Few architectural monuments survive from the Ottoman period in Palestine (1516–1918), a period that shaped the cultural and political landscape of the contemporary Arab Middle East. The best documented of those are the buildings, restoration works, and alterations carried out in Jerusalem, especially around the Haram area. Architectural monuments and building programs that were constructed after the initial building boom in the sixteenth century fell through the cracks of a multidisciplinary interest in Palestine. The plethora of political, economic, and, more recently, social studies on Ottoman Palestine and the growing interest in the construction of archaeological and architectural knowledge in the nineteenth century seem to be oblivious to the preceding four hundred years of building tradition. The public buildings of the Ottoman period suffered from the double predicament of being geographically peripheral and of falling within a perceived period of “decline”. But more important for the art historian, most of them also lack the monumentality and the fineness of detail that are generally associated with Ottoman architecture.

The Great Mosque of Jaffa provides an opportunity to investigate an Ottoman building in Palestine and illustrates the various mechanisms by which a building becomes symbolic, regardless of the elaboration of its size or style. Also known as the Mahmudi Mosque or the mosque of Abu Nabbut, the Great Mosque was built in 1812 under the patronage of the acting governor of Jaffa Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut (r. 1803–19). Today the mosque comprises two interconnected courtyards on an east-west axis, each with a slightly different orientation (fig. 1). A century after its construction, the Ottoman governor Hasan Bek al-Jabi razed the area south of the mosque to make way for a wide street leading to the port. The same governor was responsible for the construction of the eastern courtyard of the current mosque. The mosque abuts a late Ottoman police station (1897) to the north, and a row of shops separates its eastern courtyard from the Ottoman clock-tower square (1902) to the east. The western side overlooks a steep slope, and on its northern end it abuts an early-twentieth-century building. The whole composition now forms an island in the historic district of the municipality of Tel Aviv–Jaffa in Israel.

An approximate reconstruction of the urban fabric of the area surrounding the Great Mosque in the early decades of the nineteenth century (fig. 2) shows the location of the city walls and commercial buildings before they were demolished and the mosque’s eastern courtyard was built. Both the reconstruction plan and the analysis of the functional and architectural aspects of the early-nineteenth-century mosque are mainly based on the waqf documents of Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut’s complex. Abu Nabbut’s waqf consisted of a series of endowments spread over the years 1812 to 1816. Its main components are the Great Mosque, a madrasa, and two sabils. For their maintenance, the waqf founder Abu Nabbut established public benefit functions including bazaars, khans, and a significant number of shops. Only the mosque/madrasa, dating to 1812, and two sabils, dating to 1810 and 1815–16, still survive. The discussion in this article will be limited to the mosque, as the two sabils have already been discussed elsewhere.

THE MAKING OF AN OTTOMAN MOSQUE

The waqf document of the Great Mosque of Jaffa states that “[Abu Nabbut] built in the court of the aforementioned mosque to the west rooms from stone . . . and, at their entrances, vaulted iwans on well-built piers; [he built] the same to the east, iwans next to a madrasa [which] he built to retain books and
[which he] provided with a separate waqf that will be mentioned later; [to the north he built] a room followed by iwans; all [rooms and iwans were] finely vaulted with stone and lime; and he also covered the floor of the courtyard of the mosque with fine paving slabs. The document also confirms that Abu Nabbut initiated the building project and provided all the funds for it from his own money. This article will discuss two aspects of the mosque built under Abu Nabbut in 1812: first, the architectural style and morphology of the mosque and its relationship to other provincial mosques in Ottoman Palestine; and, second, the function of certain architectural elements as representational devices that were manipulated by the patron to convey messages of his own importance and political power.

The mosque built under Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut in 1812 occupies only the western courtyard of the current mosque composition. It comprises a prayer hall opening onto the qibla end of a courtyard which is surrounded by arcades on all sides (fig. 1), and forms the southern boundary of the building. It has a double-domed rectangular space with a frontal arcade (son cemaat yeri), and a modern wooden portico (fig. 3). The eastern boundary of the courtyard is currently two stories high and two bays deep. Only the western bay of the lower level belongs to the early-nineteenth-century mosque; the rest is part of a twentieth-century expansion (fig. 4). A room designated in the waqf documents as a madrasa (kütüphâne) occupies the northern end of the eastern arcade; the rooms that were used by the students (hujûrât) are located across the courtyard behind the western arcade. The northern arcade consists of domed units that open on both sides, next to which is a room of unknown function (fig. 5). The nature of the arcade is difficult to discern as it now serves as an entrance to the modern latrines built behind it. The mosque has one minaret (fig. 6), located to the west of the prayer hall. Its only entrance takes up the central unit of the western arcade. Three other entrances (dating to 1812 and 1914) are no longer in use. The courtyard is somewhat irregular, as the northern end of the eastern side tapers towards the west.

The prayer hall of the Great Mosque consists of two almost cubical spaces joined to form a rectangle whose longer side is parallel to the qibla wall. Two domes supported by pendentives and slightly elongated octagonal drums cover the internal space. There
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Fig. 1. A sketch plan of the Great Mosque of Jaffa showing the 1812 courtyard to the west and the 1914 courtyard to the east.
is a slight difference in the size and height of the domes and the decorative moldings separating the different parts of the superstructure, but stylistically they seem to date from the same time, judging by the form and openings of the octagonal drums, the stilted hemispherical profile of the dome, and its decorative incisions. The interior of the prayer hall is divided into two spaces by the structural piers. A simple mihrab covered with small glazed tiles and a minbar occupy the center of the western part. The northern facade of the prayer hall also demonstrates an uneven treatment for the two parts of the overall space: the western part is pierced by a door flanked by elongated windows; the eastern part by only a door. The western piers of the mosque’s frontal arcade (son cemaat yerli) are also unevenly spaced. These minor differences indicate that the prayer hall was not all built at the same time.

According to the waqf document, Abu Nabbat’s mosque was built on the remains of an older one. The records of the Islamic court confirm this and further indicate that the older mosque was small and in such a state of decay that its use was prohibited. In 1799, the governor of Gaza, under whose administration Jaffa was at the time, dispatched an order to the local qadi stipulating that the “ruins of the mosque” be used to billet the military garrison, indicating that it was no longer functioning as a mosque by the time of the Napoleonic campaign. Recent conservation work on the exterior of the prayer hall’s southern wall exposed a continuous vertical joint in the masonry of the lower sixteen courses, between the two domes, marking the corner of the building or the end of a wall. This suggests that an older, smaller structure was partially conserved in the 1812 building program, probably the earlier mosque mentioned in the waqf document. Abu Nabbat would have had to incorporate any remains of the mosque into his...
Fig. 3. The façade of the prayer hall of the Great Mosque as seen from the 1812 courtyard facing south.

Fig. 4. The eastern arcade of the courtyard showing the madrasa to the left and the semicircular buttresses to the right.
Fig. 5. The cellular formation of the northern and western arcades of the 1812 courtyard.

Fig. 6. The minaret of the Great Mosque showing the surface divisions of the shaft and the double balconies.
rebuilding program in order to satisfy the terms of the waqf. What he seems to have done was rebuild the existing eastern unit of the prayer hall, copy this unit directly to its west to enlarge his mosque, pull down the walls between the structural supports to provide a continuous internal space, and provide the two units with similar domes. The fact that the only inscription panel in the prayer hall is located above the entrance to the western part of the mosque supports this idea: it carries the tugra of Mahmud II, thus dating the building firmly within Abu Nabbut’s term of office (fig. 7). It follows that any analysis of the prayer hall of the Great Mosque should be concerned with the domed mosque in general, and not the two-domed unit which was clearly dictated by preexisting conditions.

The waqf document of the mosque also makes it clear that Abu Nabbut was responsible for the building of the western, northern, and eastern arcades, and the dated inscriptions embedded in the three arcades link them to the same building program. However, the courtyard is surrounded by two different types of arcades—one domed, the other cross vaulted. The western and northern arcades consist of repetitive units with hemispherical domes (fig. 5), supported by pendentives on pointed arches and columns with cushion crowns. The crude drums, the shallow capitals, the hemispherical domes, and the general dimensions of the arched openings are consistent in both arcades. Another similarity between the northern and western arcade is the deliberate and rhythmic incorporation of spolia. The western arcade opens onto the madrasa cells to the west, and to what was possibly the mosque’s main entrance to the south.

The eastern arcade is different in nature and construction from the other two. Instead of the typically Ottoman idiom of cellular domed units, it uses the regional vernacular cross-vault type. The arcade consists of cross-vaulted units separated on the courtyard side by protruding buttresses with hemispherical endings (fig. 4). The pointed cross vaults are heavy in construction; their piers vary in cross section and size from 0.80 x 1.00 m to 1.20 x 1.80 m. The protruding half-cylindrical buttresses are only one story high. A single-course ring of concave molding separates the main body of the buttress from the domed finial that projected above the wall. The reconstruction of the urban fabric of Jaffa in the early nineteenth century (fig. 2) suggests that this arcade might have been built by Abu Nabbut as part of Jaffa’s inner city wall before he built the mosque. What is interesting, though, is that a similar form of buttress appears in an earlier sabil built by the same patron in 1810 (fig. 8). The distinctive composition of cylindrical buttresses with domed finials flanking an arch reappears as a stylistic leitmotiv in two other buildings established under Abu Nabbut in 1815–16—the now demolished market known as the Suq al-Faraj (fig. 9) and the Sabil al-Shifa’, now known as the sabil of Abu Nabbut (fig. 10). This leitmotiv linked the various components of the waqf complex, setting it apart as a single program and acting as an emblem for its patron. The deliberate use of this leitmotiv and the accuracy of the waqf document in ascribing the rest
of Abu Nabbūt’s patronage allow one to conclude that even though the eastern arcade is different in nature and construction from the rest of the mosque, it was still one of the structures he funded, probably around 1810, when he had the city walls rebuilt and the gate and Mahmūdi sabil constructed. The presence of two different types of arcade in the courtyard of the Great Mosque, then, marks different phases of construction, but both of them sponsored by Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbūt.

The minaret is another element that testifies to the complicated structural and morphological changes Abu Nabbūt had made to the Great Mosque. It abuts the prayer hall on one side and the mosque entrance, which is located at the southern end of the western arcade, on the other. The minaret has an octagonal shaft with several divisions and two hooded balconies (serifes) (fig. 6). The shaft is divided into six sections separated by single-course rings of concave molding; the lowest two are separated by a billet course. The minaret’s two balconies are located between the fourth and fifth sections of the shaft, and between the sixth section and the tapered ending. Both balconies have similar wooden balustrades and slightly pitched wooden roofs. The top of the minaret consists of three sections: the lower two are much smaller in diameter and with more exaggerated tapering than the main shaft. The finial of the whole composition is a conical dome surmounted by a crescent (‘ālem).

Structural evidence indicates that when Abu Nabbūt built his mosque in 1812, he seems to have incorporated the base of a preexisting minaret. This might help explain the minaret’s awkward location between the prayer room and the western arcade, but not its final form. We cannot confirm, for example, to what height the old minaret was preserved and what parts of it Abu Nabbūt had built. The presence of a billet-string molding only in the lower section of the minaret with a different type of molding between the remaining sections of the shaft suggests that perhaps the bottom section existed prior to Abu Nabbūt’s building program and that he was responsible for the upper parts only.

That the minaret of the Great Mosque has two balconies is intriguing, since throughout the Ottoman period the use of more than one balcony on minarets, or more than one minaret to a mosque, was restricted to imperial patronage. The presence of two balconies in Abu Nabbūt’s mosque has two possible explanations. One is that the mosque was built under imperial patronage; the other, that the minaret was built in more than one phase and that, like the prayer hall’s two domes and the use of different types of arcades around the mosque’s courtyard, each balcony marks a different phase of construction. There is, however, no visible structural evidence to support the latter explanation. On the contrary, the local archives of the waqf administration (vakıflar müdürüliği) indicate that the upper part of the minaret, including the two balconies, was renovated in 1908. The commission established to mon-
itor the rebuilding of the minaret stipulated that it “should be demolished up to one meter below the lower balcony and rebuilt to its original condition.”

In their final report, dated December of the same year, the commission announced their satisfaction with the resulting restoration, stating that the new minaret is “identical to their first survey and similar in the art and built parts.”

One can therefore ascertain that in its current form with its two balconies the minaret dates back to sometime in the nineteenth century. We cannot ascertain, however, whether or not both were built by Abu Nabbut. References to the construction of the minaret are conspicuously absent from the waqf document. The same document, however, stipulates the appointment of two muezzins but only one each of all the other mosque employees, including the imam and the khatib. Whether the minaret was built under imperial patronage, or whether it was built as part of a self-aggrandizing project by Abu Nabbut is a matter that can be elucidated through the study of the inscriptions in the mosque complex.

The neat correspondence between the architectural and textual evidence of the early-nineteenth-century mosque in Jaffa is complemented by a plethora of inscriptions, which can shed some light on the meaning of Abu Nabbut’s architectural patronage and help form an overall interpretation of his mosque. The inscriptions fall into two groups: the foundation and dedication inscriptions form one, and inscribed emblematic panels form the other. The main foundation inscription is located above the 1812 portal, at the southern end of the western arcade, in a deep recess between the crown of the entrance and the intrados of the gadrooned arch of the framing gateway (fig. 11). A six-line inscription in Arabic thuluth dates the “reconstruction” of the mosque to 1812 and states that it was carried out under the administra-
tion (munāṣara) of Abu Nabbut on orders given by Sulayman Pasha (r. 1804–20), the governor of the province of Sidon, and during the reign of Sultan Mahmud II (r. 1808–39). The inscription is fairly typical. It places Abu Nabbut in a political and administrative hierarchy that links his name to the governor Sulayman Pasha and ultimately to the reigning Ottoman Sultan Mahmud II. This genealogical concern is also expressed in a 20-line waqf inscription on a marble panel embedded in the western wall of the northern arcade. In addition to establishing the political pedigree of the founder, this inscription paraphrases Abu Nabbut’s waqf for the Great Mosque and the Mahmudi sabil. In the two inscriptions, the main focus is on Abu Nabbut. He is referred to with his full titles: amir of a mamluk military group, mutasal-lim or acting governor, silahs5r-i hassā or commander-in-chief, and nāzir or mutawalli, administrator of a waqf; his names, Muhammad and Amin; and his status as a manumitted slave (ma’ttq) of Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar.

The three epigraphic panels in the mosque are emblems of official status, an Ottoman institutional convention. The rectangular marble panel above the western entrance of the prayer room has a two-part composition, with the tugra of Mahmud II who ruled between 1808 and 1839 filling the lower part (fig. 7). The use of a tugra on an Ottoman building designates it as “official” and in this case indicates that
the mosque had official patronage and was possibly built by imperial order. The meaning of the two remaining emblems in the mosque is more problematic.

The southern end of the eastern arcade opens onto what would have been the mosque’s entrance from the market area of the Suq al-Faraj (fig. 2). Two emblems (penes) with the words Muhammad, Amin, and sulahsır-i hâsâ, Abu Nabbut’s names and official title, surmount the exterior of the inner and outer arches of the side gate (fig. 12). The form of these two emblematic panels and the shape of the inscription are revealing. The two marble medallions are close copies of the tugra medallion that adorns the crown of the Mahmudi sabil with its pronounced oval frame and surrounding voluted details (fig. 13). The emblem itself is also similar to that of the sultan with its three uprights and two open elliptical curves turning first to the left then elegantly slanting downwards to the right.

While the two foundation inscriptions clearly preclude any suggestion of imperial patronage—they mention the sultan only incidentally—the use of a tugra suggests the opposite. Furthermore, both the Arabic and Ottoman-Turkish copies of the waqf document state that the building of the mosque was carried out under Abu Nabbut’s initiative, and paid for by him. Abu Nabbut’s use of a pençe that copies the sultan’s tugra further complicates the question of patronage. Who was responsible for the construction of the Great Mosque of Jaffa, and more important, was the mosque commemorating the sultan or Abu Nabbut? This question can be answered in part by comparing the mosque with the architectural patronage of the Mahmudi sabil built under Abu Nabbut two years earlier, in 1810 (fig. 8).

Architectural and textual evidence from the Mahmudi sabil makes it clear that its construction was the result of imperial patronage. In addition to Mahmud II’s imperial tugra decorating the crown of the sabil, the foundation inscription states that the sabil was built by Mahmud II. Abu Nabbut’s name is also mentioned in the inscription, but only incidentally and without the elaboration of the titles in the mosque inscriptions. The architectural style in which the sabil was built also differs tremendously from local models. The monumental dimensions of the Mahmudi
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Fig. 12. Abu Nabbut’s pençe located above the southeastern entrance of the mosque.
sabil, its projecting free crown, and its smooth ashlar walls indicate an awareness of the latest stylistic innovations in Istanbul. The use of Proconesian marble for the inscription panels and decorative details further confirms the structure as a metropolitan commission. One can conclude, in this case, that the sabil had an imperial patron and was possibly commissioned as part of the reconstruction of the city walls which took place at least two years before the mosque itself was built.

Compared to the Mahmudi sabil, the Great Mosque of Jaffa is a humble structure. Its overall dimensions and its architectural details are congruent with local building traditions and techniques. Even in the cases where the architect of the mosque utilizes an Ottoman architectural idiom such as the domed-unit arcade, the proportions and elegance of the original model are hardly in evidence. Furthermore, both foundation inscriptions and the waqf documents preclude any notion of imperial patronage by naming Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut as its patron. A different explanation should be sought for the presence of imperial elements such as the sultan’s tuğra and the two balconies on the minaret.

The morphological changes to the Great Mosque of Jaffa in 1812 indicate a deliberate choice of language. When Abu Nabbut took over what seems to have been the ruins of a single-room mosque, he chose to turn it into an “Ottoman” mosque/madrasa. To establish that, he created an Ottoman-style courtyard with a centrally domed prayer hall. Essentially, though, Abu Nabbut’s mosque is typical of the region. His model, I would argue, lay not among the metropolitan monuments of Istanbul, but rather among the mosques built by local governors in Ottoman Bilad al-Sham. The “Ottomanness” of Abu Nabbut’s mosque is reflected not only in the use of typically Ottoman architectural elements, but also in the emulation of the architectural style and building practice of Ottoman regional governors.

THE OTTOMAN MOSQUE IN BILAD AL-SHAM

The Ottoman mosque in Bilad al-Sham made a clear break from its Ayyubid and Mamluk predecessors. During the Ayyubid period the Crusader basilicas that were appropriated after the battle of Hittin in 1187 were turned into mosques, but relatively few mosques were actually built.2 The Mamluks, too, built only a limited number of congregational mosques, such as the mosques of Aleppo, Tripoli, Hama, and Baalbek, all of which use variations on the local hypostyle plan.
Their main architectural characteristics were single, double, or triple lateral bays with an accentuated central axis of the qibla aisle, a dome over the mihrab, and a courtyard, with or without an arcade. More common, however, than building a separate mosque was constructing a qibla-awan type of prayer room as part of a larger building complex such as a madrasa or khanqah.

A major shift in mosque architecture took place after the Ottoman conquest of Bilad al-Sham in 1516. In an article published in 1999, Kafescioglu sees the "Ottomanization" of mosque architecture in Syria as the proliferation of the central-spaced mosque with its prominent dome, dome-covered porticoes, and cylindrical minaret. Weber, on the other hand, argues that in the first few decades after the conquest the local Mamluk building tradition continued uninterruptedly. It was only after the establishment of the Takiyya al-Sulaymaniyya complex in Damascus in 1554-55 that typically Ottoman architectural features found their way into Damascene architecture.

Two characteristic features can be added to Weber's and Kafescioglu's interpretations: the size and nature of the courtyard and the style of the minaret. The Ottoman courtyard in Bilad al-Sham differs from its Mamluk predecessors (for example, the courtyard of the mosque of Tripoli built between 1294 and 1314) in two main features: first, the use of the repetitive domed unit for the surrounding arcades, a typically Ottoman idiom; and, second, the proportions of the courtyard in comparison to the prayer room, as the arcades of Ottoman mosques appear higher than those of earlier mosques. These two features, in addition to the now ubiquitous arcade in front of the prayer hall (son cemaat yerı), provide the Ottoman courtyard with a sense of enclosure. This enclosure is no longer an addendum to the prayer hall, as in its Mamluk predecessor, but rather an adjacent external space that forms a self-contained unit. The spatial unit of the courtyard surrounded by a repetitive domed arcade acts as a buffer between the prayer hall and the surrounding dense urban fabric and gives the Ottoman-Syrian mosque a monumental effect that far exceeds its actual size and elaboration.

Minarets also responded to Ottoman stylistic influences. The pre-Ottoman minarets of Bilad al-Sham generally follow the "Syrian tower" style with its square cross-section. Unlike the Mamluk minarets of Egypt, Mamluk minarets in Syria and Palestine conformed to the basic design of Syrian minarets that evolved in the eleventh century with a square cross-section and surface divisions separated by decorative bands. The elegant architectonic decoration of the early minarets, such as the minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo (1092), gave way to simple billet-course divisions and muqarnas hoods above openings. Examples include the minaret of the mosque built by Tankiz al-Nasiri in Damascus (1317-18) and the al-Fakhriyya minaret in the southwestern corner of the Haram in Jerusalem (1278). The Ottoman-Syrian minaret abandoned the common use of the rectangle for the octagon or in a few cases the cylinder, but remained faithful to two stylistic characteristics: the divided sections of a single-width shaft and the hooded balcony.

In addition to these formal developments, the nature of the mosque and its architectural patronage also changed. Under the Ottomans the distinction between the Friday mosque (jami') and the neighborhood mosque (masjid) all but disappeared; the two terms came to be used interchangeably. In Damascus, for example, the number of Friday mosques had increased to 153 by the end of the Ottoman period, compared to the 31 reported by al-Nu'aymi (d. 1520-21). The dramatic increase in the numbers of mosques over a period of 400 years cannot be explained solely by an increase in population. It indicates rather that mosques were built not only to satisfy religious needs, but functioned more and more as political symbols. Along with the increase in the number of Friday mosques, the social background of their patrons became more diverse. The official status of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century patrons gave way to the patronage of local notables (a'yan) in the eighteenth and to merchants in the nineteenth century. Architecturally, the Takiyya al-Sulaymaniyya built by Mimar Sinan in Damascus, the center of provincial power, served as a model. This is reflected in the proliferation of vestiges of axiality, symmetry, and the syntax of the mosque and its dependencies that appear in "Ottomanizing" mosques of regional patrons, especially those with any political pretenses. It can be argued that an Ottoman contribution to mosque architecture in Bilad al-Sham was the reintroduction of the mosque-monument as a symbol of temporal power.

The mosque of the upstart tax-farmer Zahir al-'Umar in Tiberias built in 1743 is one such example. Stylistically, it falls within the group of single-unit mosques.
whose main components are a domed single space with a front porch and a minaret. The prayer hall is covered with a single dome elevated on pendentives that support a 16-sided drum with alternating blind arches and arched openings. The interior is decorated with ablaq bands that cover the dado, the mihrab, and the minbar. The lower part of the building's façade is decorated with the three-color ablaq bands typical of contemporary buildings in Damascus. An article published in 1992 suggests that the mosque is a throwback to early models in Istanbul, such as the mosque of Firuz Aga built in 1491. I have demonstrated elsewhere that there is ample evidence that the mosque was built as part of an overall strategy to defy the ruling family, the 'Azms, and separate northern Palestine from the district of Damascus. A close study of the mosque and the socioeconomic context of its patronage indicate that the model for Zahir al-'Umar's mosque was Damascus, not Istanbul. The choice of overall composition and form represents a clear attempt to emulate the Takiyya al-Sulaymaniyya, but the architectural language and building details were copied directly from contemporary buildings established under the 'Azms.

Another example of a building that utilizes the Ottoman architectural idiom as a symbol of political affiliation and status in Ottoman Palestine is the Friday mosque of the Ottoman governor Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar built in Acre in 1780-81 (fig. 14). The mosque is part of a complex that includes a madrasa, sabil, and a tomb chamber placed around a paved courtyard with a fountain. The tectonic formation of the prayer hall with its monumental dome and flying buttresses surrounded by a sea of lower and smaller domes on three sides of the courtyard gives the mosque a monumental effect that recalls central Ottoman monuments. This monumental aspect, however, seems incongruous when juxtaposed with the intimate sense of interior details and the self-effacing and pious content of the foundation inscriptions. The most visible and potent symbol of al-Jazzar's Ottoman identity is perhaps the minaret in the northwest corner of the square prayer room. The ashlar minaret has a smooth cylindrical profile without any surface divisions, a single balcony (serefe), and a conical leaded finial. The minaret's profile and its balcony's lack of canopy refer to a central imperial model, allowing the patron to distinguish himself from other viziers in the region and link himself directly with Istanbul.

The mosque built by Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut in Jaffa is thus better understood as representing continuity in style and composition of the architectural patronage of local leaders in Ottoman Palestine. The deliberate choice of an Ottoman architectural idiom usually associated with the buildings established by provincial viziers links his mosque to a wider group of Ottoman provincial mosques. Abu Nabbut's architectural patronage would have been perceived as similar to that of other regional rulers such as Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar in Acre, Zahir al-'Umar in Tiberias, and As'ad Pasha al-'Azm in Damascus. All of these patrons, however, were higher in rank, status, and following than Abu Nabbut. Thus, even though his mosque is architecturally modest and primarily functional in purpose, its patronage necessarily implies Abu Nabbut's significance as the ruler of southern Palestine. From the local perspective, Abu Nabbut turned a small mosque into a miniature image of an Ottoman complex. In so doing, he raised the status of mosque, patron, and ultimately the town itself. It was not only the architectural language of Abu Nabbut's mosque that links it to regional vizierial mosques, however, but also its status as the central piece in a large waqf complex. Placing the Great Mosque of Jaffa in the wider context of Abu Nabbut's waqf patronage demonstrates that his construction program was part of a systematic strategy to achieve political power and social control. In this sense, the establishment of the waqf and the architectural style in which the mosque was built were devices that elevated Jaffa to the level of a grand city. This new city would then have been worthy of becoming a center of a separate province (as opposed to being ruled from Acre), which would have put Abu Nabbut on an equal footing with regional pashas.

THE WAQF OF MUHAMMAD AGA ABU NABBUT

The formal incorporation of Jaffa into the sanjak of Sidon in 1803 brought its affairs closer to the provincial capital of Acre, whose fame and fortune had been established under the suzerainty of its controversial vizier Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar (d.1804). Al-Jazzar's successor, Sulayman Pasha the Just (r. 1804-20), reappointed Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut as acting governor of Jaffa. Both Sulayman Pasha and Abu Nabbut were manumitted slaves of al-Jazzar and thus on an equal footing as members of the same rank in a mamluk household. The duties of Mu-
hammad Aga Abu Nabbut as defined in his appointment letter were to maintain security, collect taxes, tax-farm port customs, look after the well-being of the people, and refurbish the city. This last task, "i'mar al-bilād," is a stock phrase in administrative diplomatics attached to the role of every appointed ruler. In the case of Jaffa, however, urban development was a practical need.

Cohen’s study of the urbanization of Jaffa during the eighteenth century places its revival within the wider context of the economic boom in Palestine as a result of establishing direct commercial exchange with France. While Acre prospered and became the unrivaled port of Bilad al-Sham, Jaffa remained an “échelle seconnaire” serving mainly the growing number of pilgrims to Jerusalem. The dividends of this economic boom were reflected in the increase of population and the establishment of a mosque and madrasa, as well as Christian churches and hospices for an increasingly heterodox population. The number of houses, however, was still reported to be around four or five hundred in 1766, about the same as the estimates of Evliya Çelebi a century earlier. The gradual growth of Jaffa was severely interrupted in the last three decades of the eighteenth century by the Egyptian campaigns of Ali Bey al-Kabir in 1770-71, and Abu'l-Dhahab in 1773, when the city was devastated by an eight months’ siege. Baron de Tott, the French official sent to assess the effects of these campaigns on the ports of Syria and Palestine in 1777, reported that Jaffa had suffered immensely and that both population and economy had been diminished. The devastation of Jaffa at the hands of Napoleon’s troops during his campaign in Palestine at the end of the eighteenth century, and the massacre of around 3,000-4,000 men (some of whom were his own sick
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soldiers) were the topics of much contestation by travelers and officials alike. The anguish caused by the plague that spread during Napoleon’s campaign is well captured in an 1804 oil painting by the Baron Antoine Gros, entitled *The Pesthouse at Jaffa*, in the collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale.43

Abu Nabbut’s task of *i‘mār al-bilād* thus coincided with the disintegration of the city as a result of these successive calamities. His additional appointment as administrator of pious foundations (*awqaf*) in 1807 enhanced his power tremendously, allowing him a free hand in the city.44 Between 1810 and 1816, Abu Nabbut engaged in an energetic program of reconstruction that led to the rebuilding of the city’s center and the restoration of its fortifications. His vast building project was a public-benefit endowment (*waqf khayri*); it included the Great Mosque, three sabils, two khans, two markets, sixty-seven shops, and several stores, houses, and light industries (see table 1). Property transaction records indicate that he was continuously trying to concentrate his waqf property within the area in the city surrounding his mosque.

The lack of monumentality of the Great Mosque was thus compensated for by the accumulation of public functions and spaces around it. Abu Nabbut developed an area of around 2.5 hectares out of the ruins of an old mosque, took over its waqf, and expanded its physical and material possessions. The semiotics of the Great Mosque, the self-perception of the founder, and the notion of waqf patronage combined to form an effective means for wielding power. By 1817, the restoration of the city and its main public buildings was attributed entirely to Abu Nabbut’s personal initiative. Passing through Jaffa in 1830–31, the Belgian traveler Michaud reports that the residents of Jaffa remembered Abu Nabbut (despite his aggressions) as “le père de la cité nouvelle.”45 Descriptions of Jaffa after Abu Nabbut had completed his waqf complex indicate that the main public buildings were concentrated on the western and northerm slopes of the city. The Christian buildings (a Greek Orthodox church, a Latin convent, and an Armenian convent) overlooking the western slopes remained small and modest, though they were all renovated by their respective congregations.46 Abu Nabbut’s waqf buildings representing the city’s religious, commercial, and administrative center were located in the northeastern corner of the city. The development of Abu Nabbut’s waqf complex was gradual, the accumulation of property began around 1806 and lasted until 1816; construction began around 1810, possibly earlier. The morphology of the buildings also suggests that the waqf increased the density of land use in the area, and this is corroborated by information derived from property transactions registered in the Islamic court which confirms that before 1810 the northern and eastern part of the city comprised a number of gardens and empty plots of land that were bought, built over, or filled in by Abu Nabbut’s waqf complex. The terms for enclosure, courtyard, land plot, garden, open plain, kitchen garden and farm (Ar. *sāha, haush, ard, junayna,‘arsa, sahra, hākūra*, and *mazra‘a*) turn up repeatedly in the documents, suggesting a relatively significant amount of open space.47 Some of the new buildings that were established under Abu Nabbut, such as two new khans, occupied previously vacant plots. Abu Nabbut also built a market for the use of women known as Suq al-Satr in an area that was previously known as “the sandy land” (*ard al-ramilah*). Other buildings made use of open spaces that had resulted from the demolition of older buildings. The Suq al-Faraj, for example, was built in 1815 on the site of an old khan described in the waqf document as follows: “[Whatever] was within it [the old khan] of buildings and vaults and all constructions was demolished and nothing remained of the buildings, and it [the old khan] was totally ruined until it became an empty plot without use.”48 In 1815, Abu Nabbut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Old Waqf</th>
<th>Bought</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Sold</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suq</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storehouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-mill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive/sesame press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From table 1. Total numbers and types of property mentioned in Abu Nabbut’s waqf.)
bought the ruins and built a courtyard-type market with an elaborate central sabil (fig. 9), filling a wasted space with an active economic institution of 36 shops that seems to have impressed several travelers and painters visiting Jaffa in later times.

Abu Nabbūt’s main contribution to the urbanization of Jaffa was simply establishing a significant number of religious and commercial buildings that would serve a growing population, in this sense acting as a “great waqf” developing around a mosque. The contribution of “great waqfs” to the urbanization of Ottoman cities has been amply demonstrated for Istanbul, Cairo, Aleppo, and Damascus, among others.49 Kritovoulos, the Greek historian of Mehmed II’s reign, reports that after building his mosque complex in 1469–70, Mehmed ordered his new military elite to build “monuments” throughout the city.50 He himself embarked upon building a waqf complex around the tomb of the Prophet’s companion Abu Ayyub al-Ansari who died in the first siege of Istanbul in 668–69. Eyyûp became one of the first socioreligious waqf complexes around Istanbul. It consisted of a mosque (1459), a madrasa, an imaret (public kitchen), a hospice, and a bath.51 Kafesioğlu argues convincingly that the vizierial complexes built in Istanbul in the fifteenth century (such as the Mahmud Pasha mosque, Murad Pasha’s mosque in Aksaray, and Rum Mehmed Pasha’s mosque in Üsküdar, all built within two decades of the conquest) followed the sultan’s example and created a network of monuments in the urban fabric. In addition to communicating an ideology of imperial power, the new cityscape of Istanbul perpetuated the names of its Ottoman founders. These monumental waqf complexes operated on two levels: first, they constituted a visual record of the transformation of Constantinople into an Ottoman city based on the centrality of the sultan and a hierarchical Ottoman elite. Second, they formed a nucleus for new urban developments and provided them with commercial, religious, and intellectual infrastructure through the institution of the waqf.

The vizierial waqfs of sixteenth-century Damascus maintained the same pattern of monumentization. In his book on the Ottoman province of Damascus, Bakhit describes the sixteenth century as “a time of construction and repair.”52 Bakhit’s remark reflects the general thrust of contemporary Arabic and Ottoman chronicles and demonstrates an apt understanding of the symbolic nature of the Ottoman appropriation of the cityscape.53 In fact, most of the modern publications on sixteenth-century Damascus (or Aleppo) list the patrons and properties of “great waqfs” established by Ottoman governors and high officials.54 It is generally agreed that these building programs had strong political implications as manifestations of the Ottoman presence in Syria.

Weber demonstrates the role of these great waqfs in the development of sixteenth-century Damascus. The development of the Darwishiya Street to the west of the old city, for example, was the result of a series of great waqfs supporting both religious and commercial institutions established under the patronage of successive Ottoman governors (reading from north to south: the mosque of Lala Mustafa Pasha [1566], the mosque of Sinan Aga [1564–65], the mosque of Darwish Pasha [1574–75], the mosque of Sinan Pasha [1591], and the mosque of Murad Pasha [1575–76]). Ottoman vizierial complexes line the street that forms the departure point of the pilgrimage route (darb al-hajj al-shami), providing an impressive setting for an all-Ottoman spectacle. The development of an Ottoman street with an imposing street façade under the garb of establishing public pious foundations is reminiscent of the development of the Ottoman street in Aleppo that extends from the citadel to Bab Antakiya (the mosque of Husrev Pasha built in 1531–34, the mosque of Muhammad Pasha Duqakin, known as al-Adiliyya, in 1555, the complex around Khan al-Gumruk in 1574, and the mosque of Bahram Pasha in 1583), and most imposing of all the silhouette of Istanbul’s skyline.55

From the eighteenth century onwards, this same pattern of socioreligious complexes proliferated in the Ottoman provinces with two main differences: first, the scale of these complexes and their elaboration were significantly more modest than before, and, second, the patrons of these provincial complexes were local dignitaries rather than members of the imperial household. The dubbing of the eighteenth century as the “century of the a’yan” can thus be understood as a reflection of their rise to power and their obvious claim to the symbols of power.56 Although modestly conceived, the provincial mosques of Anatolia, the Balkans, and Egypt followed the model of imperial foundations as manifestations of power and legitimacy.57 It follows that the establishment of a building complex with social and economic functions as part of the waqf of the Great Mosque of Jaffa enhanced the significance of the mosque and of its founder. The amalgamation of functional buildings
such as madrasas, sabis, and khans under the Ottoman imperial waqfs was an important means of manipulating appointments of personnel and securing a tighter control over public opinion. Imperial madrasas “created a class of trained, orthodox, and loyal ulema ready and able to justify and serve the needs of the ruling institution” in such cities as Istanbul and Aleppo. Here again, Abu Nabbut’s waqf serves as a “miniature version of sultanic establishments.”

Not only did building the Great Mosque of Jaffa legitimize Abu Nabbut’s status as a local leader, but the waqf complex revived the religious and commercial center of the city.

The status of the Great Mosque in Jaffa as a teaching institution was also established through the waqf. We are told that Abu Nabbut built a madrasa as part of the mosque complex and “deposited in it books in great number, for which care and consideration are due, and has appointed for it some scholars and readers and students.” The endowment of a madrasa and a significant number of manuscripts in the same complex linked the patron and the religious community of Ottoman Palestine. This community benefited from his waqf and operated within the boundaries of its complex. In turn, the provision of food, lodgings, and health care for the general public guaranteed a certain degree of social support for Abu Nabbut. Finally, Abu Nabbut’s decision to build several sabis outside of, but adjacent to, his waqf complex enhanced the symbolic impact of his patronage, as sabis served not only those who used the mosque but also the community at large.

To conclude: the architectural and textual analysis of Abu Nabbut’s Great Mosque in Jaffa demonstrates that it served as an emblem of power. Its symbolic nature was communicated on several levels: (1) through its visual composition and architectural language; (2) through the functions sustained by the waqf complex; and (3) through the actual practice of establishing waqfs that provide public services and encourage urban growth. The message is communicated not only through formal symbols such as the choice of relatively large domes and the domed-unit courtyard, but also through the implicit notion of political identity communicated through the choice of building types and functions. Furthermore, establishing waqf complexes that serve the inhabitant and the passer-by, the pious and the mundane, the merchant and the mendicant, the student and the teacher, and in the process robing the waqf founder in a cloak of piety in this life and in the hereafter surely demonstrates the potentials of the waqf as a locus for establishing and sustaining political power. The patronage of public and religious buildings was also traditionally perceived as one of the achievements expected of any ruler. Abu Nabbut’s patronage of the Great Mosque of Jaffa and his establishment of a “great waqf,” however humble, can thus be understood as an act of kingship. Abu Nabbut had appropriated the visual symbols of political power through praxis, and his choice of architectural language confirmed his Ottoman identity and legitimized his claim.

The implications of Abu Nabbut’s patronage were not lost on his contemporaries, and ultimately resulted in his being ousted from office. Ibrahim al-‘Awra, the chronicler of Sulayman Pasha, confirms the association between the architectural patronage of Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut and his political ambitions. By 1815–16 it became known to the district administration in Acre that Abu Nabbut has openly attempted to advance his career and obtain the rank of vizier by separating Jaffa from Acre. When he failed, Abu Nabbut ordered the building of a sea wall, ostensibly to protect Jaffa from high waves, but al-‘Awra argues that his aim was really to fortify Jaffa and proclaim its independence. His enthusiasm for construction could not be attributed solely to the public interest. The chronicler tells an anecdote to demonstrate this point. While dismantling historical buildings in Caesarea to collect spolia for use in his buildings, Abu Nabbut was buried under an avalanche of rubble. He is reported to have been unconscious for three days, but ten days after the accident he was back at work supervising the construction. Al-‘Awra suggests that after Abu Nabbut lost hope of becoming a pasha peacefully, he planned to fortify Jaffa to enhance its status as the port of Jerusalem. Eventually, the fortified city would have been perceived as a suitable capital for a separate Ottoman province. If the new province was not created, Abu Nabbut would have obtained it by force.

Finally, the perception of Abu Nabbut’s building program is perhaps best reflected in his immediate superior Sulayman Pasha’s choice of building his own mosque and sabil before disposing of Abu Nabbut. Shortly after the establishment of Abu Nabbut’s waqf complex and the completion of the fortification of Jaffa, Sulayman Pasha built a mosque in Acre, restored parts of the city’s fortifications, and built a sabil just outside the city gate. Al-‘Awra gives the reasons for
Sulayman Pasha’s building of the sabil and the choice of its location as follows: “First, because he [Sulayman Pasha] liked to sit there [outside the gate] in the afternoon; second, to perpetuate his memory; and third, for the benefit of the people, especially those [foreigners] who arrive in the city and sleep at its gate.” The model for the pasha’s sabil in both style and location was the Mahmudi sabil built under Abu Nabbut in 1810 just outside the main gate in Jaffa.
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NOTES

Author’s note: I would like to thank Gürçü Necipoğlu and Julian Raby for their helpful remarks on an earlier version of this paper, and the Palestine Exploration Fund for facilitating my research in their archives.

1. Note the two forthcoming publications of recent projects by the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem: S. Auld and Robert Hillenbrand, eds., Ottoman Jerusalem the Living City: 1517–1917 (London, 2000); and a gazetteer of medieval and Ottoman sites in Palestine by Andrew Petersen.

2. The walls of the old city of Jaffa were gradually dismantled as the population grew and the city expanded in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. A major part of the city’s urban fabric was demolished by the forces of the British Mandate as a punitive measure against the Palestinian demonstrations of 1936 (Public Record Office, AIR 5/1244). The remains of the city, apart from the religious buildings and the southwestern quarter, were demolished by the Old Jaffa Development Corporation established in Israel in 1960.

3. The unpublished document of the waqf of Abu Nabbut is a compilation of Arabic and Ottoman-Turkish copies of seven separate endowments, that is, most of the endowments of Abu Nabbut. It belongs to the manuscript collection of the Islamic Library in Jaffa, and was probably copied between 1834 and 1850’s. The waqf document is 80 pages in double folio; each page measures 26 x 18 cm, and has an average of 15 lines. References to the manuscript in the text will appear as JIL ms. 212, followed by the page number in the original manuscript. For the full edited text of the manuscript, see Ruba Kana’an, “Jaffa and the Waqf of Muhammad Aga Abu Nabbut (1799–1831): A Study in the Urban History of an East Mediterranean City,” Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1998. Records from the Islamic court in Jaffa referring to the buildings, appointments, and property transactions appear in the text as JICR, followed by the record number (şijil), page, and date.


5. JIL ms. 212: 21.

6. Madrasa is used interchangeably with küshphâne throughout the waqf manuscript. Ms. 212 refers to the küshphâne as madrasa, in Arabic, and medresehane in Ottoman Turkish. The Ottoman version of ms. 212: 47 reads “ders-i ʿım ve mutasaddarın ve talebe-i-ulûm için Yûfa da kayınsı camii-i serîf-i müsteddeden medresehane inşa ve binâ içinde küshphâne-i serîf-i ‘azmetî-i-miktârî tâdî ve vaṣîʾ ētîve ve idâhîsine.”

7. There is no access to the room from the courtyard itself. Its entrance, reached through a side gate to the north of the courtyard, was locked on the several occasions when this survey was carried out. The waqf documents are silent about this room and its function, but it might have been built as a tomb chamber. Stylistically the room seems to have been built around 1812, at the same time as the western and northern arcades.

8. JICR 1, dated 1216 (1801) gives the date of the Great Mosque’s older waqf endowment as 1162 (1748). This date, however, could be the foundation date of the older mosque, or it could refer to a preexisting mosque that was renovated and reendowed in 1748.

9. JICR 1, dated 1214 (1799).

10. A legal justification would have been needed to carry out any changes on the mosque because of the unalienable status of its waqf. Abu Nabbut would have needed to enlarge, restore, or rebuild parts of the old mosque for public benefit but could not demolish or replace it altogether.

11. A similar example would be the enlargement of the Haseki Sultan mosque in Istanbul built by Mimar Sinan in 1558–39. The original single-domed mosque was enlarged in 1612–13 through the construction of an identical domed unit to the east of the original one, and demolishing the wall in between to create a continuous rectangular space. A. Kuran, Sinan, the Grand Old Master of Ottoman Architecture (Washington, D.C., 1987), p. 46.

12. The side bays of the western arcade incorporate two columns made of single pieces of red granite, two reused column drums, and other spolia. The columns supporting the central part of the northern arcade use upside-down classical capitals for their bases.

13. The cross-vault unit is an indigenous structural form in the area where stone is the main building material. The load-bearing structure is based on the heavy groins that incline toward the center forming an almost domical roof. Areas between the groins are arched curtain walls whose presence does not affect the structural stability of the unit. For more discussion of the use of cross-vaults in Palestine, see T. Canaan, “The Palestinian Arab House: Its Architecture and Folklore,” Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, 1932–33, pp. 225–247, and 1–85, and S. Amiy and V. Tamari, The Palestinian Village Home (London, 1989). In practice, the use of vaulted units varies from an enclosed introverted space to spaces with different openings in the walls between the supporting groins. When more than one structural unit is gathered to form a larger space, the arched walls are dispensed with and the groins acquire the role of support piers. See, for example, the arcade built by the Mamluk Sultan Baybars for the shrine of the Prophet’s companion Abu Hurayra near Ramla (1274–75), and the western arcade of the Haram in Jerusalem built during the reign of al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun in 1307.

14. The three central piers take the form of a T, I, and L sec-
tion from north to south respectively. The heaviness of construction and the differences in the cross-sections of the supports indicate that they were previously part of a continuous wall.

15. Kana’an, “Two Ottoman Sables in Jaffa (c.1810-1815).”

16. The two buildings were constructed after the appointment of an architect for the waqf in 1814. A document in the Islamic court, dated 1229 (1814), mentions the appointment of Dawud Abu Abd al-Nabulsi as the waqf minibars. His duties were defined as the maintenance and restoration of existing waqf buildings and the building and maintenance of new structures.

17. Department of the Revival of Islamic Heritage in Jerusalem (RIHJ), under the title “buildings.” The tender documents for the restoration of the Jaffa minaret are filed under 6/101/292/16.

18. RIHJ 6-Turkish, p. 6.

19. JII ms. 212: 74.

20. The mosque complex has fourteen inscribed panels out of which only five belong to the 1812 mosque. The Mahmudi sabil has eight inscriptions, and one inscription commemorates the 1914 expansion.

21. J. Deny, s.v. “Tugra,” Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed. The name of the sultan usually forms the bottom line of the tugra, and the oval shapes do not include any names (see examples in S. Umur, Osmanlı Paýşah Tuğraları [Istanbul, 1980]). Abu Nabbu’t’s names, however, are placed both in the oval shape (Muhammad) and in the bottom line (Amin).

22. The prayer hall of Crusader churches that were turned into mosques retained the three-bay basilical plan, but the axis was shifted from east to southeast and mihrabs were added. Variations include incorporating an additional side bay, as in the case of the Gaza mosque, to a more dramatic restructuring as in the case of Lud. Structurally, the basic unit remained the repetitive cross-vault, with a higher central bay. Examples of post-Crusader church-mosques include the Church of the Resurrection in Neapolis, the Church of St. John the Baptist in Gaza, and the Church of Abraham in Gaza, which were turned into “the Great Mosque” of Nablus, Gaza and Hebron respectively. C. Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches in Palestine During the Years 1873-1874 (London, 1896), pp. 311–13, and 383–89. Examples of specifically built mosques include the Aleppo Citadel mosque, which followed the madrasa plan, and the al-Tawba and al-Aqsab mosques in Damascus and the mosque of the Hanabila in al-Salihiyya, which followed a simple hypostyle plan.


24. For prayer halls in multipurpose buildings such as madrasas, the focus shifted from space and form to the decoration of the qibla wall or iwan, including the mihrab. See, for example, the al-Tankaziyya madrasa in Jerusalem completed in 1328–29, where the mihrab is located in the southern iwan of the madrasa.


26. S. Weber, “Architecture and Urban Development of Damascus in the 16th and 17th Centuries,” Aram 10 (1998): 431–71, demonstrates that the formal Ottoman language that was introduced to Damascus by the Sulaymaniyya complex did not standardize the viqialer complexes into a “juxtaposition” of styles, as urged by Kafescioglu, but rather that the “symbiosis of local and Ottoman forms and techniques finally leads to the canonisation of a local style.”

27. The shafts of most Mamluk minarets in Cairo are divided into three sections diminishing in height and width. In the minaret of the Sultan Hasan’s mosque and madrasa (1356–59), for example, the shaft is divided into four sections, and crowned by a bulbous finial. See Doris Behrens-Abouseif, Islamic Architecture in Cairo, an Introduction (Leiden, 1989), and Robert Hillenbrand, Islamic Architecture (New York, 1994), pp. 105–71, and pp. 506–7.

28. The hooded balcony protruding from the shaft of the minaret seems to be a specifically Syrian element that proved resilient to stylistic change. The few exceptions are the viqialer mosques of sixteenth-century Aleppo where the minarets follow the Ottoman “pencil” minaret style.

29. For a synthesis of the religious buildings of Damascus mentioned by Arab chroniclers, see A. al-Ulābi, Khitat Dimashq (Damascus, 1989).


31. For the socioeconomic context of Zahir al-‘Umar and his relationship to Damascus, see A. Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century: Patterns of Government and Administration (Jerusalem, 1973), and K. Barbir, Ottoman Rule in Damascus: 1708-1758 (Princeton, 1980).

32. Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar (T. Cezzar Ahmed Paşa) was the governor of the province of Sidon from 1775 to 1804. His career started in Egypt when he accompanied his patron Grand Vizier Hakim-Oğlu Ali Paşa to Egypt when the latter was appointed governor in 1756. Al-Jazzar remained in Egypt after his patron’s departure, and became affiliated with the household of bayi of Bey ‘Ali Bey al-Kabir, r. 1763–73, where he occupied a high administrative post and gained the title of bey. While in Palestine, he helped the Porte put down the rebellion of Zahir al-‘Umar, and was rewarded by an appointment as wali. In Acre, he established a mamluk household that ruled Ottoman Palestine between 1775 and 1832. See al-Bitar, Hlayt al-Bashar ft türkîh al-qarn al-thālith ’ashar, 3 vols. (Damascus, 1961), 1: 137–42; K. Salibi, “al-Djazzar Pasha,” EI, 2nd ed. supplement 5-6, pp. 268-69, Stanford Shaw, ed., Ottoman Egypt in the Eighteenth Century: The Nizamname-i Misir of Cezzar Ahmed Pasha (Cambridge, 1962), p. 7; and H. Shihab, Türkîh Ahmad Bâshâ al-Djazzâr (Beirut, 1955), pp. 37–41.

34. The minaret was struck by lightning and fell in 1812; it was rebuilt by permission of the sultan in 1815-16. I. al-'Awwa, Tārīkh wiliyāt Suleyman bāsha al-adil 1804-1819 (Beirut, 1989), p. 256, mentions that the minaret was built "exactly as it was in its original design."

35. Jaffa had been a sanjak in the province of Damascus since the sixteenth century. It was administered by a customs officer, who also acted as a mūtasarrīf. The main shift in its administration came in the 1770s when the Syrian coast was given, albeit briefly, to Muhammad Bey Abu 'l-Dhahab of Egypt, and consequently to the mūtasarrīf of Jerusalem. This arrangement remained in place until the end of the century when the administration of Jaffa was given to Darwish Hasan Pasha, the acting governor of Gaza. It was annexed by Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar in 1799, and officially included in the province of Sidon in 1803. JICR 2: 62, dated 1218 (1803), and Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century, pp. 156–57.


38. JICR 2: 61, dated 1218 (1803).

39. For the eighteenth-century economic boom in Palestine, see Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century; of 130 French traders in the region, only one was established in Jaffa in 1764. By comparison, there were 34 in Sidon, 23 in Acre, and 8 in Ramla; F. Charles-Roux, Les échelles de Syrie et de Palestine au XVIIIe siècle (Paris, 1928), p. 83.


43. The painting depicts Napoleon visiting his sick soldiers. The landscape surrounding the main building of the pashio is that of Jaffa. The building itself, however, resembles the mosque of Ibn Tulun in Cairo. The painting belongs to the collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Estampes (De57a), Paris.

44. JICR 2: 114, dated 1221 (1807). Abu Nabbut was administrator of the waqf from 1807 to 1827. Between 1819 and 1827 he served as governor, first of Selanik, then of Diyarbakir. He was dismissed from his post as waqf administrator in Jaffa in 1827; see JICR 7: 21, dated 1243 (1827).


46. The Greek Orthodox church was refurbished in 1816 on condition that it not be altered in form or size. The Latin convent was renovated in 1819, and a fatwa was issued by the mufti of Jerusalem that allowed its enlargement in 1830. The Armenian convent was also refurbished in 1830. Descriptions of the nature of work carried out on each building during the reign of Abu Nabbut are in the records of the Islamic court of Jaffa.

47. The terms are given in the form in which they appear in the waqf documents. The meanings and definitions are based on comparisons between the Arabic and Ottoman copies of the waqf documents, in addition to the Encyclopaedia Islam; M. Amin and Leila Ali Ibrahim, Architectural Terms in Mamluk Documents (Cairo, 1996); O. Aureneche, Dictionnaire illustré multilingue de l'architecture du Proche Orient ancien (Beirut, 1977); A. Barathéomy, Dictionnaire arabe-français, dialectes de Syrie: Alep, Damas, Liban, Jérusalem (Paris, 1993); R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes (Leiden, 1881); D. Hasol, Dictionary: Architecture and Building. English-French-Turkish (Istanbul, 1993); A. Petersen, Dictionary of Islamic Architecture (London, 1996); and J. Redhouse, A Turkish and English Lexicon (Istanbul, 1989):

### Arabic – Ottoman – Turkish – English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Ottoman</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sâhâ, haush</td>
<td>sâhâ</td>
<td>saha</td>
<td>enclosure, square land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ard</td>
<td>bâne</td>
<td>arsax</td>
<td>pen, small court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadir</td>
<td>hasti, hastire</td>
<td>avlu</td>
<td>garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junayna</td>
<td>bağçe</td>
<td>bağçe</td>
<td>ground, plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'arsa</td>
<td>'arsa</td>
<td>arsa, parsel</td>
<td>open plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahrâ</td>
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