service of the waqf, to the exclusion of all outsiders.

Kinship or quasi-kinship relations between master and slave were not the only social ties that united people in the Near East between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. In the remainder of this essay we adduce examples of various units in Near Eastern society that were sustained by the waqf system, whether directly or indirectly, materially
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61 Mubārak, vol. 4, 54 (16-29). For the biography of al-Silahdār, see vol. 5, 15 (17ff).
62 Ibid., vol. 4, 77 (11) - 78 (33). Note that the freed slave is called by the family name of his master, al-Jawhari.
63 Ibid., e.g., vol. 2, 22 (20), 25 (17-19, 23). In Mecca freed slaves often served as business agents for their masters; see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka in the Latter Part of the 19th Century (London, 1931), 11.
64 Barkan and Ayverdi, no. 1148.
65 Ibid., no. 2045.
or otherwise (i.e., as groups for which the founders expressed some feeling of loyalty). The order in which we deal with these units is not intended to indicate their relative importance or the role played by the waqf in their social significance in various areas and periods. Only a quantitative analysis will perhaps enable us to answer such questions in the future.

The home town of the founder is mentioned frequently in waqfiyyat. This is natural, since the residents and institutions of the home town are those with whom the founder was familiar. Consequently, most of the provisions in favor of persons and institutions in that town do not necessarily reflect urban loyalty or solidarity. For example, one of the most common patterns was a provision favoring the Grand Mosque, as exemplified in the waqf registers of Tangier. The sijill of Jaffa in the early nineteenth century indicates that the beneficiary with the greatest number of awqāf was the Grand Mosque of Jaffa, and even in the Mandatory period we found two newly established awqāf with provisions for that mosque, after the extinction of the family, and one by two women from Gaza, partly for their family and partly for the Muslim hospital and the mosque in Gaza. Equally common were allotments for the poor of the town, sometimes with the explicit stipulation that they be Muslims. In Jaffa we find such provisions in the awqāf of al-Hājj Wahba Muḥarram, Ḥasan Abū Mahmūd, Ḥamīda al-Lamrānī, Raʿūfa Zaydān, ʿAshiyya al-Suksuk, and Darwish al-Qāṭṭān. One woman, Zakiyya al-Jabakiyya, provided for Jaffa’s orphans; in two other awqāf, those of Muḥammad al-Nābulṣi and of the children of Raḍwān al-Quṭb, the poor of Nablus and of Hebron were the respective beneficiaries because the founders originated from

68 Caspi, 34; Sijill of Jaffa, 191/77 (17 February 1929); 199/65 (20 February 1933); 206/257 (10 June 1935); 224/656 (23 November 1942); 226/582 (10 October 1943).
these towns.\textsuperscript{69} It should be mentioned that all these awqāf were established in favor of the founders’ families and that the poor or orphans were only secondary or ultimate beneficiaries, a fact which reduces the significance of such awqāf for the sustenance of the urban social unit.

Of greater significance are those awqāf in which a primary beneficiary is specified as living in the founder’s town, and even more so when the waqfiyya explicitly stipulates his priority over beneficiaries living elsewhere. For example, in eighteenth-century Turkey Miqdad Ahmed Paşa established a waqf of 78,000 akçes, to be lent at interest exclusively to merchants doing business in Amasya.\textsuperscript{70} In Egypt, at different times in the nineteenth century, three eminent men from Samannūd (Gharbiyya province), Aḥmad al-Badrāwī, ‘Abd al-Muta‘āl ‘Ali, and al-Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Āl, founded three awqāf with a combined area of 2,000 faddāns of agricultural land plus urban real estate. The founders stipulated that the administration should pass, either forthwith or after the death of certain of their descendants, “to the most suitable man among the inhabitants of Samannūd” (aşlah rajul min ahl Samannūd).\textsuperscript{71} In Palestine some of the prominent Jerusalem family awqāf favored Jerusalemites above others. In a waqfiyya dated 4 April 1932, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-‘Ālamī provided, among other things, for the Muslim poor of Jerusalem; only if none could be found in Jerusalem, were Muslim poor elsewhere in Palestine allowed to benefit from the waqf.\textsuperscript{72} Exactly ten years later, on 4 April 1942, Amina al-Khālīḍī created a large waqf for the establishment of a hospital in her name and various other purposes. In her waqfiyya she stipulated that inhabitants of Jerusalem should be given preferential treatment in the hospital. Moreover, if after her death a vacancy should occur in the committee appointed by her to administer the waqf, it should be filled by a Jerusalemite.\textsuperscript{73} On the other hand, in a famous case brought before the High Court of Palestine in 1931 against the Supreme Muslim Council and its head, the Mufti of Jerusalem, certain people from Hebron claimed that all the founders of awqāf dedicated to al-Ḥaram

\textsuperscript{69} Sjiil of Jaffa, 197/41 (14 February 1932); 197/209 (5 June 1932); 202/518 (23 November 1933).
\textsuperscript{70} Yediyldz, 149.
\textsuperscript{71} al-Åhrām, 2 November 1952; 25 June, 23 October, 8 December 1953. For implications of this clause involving the Wafūd leader Muṣṭafā al-Ånba‘ās, see Baer, History of Landownership, 184. [Cf. Reiter, Islamic Endowments in Jerusalem under British Mandate, 106-08; Layish, “The Muslim Waqf in Jerusalem after 1967: Beneficiaries and Management,” 155-56].
\textsuperscript{72} JLR, 546/32 (lines 13-14).
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 927/42 (Lines 91, 102).
al-Sharif al-Ibrāhīmi (the sanctuary of Hebron) had allocated the residual income to the inhabitants of Hebron. They demanded that the income be distributed according to the waqfīyyāt, which they quoted.  

Like the Grand Mosque, the mosque of a quarter (ḥāra) was the beneficiary of many awqāf founded in Near and Middle Eastern history. Again, in most cases one cannot determine whether such deeds were made because this was the mosque nearest to the founder and where he had prayed for most of his life, or whether for him the town quarter had become a social unit of loyalty and solidarity. Of numerous examples we mention here only two: the waqf of Ḥafiẓā al-Qudsiyya from al-Manshiyya quarter in Jaffa, who in 1936 dedicated two houses in that quarter, among other purposes, to the Ḥasan Bek mosque, also in that quarter; and the waqf al-Sakḥāfī, founded in 1946 and consisting of real estate in the Jabaliyya quarter of Jaffa, dedicated (after the extinction of the family) in favor of the Friday mosque of al-Jabaliyya.  

The recurrent stipulation that the imām of a mosque in a quarter be appointed administrator may not be of great significance for the role of the quarter in the social system. More important, it would seem to us, were such stipulations as that made by a certain Mehmed b. ʿĪsmāʿīl in 1514, to the effect that after his death the cemāʿat-i mahalle should choose his successor as the administrator of his waqf. In certain areas and periods of Islamic history such a procedure was apparently the rule. Thus, Ed. Michaux-Bellaire wrote in his introduction to the publication of the waqf register of Tangier: “Il y a un siècle environ, les administrateurs des biens habous ... étaient encore désignés par les notables de chaque quartier, pour leur mosquée.” In some cases the cemāʿat-i mahalle was given the right not to appoint the mütevelli but to supervise him in his capacity as nāzir or hasbī nāzir (honorary supervisor).  

74 High Court, no. 23 of 1931, Palestine Law Reports, 920/33, 710ff. See also ISA case no. 289 (Advocates).  
76 Barkan and Ayverdi, nos. 77, 1323.  
77 Michaux-Bellaire, 6. [For the participation of local residents in appointments to mosques located in a quarter and fountains in eighteenth-century Aleppo, see Marcus, Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century, 303-04].  
78 Barkan and Ayverdi, e.g., nos. 60, 90, 95, 111, 112, 113, 117, 1872, 2426, 2471.
In the sixteenth century the waqf also played a role in the fiscal function of the various quarters. Thus, we find in the Istanbul register of 1546 that part of the income of certain awqāf was allocated to the payment of the avarız-i mahalle, i.e., contributions exacted from the quarter as a unit by the sultan’s ‘urfi authority.\textsuperscript{79} Instances of awqāf aiding inhabitants of specific quarters to comply with their tax obligations occur in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as well.\textsuperscript{80} A founder who created a waqf for such a purpose must have felt some loyalty to or solidarity with the quarter and thus supported it as a social unit. A slightly different example is found in the work of Yediyıldız on eighteenth-century Turkey, where, in one instance, a son of a şeyhülislâm established a huge waqf consisting of 900,000 akçes, to be lent at an interest rate of ten percent per year exclusively to residents of town quarters specified by the founder.\textsuperscript{81} Further research may indicate whether such stipulations were unique and when and where they prevailed.

Since inhabitants of many Muslim cities between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries belonged to professional guilds, it is not surprising that the waqf was sometimes used to support these organisations. For example, Mubārak lists a number of guild Shaykh among waqf administrators: the Shaykh of the saddlers, the tinsmiths, the silk-merchants, and the lahhadlı.\textsuperscript{82} Since we do not know whether the zawiyas, mosques, maktabs, and wakālas served the guilds whose Shaykh administered their awqāf, we cannot be certain whether these awqāf did in fact support the guilds. In view of the considerable powers of waqf administrators, this may well have been the case. Nor can we say at present whether guild Shaykh were rare or common among waqf administrators. In eighteenth-century Turkey, for example, only two out of 114 private administrators in Yediyıldız’s sample were guild Shaykh.\textsuperscript{83}

Similarly, the data at our disposal are often insufficient to evaluate the significance of instances in which guild Shaykh appear as founders of awqāf. In the cases recorded by Mubārak it was the Shaykh of the builders in Cairo and in Alexandria who restored a zawiya or

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., e.g., nos. 1347, 2426. On avarız and the role of the town quarter in their collection, see Encyclopaedia of Islam, new ed., s.v. ‘Awārid (H. Bosen).
\textsuperscript{80} Kunter, “Türk Vakifları,” 122 (no. 4), 123 (no. 9).
\textsuperscript{81} Yediyıldız, 147.
\textsuperscript{82} Mubārak, vol. 2, 103 (4-5), 106 (16-17); vol. 3, 24 (21); vol. 5, 133 (15). It is not clear which trade was meant by lahhadlı; perhaps gravediggers (lahada = to bury, see Tāj al-‘Arūs, vol. 3, 492).
\textsuperscript{83} Yediyıldız, 196-97.
established a mosque and founded a waqf in its favor. He does not, however, indicate whether the mosque or zāwiyā served the builders guild. We are better informed about some of the Turkish awqāf involving guilds. For instance, in 928/1522 Üstad Ahmed b. Abdullah, the kethüda (head of the guild) of the dyers in Istanbul, founded a waqf consisting of a number of dwelling-places, most of which he allocated to three of his apprentices (şakird) and their offspring. An even more significant example is a waqfiyya from eighteenth-century Turkey analyzed by Yediyıldız in which Ahmed b. Abdullah, a tent merchant, established a waqf stipulating that a scavenger paid by his waqf be appointed to sweep the street in front of the tent merchants’ shops, that clothes be supplied to pupils of a school founded by a tent merchant, that the masters of the tent makers and tent merchants be appointed supervisors of the waqf, and, finally, that the clerk, collector of income, and administrators of the waqf of the masters of tent makers and tent merchants (whose existence is in itself interesting in our context) be appointed to fill the same functions in Ahmed b. Abdullah’s newly established waqf.

The waqf institution was also used for the establishment of welfare funds and other forms of mutual aid in Turkish guilds. According to Osman Nuri’s work, based on the sijill of Istanbul, Turkish guilds owned common property in the form of copper vessels donated by the guardians of apprentices on the occasion of their promotion. These vessels were held by the guilds as waqf, and were rented out for celebrations. Evliya Çelebi relates that Sultan Süleyman, to show his favor to the goldsmiths, granted them as a waqf 10,000 plates and 500 kettles and pans. Guild funds and the income derived from them served various purposes. Accumulated capital was lent to members in need of funds, such as those wishing to expand their business. The interest from such loans was assigned to charities, such as the distribution of rice among poor members of the guild or other destitute persons, assistance to sick guild members, and funerals of members who lacked sufficient resources for this purpose. Unfortunately, Nuri’s
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84 Mubârak, vol. 2, 110 (24-27); vol. 5, 75 (24-28); vol. 7, 69 (32-33).
86 Yediyıldız, 171.
information on these funds in the guilds of Istanbul is general and lacks specific examples. On the other hand, his description of the guilds in the Macedonian town of Seres, recorded from the personal account of a native of that town who moved to Istanbul after the Balkan wars, is quite detailed. Nuri explains that guild funds there were kept in the form of foundations called esnaf vakfi or similar terms. These were managed by the guild heads, also called mütevelli. Details of the fund of the wool-carders’ guild (hallaclar) in Seres for 1872-73 show that the largest contributions of income came from rent, interest, and voluntary contributors. Expenditure included payment for shops that were purchased, charities, allotments for education and ritual purposes, repairs of bridges and roads, management of awqāf, and various other activities.89

One professional group which benefited from awqāf was the army. For instance, an eighteenth-century Turkish admiral established a waqf in favor of a fortress and its garrison,90 and the awqāf of some officers of the Cairo ocaks in the eighteenth century provided for the soldiers in their units.91 Moreover, in some awqāf, the aghā of the Janissaries in Cairo was assigned the post of administrator or assistant to the administrators.92 In Algiers, too, the different units of the Janissaries had waqf property administered by a wakil (manager) nominated by them.93

The group most closely connected with the waqf as a profession was obviously the class of religious functionaries, the ‘ulamā’. Like other groups discussed in this essay, the ‘ulamā’ were linked to the waqf both as beneficiaries and as administrators. More than any other group, however, the ‘ulamā’ as a social entity depended on the waqf system for their very existence. A glance at the Istanbul waqf register of 1546 reveals the enormous extent of property whose income was used to maintain imāms, khatibs, mūdarrises, students in the madāris, and lower functionaries of worship and religious instruction. According to the editors’ count, between the years 1530 and 1540 awqāf in the eyalet of Anadolu, mainly those of sultans and high officials, provided for 342 Friday mosques, 1,055 other mosques, 110 medreses, as well

89 For further details on Turkish guilds and their funds, see G. Baer, “The Administrative, Economic and Social Functions of Turkish Guilds,” International Journal of Middle East Studies, vol. 1 (1970), 28-50 (esp. 44-45).
90 Waqf of Mustafa Paşa (1730), Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. 8, 29, 33.
92 Ibid., 54 (5, 8-9) (waqf al Silaḥdar, 1655-56); 91 (20-21) (waqf ‘Uthmān Ketkhuđa, 1736-37).
93 Busson de Janssens, 37.
as other religious institutions, and these institutions included 121 müdderises, 3,756 khatıbs, imáms, and miiezzins, as well as 3,299 students, shaykhs, etc. In addition, 239 Friday mosques, 937 other mosques, and 106 medreses in other parts of the empire were supported by these awqāf at that time. The awqāf studied by Yediyıldız (a sample of less than 350 out of 6,000 founded in eighteenth-century Turkey) provided for 1,264 functionaries in mosques, 384 in medreses, 741 in mektebs, and many more personnel in religious and semi-religious institutions who cannot be classified strictly as ‘ulamā’. In Ottoman Egypt awqāf established by rulers and consisting of agricultural lands (al-rizaq al-aḥbāsiyya) amounted at the end of the eighteenth century to about 600,000 faddāns (acres) from Cairo southwards. Their income was mainly intended to provide for the functionaries of mosques and madrasas. When Muhammad ‘Ali expropriated these lands, the ‘ulamā’ and Jabarti repeatedly claimed that the result was the complete disruption of the performance of worship in the mosques and of teaching in the Qur’ān schools (makātib). Many founders of awqāf in Egypt favored the ‘ulamā’ of the Azhar mosque and provided for worship and teaching there. One of these benefactors was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ketkuda, a grandee of the Qazdughliyya faction ca. 1760. Though he established other mosques and schools as well, the principal beneficiaries of his awqāf were the ‘ulamā’ of al-Azhar. Many details about allocations to ‘ulamā’ and students at al-Azhar have been recorded in Mubarak’s Khitaṭ. Some of the large awqāf extant in the twentieth century consisting of landed property also included provisions for the ‘ulamā’ of Al-Azhar. Moreover, these ‘ulamā’ benefited not only from allocations of waqf income specifically earmarked for them; in many cases they were assigned stipends from other awqāf by rulers who were able to dispose of their income. For instance, when Muhammad Pasha ‘Izzat, the wāli or governor of Egypt in the 1770s, decided to favor Shaykh Murtadhā al-Zabidi, he granted him an allowance from the income of the Waqf al-Ḥaramayn.

94 Barkan and Ayverdi, xvii-xviii.
95 Yediyıldız, 5 n. 1, 211, 313, 315, 316.
96 Ibid., e.g., vol. 1, 26 (8); vol. 4, 141 (31-32), 209 (4-5).
97 Ibid., vol. 4, 123 (33)-124 (4); 142 (1-4); 211 (14-16); 220 (18-19).
99 Mubarak, vol. 4, 20-25, 71 (26); vol. 5, 91, and passim.
100 Cf. Baer, History of Landownership, 156 and the sources mentioned there.
Perhaps even more important for the social position and influence of the ‘ulamā‘ was the fact that they very often were appointed administrators of waqf. The 1546 Istanbul register shows that in many waqf the imām of the nearest mosque was appointed as the immediate mütevelli,102 and in even more waqf he was assigned this post after the founder died or after the extinction of his offspring and those of his freed slaves.103 In addition, some other religious functionaries are mentioned as administrators in some of these waqf. In Yediyildız’s sample of eighteenth-century Turkish waqf, thirty-two out of 114 private superintendents (nāzir) were religious dignitaries.104 In Egypt it was the Shaykh al-Azhar in particular who was appointed, beginning in the nineteenth century, as the nāzir (in Egypt, administrator) of many waqf. In 1953 he acted as nāzir for thirty-two waqf; this meant an average annual income from management fees (generally 10 percent of the waqf’s income, but sometimes more) of £E 2,398 between 1929 and 1951. Beginning in the 1920s the Ministry of Awqāf acted on behalf of the Shaykh al-Azhar (as well as for the president of the shari‘a courts and the Grand Mufti of Egypt), taking a commission of five percent.105 Thus, he had an annual income from waqf management of over £E 1,000, without actually serving as an administrator. Other ‘ulamā‘ of the Azhar mosque and university have been favored as nāzirs of waqf, including the shaykh of the riwāq (hostel) of the Sa‘īdis (Upper Egyptians), the Hanafi or Mālikī muftis of al-Azhar, and various others.106 Mubārak’s lists mention other ‘ulamā‘, including teachers and imāms, as managers of waqf.107 These are but a few examples of one of the most conspicuous attributes of the Muslim waqf. Obviously, many founders preferred appointing ‘ulamā‘ as administrators because of their prestige as righteous men. Moreover, a waqf under their protection was considered less vulnerable to encroachment by outsiders.

---

102 Barkan and Ayverdi, e.g., nos. 67, 68, 78, 80, 96, 101.
103 For instance, ibid., nos. 7, 19, 21, 37, 45, 62, 70, 76, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90, 106, 107, 123.
104 Yediyildız, 196-97.
106 Mubārak, vol. 3, 7 (7-8); vol. 4, 21 (26), 24 (14), 69 (13-14), 82 (2); vol. 5, 14 (22), 109 (5); vol. 6, 27 (18), 32 (35-36); Jabarti, vol. 2, 147 (29-30). The Mufti of Jaffa used to administer the waqf in favor of Grand Mosque of that city; see Caspi, 45. [The Mālikī mufti of Algiers was the ex-officio administrator of the endowments in favor of the Great Mosque of Algiers. For this and on the administration of major public foundations in general, see Miriam Hoexter, “Huqūq Allāh and Huqūq al-‘Ibād as Reflected in the Waqf Institution,” Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 19 (1995), 146-69].
107 For instance, Mubārak, vol. 2, 34 (13-14), 98 (9-10); vol. 4, 63 (25), 67 (20); vol. 5, 18 (6-7); vol. 6, 24 (9-10, 12-13).
Closely connected with the 'ulama' were the ashraf, the descendants of the Prophet, the only formally recognized nobility in Islam. The Islamic character of their lineage explains the fact that many of the ashraf were 'ulama', although many also were engaged in other trades, crafts, and services. The persistence of the ashraf as social unit, and in some places even as a political force, was supported by special awqaf in their favor administered by their local head in each town, the naqib al-ashraf. Whenever the naqib al-ashraf was deposed for political reasons and another appointed in his place, control of the awqaf of the ashraf was immediately transferred. For example, Shaykh Khalil al-Bakri took control of the awqaf administered by 'Umar Makram when the latter escaped from Egypt at the time of the French invasion. For most of the nineteenth century the Bakris held the office of naqib al-ashraf, and with it many awqaf. Their rivals among the Cairo ashraf were the members of the Wafâ‘i order, called al-Sâdât. They, too, had extensive awqaf, and their head at the time of Mubârak's writing, 'Abd al-Khâliq al-Sâdât, was the administrator of the awqaf of many mosques and other institutions. Control over these awqaf had sociopolitical significance, as evidenced when the head of the Wafâ‘is at the time of the French invasion, Shaykh Muḥammad Abû‘l-Anwar al-Sâdât, fell foul of the French rulers of Egypt. The French were quick to seize his awqaf. In Latakia ashraf received income from two villages in the coastal plain which belonged to the Waqf al-Ḥaramayn.

Awqaf supported not only the formally recognized nobility in Islam, the ashraf and their head the naqib, but also the informal elite of traditional society, the notables (a'yan). Sources and documents studied by us show that the notables became connected with awqaf in a manner different from what we have described with regard to other social units. To this point, we have seen that founders generally allocated income to members of a particular social group or designated them as

108 In Egypt the management of awqaf in favor of ashraf by the naqib al-ashraf was regulated by a special decree of the Khedive dated 13 June 1895; see al-Awâmîr al-'Aliyya wa‘l-Dakrât, vol. 19 (1895), 168-69. On awqaf for the benefit of the “chorfa” (ashraf) in Algiers, see Busson de Janssens, 36; A. Devouix, “Notes historiques sur les mosquées et autres édifices religieux d’Alger,” Revue Africaine, 6 (1862), 203-04.
109 Jabarti, vol. 4, 87 (7-8).
110 See, for instance, Mubârak, vol. 4, 112 (10-11).
111 Ibid., vol. 5, 132 (28-34), 138-41.
112 Ibid., e.g., 46 (23-24), 110 (36), 123 (9), 141 (15-16).
114 See J. Weulersse, Le pays des Alaouites (Tours, 1940), 216.
administrators in the waqfiyya either to strengthen and support the group (family, freed slaves, guilds) or because of its religious prestige ('ulamā', ashrāf). Notables, on the other hand, often acquired property, income, or control of existing awqāf in consequence of their economic, social, and political power. The difference, of course, resulted from the fact that the former groups were well-defined social units, often with little economic or political power, while the latter was an ill-defined informal group with considerable power in certain areas and periods.

The acquisition of income or control of awqāf by notables or privileged groups assumed different forms. The prevalent pattern in Ottoman Egypt was the seizure of rizaq aḥbāsiyya or their income by powerful provincial families or Cairene dignitaries. In the eighteenth century many of the rizaq aḥbāsiyya had been appropriated by village shaykhs or notables (ku bara‘ al-bilād), especially in Upper Egypt where registration was practically non-existent. Often the holders (al- wādī‘īna aydīhim ‘alayhā) did not deliver the income due to the beneficiaries or else delivered only a small part of it.115 Similarly, when the power of Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mahdi al-Ḥifnī grew as a result of the appointment of a friendly pasha in Egypt, he exploited the occurrence of the great plague in 1790 as an opportunity to seize the rizaq of dignitaries who had died in the epidemic.116

As we have seen, notable families in Damascus and Jerusalem achieved control of some of the large public awqāf mainly by being appointed to their administration.117 The families of Jerusalem notables benefited from the large awqāf of Jerusalem and Palestine in yet another way. We have mentioned above the perpetual lease acquired by the Khalidis. Similarly, the ʿAlamīs received various properties in Jerusalem which were part of a waqf in favor of the Dome of the Rock in the form of a perpetual lease of the type known as ijāratayn.118 And according to the memorandum of ʿAbdullāh Mukhlīṣ and Yaʿqūb Abūl-Hudā quoted above, part of the income from the famous large

116 Ibid., 233 (32-33).
117 See p.269 above, fn. 17ff.
118 Waqfiyya of Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-ʿAlāmi, dated 2 April 1932, line 24. JLR, 546/32. Elsewhere we have shown in detail how the notables of Jerusalem acquired various rights and properties when awqāf that had deteriorated were dismembered. See G. Baer, “Jerusalem’s Families of Notables and the Waqf in the Early 19th Century,” [esp. 113-17. See also idem, “The Dismemberment of Awqāf in Early Nineteenth Century Jerusalem,” Asian and African Studies, 13 (1979), 220-41].
waqf of Haseki Sultan was used to “distribute bread ... among the notables of Jerusalem” (a'yân al-Quds).\(^{119}\)

This last example would seem to be bizarre were it not for the existence of parallels in Egypt. There, too, public and charitable awqāf indirectly served to maintain the prestige of rich and influential families through an institution called al-'iânât al-khayriyya wa'l-martabât al-shahriyya al-khâṣṣa bi'l-‘ā'ilât al-karīma. These were subventions paid out of the income of khayri awqāf to members of “noble” families who had fallen upon evil days “in order to remove the threat of need,” the support to be given “in secret ... so that their condition not be known to the nation.” Sometimes these subventions apparently were used for purposes of luxury and pomp, rather than to remove the threat of need. Nevertheless, the system was justified by the Minister of Awqāf for some time, even after the Revolution of 1952.\(^{120}\)

One group of beneficiaries of such martabât shahriyya min al-awqāf al-khayriyya were members of the Muḥammad ‘Ali family, the ruling family in Egypt. According to information published after the Revolution, twenty-two members of the royal family had received grants of between £E 22 and £E 100 per month each from al-awqāf al-khayriyya, and in addition, some of them received annual grants for clothes, the education of children, etc.\(^{121}\) It is interesting to note that as early as the 1920s the role played by awqāf in securing the status of the aristocracy and saving it from ruin was used as an argument against its abolition.\(^{122}\)

We do not know the dimensions of such functions in public awqāf. Whatever it may have been, it certainly could not compare with the importance of the family awqāf of the royal family and of the Royal Waqf Office, which had become the administrator of about one-fifth of all waqf land in Egypt. Since we have dealt with this aspect elsewhere in detail,\(^{123}\) and since it is part of a larger theme (namely the relation

\(^{119}\) Memorandum of Mukhless and Abu al-Hoda, 12 (Arabic) and 15 (English translation). ISA, CS 189. [For a detailed discussion of this endowment, the distribution of its income, and the inclusion of Jerusalem’s notables among its beneficiaries, see O. Peri, “The Ottoman State and the Waqf Institution in Late Eighteenth-Century Jerusalem,” M.A. thesis, the Hebrew University (Jerusalem, 1983) (in Hebrew), esp. 42-45, 64ff.].

\(^{120}\) al-Ahrām, 17 June, 2 and 7 December 1953; 26 March 1954.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., 12 and 19 November 1953; for further examples, see Baer, History of Landownership, 162.

\(^{122}\) Y.M. Delavor, Le wakf et l’utilité économique de son maintien en Égypte (Paris, 1926), 51-54.

\(^{123}\) See Baer, History of Landownership, chap. 4, esp. 175-78.
between the waqf and the ruler), we shall not describe it further in this context.

Having treated the support given by the waqf system to social units or groups based on kinship or quasi-kinship or on criteria of territory, profession, or class, we turn now to two important units of the Near and Middle Eastern social system between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries: the religious and the linguistic-ethnic. One of the original aims of the waqf, if not the main one, was of course to strengthen the Muslim community. Throughout the centuries other social units also attained importance as recipients of waqf support, but the Muslim community always retained its prominence. This is expressed in various ways. First, poor Muslims (fuqara' al-muslimin) figure among the most frequent ultimate beneficiaries of all types of awqāf, whatever the immediate and intermediate purposes of these may have been. Another favorite ultimate (and sometimes even intermediate or immediate) beneficiary are the sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina (al-haramayn al-shari'ayn), which, of course, symbolize the community of Muslims. 124 Awqāf in favor of mosques, madrasas and Qur'ān schools may also be considered as representing a wish to strengthen Islam and the Muslims, and even in awqāf in which the founder’s town is accorded some preference, it is generally the mosque, the madrasa, or the poor Muslims of that town who are provided for, as noted above. All this is common knowledge, and citing examples would be superfluous, but it must be mentioned here in order not to distort the picture of the waqf’s position in the social system.

Within the Muslim community there were various subdivisions. The social significance of the different schools of law (madhāhib, s. madh-hab), has been the subject of vivid and ongoing scholarly discussion in recent times. Most examples of sixteenth-to-twentieth-century awqāf favoring a specific school of law are those in favor of the Ḥanafī madhhab founded by persons close to the Muḥammad ‘Ali dynasty in nineteenth-century Egypt. Among these is the large Shawā waqf founded by Zaynab, the daughter of Muḥammad ‘Ali, who allocated

124 [In eighteenth and nineteenth century Ottoman Algiers the Haramayn became the most popular ultimate beneficiary of private endowments and the largest public foundation in the town. See Hoexter, Endowments, Rulers and Community. For the Anatolian and Rumelian endowments created for the Waqf al-Ḥaramayn in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see S. Faroqhi, Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans 1517-1683 (London and New York, 1994), esp. 82-83. For eighteenth-century Jerusalem, see Peri, “The Ottoman State and the Waqf Institution,” passim. See also Encyclopaedia of Islam, new ed., s.v. Al-Ḥaramayn (B. Lewis)].
part of the income to the ‘ulamā’ of the Ḥanafi school at al-Azhar;\textsuperscript{125} the waqf of Rāṭib Pasha, Egyptian minister of war in 1878, who established a special riwāq for Ḥanafi students at al-Azhar;\textsuperscript{126} Sa‘īd’s awqāf providing for a Ḥanafi teacher;\textsuperscript{127} and the waqf of Ismā‘īl’s mother providing for a Ḥanafi imām.\textsuperscript{128} On the other hand, the Jawhari waqf (1856-57) provided for a Shāfī‘i teacher.\textsuperscript{129} Only ‘Abbās I (1853) provided both for a Ḥanafi and a Shāfī‘i imām.\textsuperscript{130} The fact that most of these examples are from late nineteenth-century Egypt may be related to the growing number of Ḥanafi ‘ulamā’, the growing importance of this madhāhib in Egypt, and its connection with Egyptian rulers at that time.\textsuperscript{131} Eighteenth-century awqāf that mention madhāhib tend to provide simultaneously for teachers or imāms of different schools of law, as did those of ‘Uthmān Ketkhuda (1736-37) and Abū Dhadhab (1774).\textsuperscript{132}

Throughout the period under discussion the subdivision into ṣūfī tariqas appears to have been much more relevant to the foundation of awqāf than the division into madhāhib. Awqāf in favor of dervish convents (zāwiya, pl. zawyā; takīyya, tekiye, or tekke, pl. takāyā; khāneqāh, pl. khawānīq) abound in the Near and Middle East under Ottoman rule and are too numerous to list here.\textsuperscript{133} Some of them do not seem to have been controlled or inhabited by distinctive tariqas, and in fact most of the zawyā, takāyā, and khawānīq mentioned in the 1546 register of Istanbul awqāf, as well as most of those included in Mubārak’s list, are not recorded as belonging to a specific tariqa. Many others, however, were definitely connected with particular tariqas.\textsuperscript{134} The most detailed study of awqāf of this kind is the article by Suraiya Faroqhi on the dergāh or central monastery of the Bektashi order of dervishes in Turkey.\textsuperscript{135} The Ḥacı Bektaş awqāf were concentrated mainly around

\textsuperscript{125} For sources, see above, n. 49.
\textsuperscript{126} For details of his waqīyya, see Mubārak, vol. 4, 24 (2-15).
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., vol. 5, 84 (32-33).
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., vol. 4, 117 (11).
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., 78 (11-12).
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., vol. 5, 82 (31-33).
\textsuperscript{131} For a detailed description of this process, see ibid., vol. 4, 30 (1-8).
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., vol. 5, 90 (25-27), 107 (17, 22-23, 27); see also D. Crecelius, “The Waqf of Muhammad Bey Abū al-Dhadhab in Historical Perspective,” [International Journal of Middle East Studies, 23 (1991), 57-81].
\textsuperscript{133} See, for example, Barkan and Ayverdi, xxvii-xxx, 203-08 (nos. 1153-97); Mubārak, vol. 6, 16-45 (more than 100 awqāf in favor of zawyā), 54-57, and passim.
\textsuperscript{134} See De Jong, 29-30.
\textsuperscript{135} Suraiya Faroqhi, “The Tekke of Ḥacı Bektaş: Social Position and Economic Activities,” International Journal of Middle East Studies, vol. 7 (1976), 183-
the village of Haci bektas itself and all were situated in the vicinity of
the tekke. They were all rural. Altogether, the tekke had an annual waqf
income amounting to 99,000 akçes, meaning that it was relatively rich:
all the awqaf in the nearby town of Kirsehir combined had only as
much income as that.136 The mütevelli of the waqf was chosen from
among the "descendants" of Haci Bektaş. When Mahmud II sup-
pressed the Janissaries, who were connected with the Bektashi Order,
he confiscated the awqaf of the dergâh.137 In other parts of Turkey
zaviyes also were established in favor of Bektashis,138 and branches of
the order were established in other parts of the empire as well,
apparently through the Janissaries. The main center in Egypt was the
Takiyyat al-Qasr al-Ayni, which was a beneficiary of extensive
awqaf.139 After a period of deterioration, this takiyya and its waqf
properties were restored in 1787, at the time of Hasan Paşa's Ottoman
expedition to Egypt.140 The Mevlevi dergâh of Konya was even more
richly endowed than the Haci Bektas tekke, and in this case, too, most
of the waqf properties were located in the sancak of Konya.141 Awqaf
in favor of Mevlevi dervishes and their tekkes were, of course,
established in other parts of Turkey as well,142 and in Egypt, too, the
Mawlawiyya benefited from various awqaf which were administered
by the shaykh of their takiyya, who was at the same time head of the

tariqa.143

A waqf in favor of the Naqshbandi takiyya in Egypt, managed by a
Naqshbandi, is mentioned in a document dated Shawwâl 1123/ Decem-
ber 1711.144 In the nineteenth century the Khedive Abbâs I con-
structed a takiyya for the Naqshbandiyya order and established extensive awqâf
to support it.145 A specific branch of the Naqshbandiyya was the beneficiary of a waqf founded as late as June 1942 in Jaffa, where

---

208. [Cf. A. Layish, "Waqfs and Shi'i Monasteries in the Ottoman Policy of
Colonization: Sultan Selim I's Waqf of 1516 in Favour of Dayr al-Asad," Bulletin
136 Faroqhi, "The Tekke of Haci Bektaş: Social Position and Economic
Activities," 192-94.
137 Ibid., 201-02.
138 See, e.g., Barkan and Ayverdi, no. 870.
139 See De Jong, 26 and n. 114 for details on these awqaf.
140 Jabarti, vol. 2, 144 (15-28).
141 Faroqhi, "The Tekke of Haci Bektaş: Social Position and Economic
Activities," 192-94.
142 See, for example, Kunter, "Türk Vakıfları," 121.
143 See De Jong, 26, and n. 109 for details on the awqaf.
144 Ibid., 28, and n. 128.
145 Ibid., 81-82. For nineteenth-century Naqshbandi awqâf in Turkey, see, e.g.,
‘Abd al-Rāziq al-Bukhārī stipulated that his waqf should be controlled by the zāwiya of al-Sāda al-Naqaşbandiyya al-Bukhārīyya. This branch of the Naqaşbandiyya originated in Turkey and figured as well in various forms in the Istanbul awqāf of the sixteenth century. In early eighteenth-century Egypt an Ottoman vāli, Mehmet Paşa, established a waqf in favor of a takiyya of poor Turkish Khalwatis, an order with numerous members and extensive awqāf in Egypt. Another Şūfi order which was created in eighteenth-century Egypt and whose awqāf are frequently mentioned by Mubārak is the Bayyūmiyya (a branch of the Ahmadiyya). In the nineteenth century awqāf were established for the Tijāniyya or the Şamūbiyya, an offshoot of the Burhāmiyya, and the revenues provided boat fuel enabling members of the tariqa to sail to Disūq for the mawlid of İbrāhīm al-Disūqī. A waqf in favor of the zāwiya of the Shādhiliyya order in Acre was founded as late as 14 March 1964. These are, of course, only a few examples from a long list of awqāf created throughout the Near and Middle East in favor of one tariqa or another. At a certain point madrasa students came to regard these extensive foundations as a threat to the upkeep and maintenance of their institutions. This, at least, is the most convincing interpretation of the fitna in Cairo in October 1711, when a student of theology (sukhte) assembled a group of followers in the Mu‘ayyad mosque and preached, inter alia, “the abolition of the tekyes built for a band of dervishes such as Gülşeni and Mevlēvi and Bektashi and all the others, and the replacement of the dervishes inhabiting these tekyes by students of religious sciences; the tekyes should be turned into medreses.” The Azhar shaykhs rejected his demands because, they said, any change in the character of the tekyes, e.g., turning them into medreses, would constitute a violation of the founder’s stipulation.

Non-Muslims as well used the waqf to support their communities.

---

146 Siğil of Jaffa, 223/435 (23 June 1942).
148 Jabarti, vol. 1, 30 (4); Mubārak, vol. 6, 27 (13-15); De Jong, 25.
149 Mubārak, e.g., vol. 2, 6 (7); vol. 3, 18 (7-8); vol. 6, 16 (33), 42 (25).
150 See De Jong, 149, and n. 101 for details.
151 Ibid., 118, n. 108.
152 Siğil of Acre, 45/64.
and institutions. The Copts, the largest Christian community in the Middle East, established extensive awqāf in favor of various Coptic churches in Cairo and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{154} From time to time prominent Coptic notables turned part of the large properties they had acquired into awqāf for the benefit of their community. Ibrāhīm al-Jawhari, the influential head of the Coptic scribes (ra‘īs al-kataba al-aqībat) from the 1770s until his death in 1794-95, endowed Coptic churches, monasteries, and other institutions with extensive lands and income from other sources.\textsuperscript{155} About a hundred years later the Coptic notable Tādрус Efendi ‘Arayān, who served the Muḥammad ‘Ali family in various capacities and became a large landowner, was another major benefactor of the Coptic community. He turned part of his landed property and real estate into a waqf in favor of the Coptic poor and their churches.\textsuperscript{156} For almost a century Coptic awqāf were the object of a bitter struggle between the Coptic clergy and monks, on the one hand, and the secular organization of the community, al-majlis al-millī al-‘āmm li‘l-aqībat al-orthodoks, on the other. Though one of the express purposes for which this latter organization was founded in 1874 was to take over the awqāf from the clergy who had been managing them, and in spite of various laws enacted to this effect, the awqāf did in fact remain in the hands of the abbots until the 1960s.\textsuperscript{157}

Maronites used the waqf institution to endow convents and preserve the extensive properties of the Maronite church. These properties, which had originated in various ways, were all called awqāf, although some of the categories enumerated by Touma were not properly established as such.\textsuperscript{158} This does not preclude the existence of numerous proper awqāf founded by Maronites, e.g., one in favor of a Maronite convent founded in 1733, another in favor of the seat of the Maronite patriarch established in 1780, and one endowed in the 1770s by the Maronite notable Abū Zāhir al-Dahdūh in favor of two Maronite monasteries.\textsuperscript{159} Like Muslims, Maronite dignitaries assigned the ultimate benefit of

\textsuperscript{154} Mubārak, vol. 6, 72 (34-35), 75 (22-25), 76 (34–77 (1), 77 (13-16).
\textsuperscript{155} Jabarti, vol. 2, 116 (1-3), 262 (8-19); Mubārak, vol. 6, p. 85 (29-32).
\textsuperscript{156} Mubārak, vol. 6, 80 (6-20). His waqf of more than 646 faddāns was still extant in the middle of the twentieth century; see al-Ahrām, 20 August 1947, 16.
\textsuperscript{157} See al-Ahrām, 25 February, 18 May 1944; Baer, History of Landownership, 178-81.
\textsuperscript{158} Toufic Touma, Paysans et institutions féodales chez les Druses et les Maronites du Liban du xviie siècle à 1914, (Beirut, 1972), vol. 2, 540-41.
\textsuperscript{159} For the waqfīyyāt, see ibid., 805-06; Ṭanūs al-Shidyāq, Akhbār al-a‘yān fi Jabal Lubnān (Beirut, 1859 [1954]), vol. 1, 234. On a waqf founded in 1898 by a certain Jubarān Jahbūr in favor of the Maronite Church in Nazareth, see Palestine, Annotated Supreme Court Judgments (1938), vol. 2, 241, CA 84/38.
their family awqāf to “the Maronite community” or “the poor of the family, on condition that they are Maronites, and finally to the poor of the Maronite community.”

Other Christian communities possessed awqāf as well. Awqāf of the Greek Orthodox Monastery on Mount Sinai have been studied on the basis of documents kept there. The most important of the awqāf in favor of this monastery were situated in Cyprus and Crete.

Finally, awqāf also served to support ethnic or national groups. As early as the eighteenth century Ahmed Efendi, a qādi in Aleppo who established and endowed the madrasa al-Ahmadiyya there, stipulated in his waqfiyya that Kurds be employed in the madrasa. His decision has been explained by the probable Kurdish origin of his family.

Other instances include awqāf specifically established in various parts of Algeria for the benefit of Muslims of Andalusian origin and awqāf in eighteenth-century Egypt with provisions for Turkish students at al-Azhar. Similarly, many founders of khāri awqāf in Egypt in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were Turks who designated the Turkish army or some other Turkish institutions as beneficiaries of their awqāf. In an article published in Vakıflar Dergisi, a member of the General Directorate of Awaqf in Turkey has collected the waqfiyyat of awqāf created for national purposes. Though he includes awqāf which, strictly speaking, cannot be considered “nationalistic,” such as those aimed at strengthening the military power of the Islamic Ottoman state or those in favor of public services in Turkish Cyprus without an explicit Turkish character, he nevertheless records some awqāf of the kind dealt with here. His most remarkable example is the waqf of Doktor Riza Nur Bey of Sinop, founded in stages in 1924 and 1927, in which he dedicated the income of a çiftlik to the establishment of a
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library, with the explicit aim of exalting the Turkish nation: “Bundan maksat ve arzum Türklüğün yükselmesidir” (The aim of this, and my desire in this regard, is to exalt the Turkish identity). Another interesting example of this kind, which later became a case in the courts of Mandatory Palestine, was the waqf of 'Ali Efendi Fawzi b. Muḥammad Efendi b. al-Imām of Kayseri, called “el-Turk,” who resided in Jerusalem in the early 1930s. In his waqfīyya, dated 25 May 1932, he stipulated, inter alia, that twenty pounds be distributed yearly by the mutawallī among the Red Crescent and the Air Force of the Turkish Republic by means of the Turkish Consulate General in Jerusalem. Awqāf of this kind appeared rather late in Near and Middle Eastern history, after national units had acquired political significance. In fact, they appeared too late to assume a common pattern, because the modern states established on the basis of these national units either nationalized the waqf or abolished the waqf system altogether.
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