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INTRODUCTION

Modern-day urban landscapes in the Near East are contemporary witnesses to their history. Thus, four hundred years of Ottoman presence (1516-1918) and cultural concepts left a distinctive imprint on urban centres in Syria. The cityscapes of both Aleppo and Damascus, for example, were largely modified by important trade centres and mosques during the first one hundred years after their incorporation into the Ottoman Empire. The urban skyline of both cities is marked by wide-span domes and variations on the typical Ottoman 'pencil shaped minarets', as well as by a series of civil foundations situated in the suq and bearing the names of a number of Ottoman civil servants. The Ottoman presence is evident for the visitor to these cities.

To what extent can we talk of the 'Ottomanization' of the cityscape? Is the import of imperial art obvious, or do local modifications of the Ottoman principles of form dominate? The character of Ottoman constructions in the Ottoman provinces will be studied here using the city of Damascus as an example. The development of Ottoman architecture in Damascus in the 16th and 17th centuries can be divided into three stages.

a) A surprising continuity marks the preliminary phase of Ottoman rule in Damascus. Local traditions of construction remain almost unchanged at the beginning, even if one can already find interpretations of Ottoman architectural design in 932/1525-26, for the first time.

b) By the mid-16th century at the latest, more and more concepts of construction, design, and technique, which still cannot be considered genuine imperial art, are imported from the capital. A specific expression of cultural self-awareness, as a part of the Ottoman cultural sphere, derives from the adaption of Ottoman forms of expression and structure and their merger with local traditions. This is how the Ottoman city of Damascus emerged. Hence,

1 I would like to thank Jens-Peter Hansen, Rafah Maduar and especially Simone Bass for their immense help in writing the English version of the text. Furthermore, I must express my thanks to Nazih Kawakibi, Akram Ulabi, Astrid Meier, Jean-Paul Pascal and Sirab Aassi for their help in enabling me to find my way around 16th century Damascus.
one can speak of the 'Ottomanization' of the urban skyline. The term 'Ottomanization' is used here in the sense of an integration of Ottoman architectural vocabulary, clearly distinguishing a building as Ottoman, without standardising its architecture as such. The city presents to every visitor an unmistakable Ottoman character, with its new city centre and the development of a commercial centre bearing Ottoman forms and structure. We will see how this occurred on the basis of local traditions.

c) The specific Damascene symbiosis of local and Ottoman forms and techniques finally leads to the canonisation of a local style based as much in the Ottoman concept of structure as in the local tradition of Damascus. It will be demonstrated that there is no contradiction between the emphasis on local traditions and their further use, and the simultaneous extensive integration of Ottoman forms and structures. The Ottoman conception of culture (Kulturverständnis) makes the expression of particular local forms straying from those of the capital possible, while still demonstrating their attachment to the cultural sphere of the Ottomans.

I. CONTINUITY

Is it commonly known that Ottoman rule in the Bilād al-Šām was initially characterised by a remarkable continuity and relative tolerance on the political level. In Damascus, the Governor Ġābirī al-Ǧazālī (924/1518 until 927/1521) was confirmed in his office and served until his rebellion, while the governor of the Mamluks in Aleppo, Ǧayrābū, was transferred to the same post in Cairo. The Mamluk Ǧādi al-Ǧuḏī. Wālī ad-Dīn ibn al-Farrūr, who had held the post of the highest Ǧādi of Damascus right up to the Ottoman conquest, regained his office in 924/1518. The outstanding feature of the establishment of Ottoman institutions in Damascus was continuity.

The same is true of architecture. Sultan Selīm I (1512–20) kept Šāhāb ad-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Ǧāṭār as the Damascene chief architect, commissioning him to design new buildings. Buildings in Damascus seemed initially to inherit the Mamluk architectural tradition, as already demonstrated by Michael Meinecke. With a few notable exceptions, the continuity in the local building traditions of the first decades is striking.

---


The lay-out of the early Ottoman prayer-halls clearly demonstrates a Mamluk conception of space. This is true of the prayer-hall of the famous Ġāmi‘ as-Salām of Selim I in āš-Salāhiyya (924/1518, fig. 1). This mosque originally had only two aisles perpendicular to the qibla wall which recalled the prayer-hall of the Mamluk Sibī‘īyya mosque (fig. 2). The central dome-chamber construction of the Ottomans was not yet introduced.

If one compares the Turjat Lutfi Bāša (ca. 1534, fig. 3) with the façade of the Muqād as-Saṣifa (1411-12, fig. 4), one can find a more-or-less similar shaping of the façades. Wide rectangular areas of decor are inserted in the typical Mamlukian ablaq stripes, and are framed with protruding bands. The medallions fitted into a frame and defined by knotted ribbons are typical. Only by taking a close look can one detect very subtle shifts in the decoration, for example, twisted ribbons running along the façade.

The continuity seems to be interrupted by the violent suppression of al-Gazālī’s rebellion in 927/1521 and the subsequent demolition of Mamluk structures, unlike those in Cairo and Baghdad. The province came under al-}


most direct administration by Istanbul. Mamluk architectural principles are still used as late as 1534 in the turba of Lutfi Bâsî, but already the Zawiya as-Šâmâdîya, erected in 934/1527, makes use of a central dome covering a square room. This is the Ottoman concept of the central dome-chamber (fig. 5, 6). It was most probably the patron of the building, Muhammad ibn Halîf as-Šâmî (d. 948/1541–42), who instructed the local craftsman to build a central dome. He had been to Istanbul for an audience with Sultan Selim I, who gave him a fief, and it seems certain that he was deeply impressed by the Ottoman use of space in their mosques. As-Šâmî’s craftsmen resorted to a known construction method, since the construction technique of an Ottoman central dome with its low pendientes was not yet known in Damascus. The inner space of the mosque appears to be a gigantic Mamluk turba. Squinches constitute the zone of transition to the polygonal two-storied drum on which a high rising cupola rests (fig. 6). Ten years after the Ottoman conquest, we already find in the Zawiya as-Šamâdîya a typical Ottoman feature of construction – the central dome for a larger mosque executed in the style of the local tradition of construction. This indicates the direction of further development in Damascus. It is nevertheless not possible at this stage to speak of an Ottomanization of the urban architecture. This was soon to change.

II. THE CREATION OF OTTOMAN DAMASCUS

II.1. The importation of construction features

The well known Takîya as-Sulaymânîya (962/1554 until 967/1560, fig. 7–10) constitutes the turning point in the design of Ottoman buildings in Damascu.
The famous takiya of Sūleyman I (1520-66), designed by Mimar Sinan (~1490-1588), is in many ways exceptional for Damascus. The Sultan in Istanbul commissioned the court architect to construct it, and this complex (al-Takiya as-Sulaymuniya and the nearby Madrasa as-Salimiyah of Selim II) is probably the only early Ottoman structure in Damascus which was not planned insitu. Local forms were integrated over the course of the construction, but the majority of the construction elements (tiles, carved stones, covering of the dome, etc.) were produced by craftsmen obviously familiar with these techniques and design, and not by local craftsmen. From this we may deduce that an Anatolian workshop was present during construction.

The mosque itself has a very simple ground plan. A central dome rests upon the rectangular cube, without any further division of space (fig. 10), but it is furnished with architectural elements which had been unknown before in Damascus. First of all, there are the Ottoman pencil shaped minarets which flank the building on the sides, then the flat and wide-span cupola with its lead cover and the small buttresses which support the bevelled, almost round, drum. Inside, the low pendentives make the transition from the rectangular room to the drum. The ante-chamber, with its double row of columns, is also a new feature. Besides the use of tiles inside the building and on the façade, which will be discussed below, this is the first appearance of the Ottoman folded capitals, round pointed arches, Ottoman twisted muqarnas, and many more details which are new to Damascus.

The takiya of Sūleyman is the ‘most Ottoman building’ in Damascus despite the integration of local decorative elements and, as such, had an enormous impact on the architecture of its time. The architectural features of this building and its Ottoman forms of design were subsequently emulated throughout the town. A far reaching Ottomanization of the artistic style can be discerned from the early fifties of the 16th century onwards. The design of the decor and the lay-out evolves, with certain local adaptation, into the typical Ottoman one.

Let us discuss the lay-out first. Single elements of the cupola become integrated into the canon of the Damascene architectural features at this time, even if the local form of the cupola will later come to dominate again. This is true,
above all, for the central dome which becomes the dominating principle of construction in the Damascus mosques. The squinch is replaced by low pendentives. However, only the dome of the Sinaïyya Mosque preserved a lead covering (999/1591, fig. 11)_10, and buttresses of the drum can only be found at the mosque of Darwiš Bāša (982/1574-75, fig. 12)_11.

At the turn of Darwiš Bāša (982/1574-75, fig. 12, above left)_12, or the turn of Murād Bāša (next to his mosque of 976/1568-69 until 983/1575-76, fig. 13, right)_13 a mausoleum is separated from the mosque or the madrasa for the first time, and the turn of Darwiš Bāša is octagonal like some of its Istanbul models. The ground plans of the Darwišīyya and Sinaïyya Mosques recall, albeit on a much smaller scale, the Mirimah Mosque in Istanbul. The Madrasa as-Salimiyya (974/1566, fig. 7, above left; fig. 29, 30)_14 of Selimi II (1566-74) introduces into Damascus architecture a madrasa-type, used in Istanbul and Anatolia, where the rooms are regularly distributed around a rectangular courtyard. The iwān type which was still used in the Mamluk period, either in its pure form, or strongly changed like the qā'a madrasas of the 15th century, vanishes completely. The typical Ottoman organisation of such a school is established in Damascus by the Madrasa as-Salimiyya.

Pencil-shaped minarets now appear in Damascus as a main feature of Ottoman architecture, and as the foremost symbol of an Ottoman presence. We have already examined the Takīya as-Salaymāniyya as a landmark. The mosques of Darwiš Bāša (979/1571 until 982/1574, fig. 12), Sinaī Bāša (994/1586 until 999/1591, fig. 11) and Sīyāqūt Bāša (1005/1596-97)_15 all have a slightly


_12 For this building, see the literature of fa. 11 and: Sack, Damascus, No. 4, 23; Walzinger and Wattinger, Damascus, C-5-1.

_13 For this building, see: fa. 31.


_15 For this building, see: fa. 9.

_16 For this building, see: al-Kawākibī, al-Ḥaḍīr al-Urma'īyya, p. 188; Pascual, XVIIe Siècle, tab. I; Sack, "Intra murus", p. 266; Sack, Damascus, No. 4, 63; Talal, Appendix, No. 297; Walzinger and Wattinger, Damascus, E-90-1.
changed pencil-shaped minaret which is clearly visible from afar. Many more examples can be given, but the ‘Ottomanization’ of the square Mamluk southeastern minaret of the Umayyad Mosque, achieved by adding a pencil-shaped top, is the most striking one (fig. 14).

The same is true for the forms of decoration. The pointed bulbous arch of Persian origin makes its way to Damascus and can, among others, be found in large vaulted constructions such as the riwaq of the ante-chamber of the Siyyaš Bāša Mosque (fig. 15).

II.1.1. Tiles

Tiles became the most remarkable decoration technique of the mosque. Large panels of locally produced tiles are to be found in several mosques and turbars of Damascus. Local production of tiles was started in the Mamluk period. Tiles appear at the beginning of the 15th century on different minarets, and first at the Tawrżī Mosque and Turba (826/1423). These tiles are all ascribed to one workshop which did not survive the second half of the 15th century. Meinecke assumes a short period of production in the twenties of the 15th century. The Ottomans reintroduced this technique of decoration later on. The Taqīya as-Sulaymāniya (962/1554 until 967/1560) constitutes the prelude of a whole series of tile-decorations. While no earlier example of Ottoman tiles is to be found in Damascus its introduction is supposedly connected to the restoration of the Dome of the Rock by Sultan Suleyman. Most probably, a workshop settled in Damascus after the conclusion of the work in Jerusalem. Much of the production after 1555 shows the influence of a Persian workshop followed by the late 16th century Iznik models in consequence.

The panels with the dark blue background at the takīya, or the extensive panels of the Hāmmūm al-Qāsimi (981/1573–74) and the Gāmi’ as-Sināniya (994/1586 until 999/1591, fig. 16) recall Persian style and colours. The dark green tiles of the minaret of the Gāmi’ as-Sināniya, as well as the use of tiles on the exterior façade, point towards the Persian cultural sphere (fig. 11).

18 The tiles for the Gāmi’ and Turba Muhāf ad Din, ‘Arabī (924/1518), whose completion was commissioned by Sultan Suleiman, are dated later by an inscription: 996/1588 (turba) and 1174/1760/61 (mosque). See also: Grosse, Arabische Inschriften, No. 201.
20 For this building, see: Bâkhit, Damascus, p. 117; Ibn Ālam, al-Rāʾiṣ wa-l-Qālīt, p. 17, fn. 1 (the editor al-Munajjed quotes al-Gazzī here); al-Kawākibi, “al-Hayât al-Umāniyya”, p. 385; Kromer, Topographie, p. 9; Pascual, XIV Siècle, tab. 1; Sack, “Stadtmauern”, p. 268; Sack, Damascus, No. 1–32; Sauvaget, Les monuments historiques, No 82; Walzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, E4–6.
A turn towards models from Iznik is indicated by the example of the Ğâmi’ and Turbat ad-Darwiśīya (terminated in 982/1574-75), Turbat al-Murâdīya (terminated in 983/1575-76), and the Turbat Şâlah ad-Dîn21. The examples of Damascene local production do not give a uniform picture. Forms, colours, size, and motives which are well known in Anatolia differ enormously from each other. Even key-motives, for example the medallions formed by ribbons enclosing a bunch of grapes, can be found in the Ğâmi’ ad-Darwiśīya and the Turbat Şâlah ad-Dîn (1020/1611, fig. 17) on a white background, and in the Ğâmi’ as-Sinānīya on a blue background. Different examples of local tile-production, such as rectangular tile-panels finished with small arches, can be found at the Takîya Sulaymâniyya, Madrasa as-Salîmîya, Ğâmi’ Darwiś Bâš, Ŧâmâm as al-Qâšî (“981/1573-74”), Turbat Darwiś Bâš, Ğâmi’ Sinân Bâš (fig. 16), Turbat Murâd Bâš (fig. 18), Mastabat Sa’d ad-Dîn al-Gidâwî in Midân (by 982/1574)22, Ğâmi’ Sinân Ağâ (972/1564-65)23, and Turbat Muhyî ad-Dîn ibn ‘Arâbî (decorated with tiles in 996/1588).

The themes of decoration differ for the most part, and even in the rare cases in which they are repeated side by side, they are still treated in the same manner. Other motives, for example a tile-panel representing a prayer-carpet with a mosque lamp in the Darwiśîya Mosque, are unique and show no relation to other tiles of Damascene production. Another unique example is the restoration-inscription of 1054/1644-45 on the qibla wall and the fountain of the Zâwîya as-Šarâdîya. The style of the writing and the colouring are unique in Damascus, and immediate models are not known (fig. 19). The Ottomans, in common with the Mamluks before them, sometimes used and reused single tiles and panels as spolia in their constructions. Some small inscription panels can be found in mosques or even in domestic buildings.24

Local tile production, mostly independent of Iznik, began with the tiles for the Takîya as-Sulaymâniyya and can be followed up well into the 19th century by using signed and dated examples.

21 The tiles of this Ayâbudît turba are dated: 1020/1611, 1027/1618, and 1037/1627-28. For this building, see: Bahraî, “al-Qâshî”, pp. 25-26; Sack, “insa maros”, p. 1985; Sack, Damascus, No. 2.21, 2.22; Tâlas, Appendix, No. 18; Wulzinger and Warnzinger, Damascus, F/18-9.


23 For this building, see: Gaudé, Arabische Inschriften, No. 86; al-Kawâkî, “al-Hayî al-Umrânîya”, p. 185; Meinecke, “osmanische Architektur”, p. 583; Pancal, XVth Siècle, tab.1; Sack, Damascus, No. 4.2; Tâlas, Appendix, No. 145; Wulzinger and Warnzinger, Damascus, E/2-3.

24 For example: Ŧâmâm as al-Qâshî (façade), Ḥân az-Zayt (façade), Ḥân al-Ghâliyya (façade and centre of the arches).

25 For example: Bayt ad-Dîrî and Bayt Musaḥba. Ottoman inscription tiles can be found sparsely in the Ğâmi’ Aḥnâdîya, Takîya al Mawlawîya, Zâwîya as-Samâdî.
A turn towards models from Iznik is indicated by the example of the Ğâmî and Turbat ad-Darwâziyya (terminated in 982/1574-75), Turbat al-Murâdîyya (terminated in 983/1575-76), and the Turbat Şâlâh ad-Dîn. The examples of Damascene local production do not give a uniform picture. Forms, colours, size, and motives which are well known in Anatolia differ enormously from each other. Even key-motives, for example the medallions formed by ribbons enclosing a bunch of grapes, can be found in the Ğâmî ad-Darwâziyya and the Turbat Şâlâh ad-Dîn (1020/1611, fig. 17) on a white background, and in the Ğâmî as-Şânâniyya on a blue background. Different examples of local tile-production, such as rectangular tile-panels finished with small arches, can be found at the Takâyya Sulaymânîyya, Madrasa as-Salâmiyya, Ğâmî Darwâzâ Bââšâ, Ḥammâm al-Qâşânî (981/1573-74), Turbat Darwâzâ Bââšâ, Ğâmî Şânâniyya (fig. 16), Turbat Murâd Bââšâ (fig. 18), Mašâbah Sa’d ad-Dîn al-Ǧihâwî in Mîdân (by 982/1574)22, Ğâmî Şânâni Âgâ (972/1564-65)23, and Turbat Muḥyî ad-Dîn ibn ‘Arâbî (decorated with tiles in 996/1588).

The themes of decoration differ for the most part, and even in the rare cases in which they are repeated side by side, they are still treated in the same manner. Other motives, for example a tile-panel representing a prayer-curtain with a mosque lamp in the Darwâziyya Mosque, are unique and show no relation to other tiles of Damascene production. Another unique example is the restoration-inscription of 1054/1644-45 on the qibla wall and the fountain of the Zâviyya as-Şânâniyya. The style of the writing and the colouring are unique in Damascus, and immediate models are not known (fig. 19). The Ottomans, in common with the Mamluks before them, sometimes used and reused single tiles and panels as spolia in their constructions. Some small inscription panels can be found in mosques or even in domestic buildings.25

Local tile production, mostly independent of Iznik, began with the tiles for the Takâyya as-Sulaymânîyya and can be followed up well into the 19th century by using signed and dated examples.

23 For this building, see: Gabe, Arabische Inschriften, No. 88; al-Kawâkibî, “al-Hâyyâ al-Umânîyya”, p. 185; Meinecke, “osmanische Architektur”, p. 583; Piscion, XVIIe Siècle, tbl.1: Sack, Damascus, No. 4, 2; Talas, Appendix, No. 145; Wolzinger and Wolzinger, Damascus, E2/1-2.
24 For example: Ḥammâm al-Qâshânî (façade), Ġümn az-Zaâyî (façade), Ḥâm al-Ǧâshîyya (façade and centre of the arches).
25 For example: Ḥayt ad-Dîrî and Ḥayt Muṣabbû b. Ottoman inscription tiles can be found sparsely in the Ğâmî Ahmadîyya, Takâyya al-Mawâlidîyya, Zâviyya as-Şânâniyya.
II.2. The formation of an Ottoman cityscape

An Ottomanization of the architecture of Damascus can be defined as demonstrated above. Without denying the local traditions, new elements of construction were integrated into the urban architecture of Damascus, marking it unmistakably Ottoman but in Damascus with Damascene characteristics. Thus far, we have concentrated on the features and architectural expression of the buildings, but now we will turn to the change wrought in vast parts of the urban texture in Damascus. A true Ottoman city developed along the Darvishiya-Street extra muros in the West. Its main features are the Ottoman saray (the first Ottoman Governor Palace), and a series of important mosques of Ottoman governors which are closely connected to the new sūq-area intra muros. These are the three elements of the first Ottoman city. It will be called the "first Ottoman city" in contrast to the 'Tanzimāt' city which emerged around the Marga-Square in the late 19th century.26

II.2.1. Darvishiya-Street

Running along the western city wall from North to South, Darvishiya-Street developed into the most important, or even the Ottoman street, of Damascus. A number of large mosques and their attached foundations found their place here. For example, the now defunct Ġāmi‘ Tā‘ Bāṣā (936/1529)27, the Takiyya ad-Darvisiya (as-Suyyūsī / al-Qaṣṣāṣī),28 also defunct and undated, or the Ġāmi‘ Darwīs Bāṣā (982/1574-75) and the Ġāmi‘ Sinān Bāṣā (999/1591). This series of large-scale Ottoman waqf foundations begins in the North with the complex of Lāl Mustafā Bāṣā (mosque of 974/1566, ħān, hammām and sūq of 971/1563-64)29 and of Qaramānī (hammām and mosque of 969).

27 For this building, see: Ibn Qun’a, al-Ittāwāt wa-l-Qaṭāq, p. 13; Pascual, XVIIe Siècle, tab.1; al-Kawākib, "al-Ḥiyāt al-Urmiyya", p. 185; Talas. Appendix, No. 221.
28 For this building, see: Sack, Damascus, No. 4.24; Sāriye Vüketesi Sil-kâmesî, vol. 21, (1305/1888-89), p. 147; Talas. Appendix, No. 120. Weber, "Marga-Platz", No. 77; Wolzinger and Ważinger, Damascus, Ch. 3.
29 For the mosque, see: Meinecke, "osmanische Architektur", p. 583; al-Kavākib, "al-Ḥiyāt al-Urmiyya", p. 185; Pascual, XVIIe Siècle, tab.1; Sack, Damascus, No. 4.1; Wolzinger and Ważinger, Damascus, D7-2. See for the ħān (Ḥan al-Bāṣa): Bakht, Damascus, p. 116; Ibn Qun’a, al-İttāwāt wa-l-Qaṭāq, p. 15; Ibn Tūlūn, Quṭb Dellq, p. 330; al-Kawākib, "al-Ḥiyāt al-Urmiyya", p. 183; Meinecke, "osmanische Architektur", p. 582; Pascual, XVIIe Siècle, tab.1; Sack, Damascus, No. 107; Wolzinger and Ważinger, Damascus, D7-2 (7). For the hammām (Hamamiya ar-Ra’s), see: Bakht, Damascus, p. 116; M. Ecochard and CL Le Chuquet, Les Bains de Damas, (Beirut, 1942-43), vol. II, pp. 91-94; Ibn Qun’a, al-İttāwāt wa-l-Qaṭāq, p. 15; Ibn Tūlūn, Quṭb Dellq, p. 230; al-Kavākib, "al-Ḫayāt al-Urmiyya", p. 143; Meinecke, "osmanische Architektur", p. 583; Pascual, XVIIe Siècle, tab.1; Wolzinger and Ważinger, Damascus, C3-2 and for the sūq (Sūq as-Sarrīfīa and Sūq Lāli Mustafā Bāṣā): Bakht, Damascus, p. 116.
1561) 39, and ends in the South with the Čami’ Murād Bāša (terminated in 983/1575-76) 40. The Darwīšiya-Street was the main road passing through the city, and as such was the ideal location for a display of Ottoman hegemony through physical manifestations. The political character of the street becomes evident when one looks at its function as part of the Darb al-Ḥajj directing the huge numbers of pilgrims towards the South. Thousands of pilgrims from all northern and eastern countries came together in Damascus each year to set out together for the Ḥijāz. The majority of them camped in the Maqār of Damascus, right next to the Takīya as-Sulaymānīya. The pilgrims travelled down Darwīšiya-Street facing south, passing the Ottoman saray and most of the important mosques of Ottoman governors.

The Ottoman saray is built extra muros at the very beginning of the Darwīšiya-Street in front of Bāb al-Naṣr in the middle of the 16th century (fig. 20). The new men in power in this region seem carefully to have avoided the local notables, while the Mamluk governor had still resided intra muros at the Dār as-Saʿāda. 41 The central state of the Ottomans concentrated its administrative forces extra muros. Only the new supreme court of the province (Mahkamat al-Bāb, fig. 21) was built inside the walls, but was next to the new Ottoman saray (see below) in the 16th century. 42

It is not easy to render this development meaningful. Do we deal with a kind of city-planning with a waqf as an urban nucleus or — let us say — an deliberate urban impetus? Could this be compared to the re-urbanisation of Istanbul

40 For this building, see: Bāshī, Damascus, p. 117; Gauhe, Arabische Inschriften, No. 153. 154: Ibn ʿArabi, al-Ḥayāt al-ʿUmrāniyya”, p. 186; Kremer, Topographie, p. 19; Meinecke, “osmanische Architektur”, p. 584; Meinecke, türkische Architektur, vol. 1, p. 207; Pastula, XVII. Stelle, tab. 1; Sack, Damascus, No. 476; Walsh, Theotist and Watzinger, Damascus, p. 27.
41 The phenomenon of building the saray, the seat of the Ottoman governor, extra muros is not limited to Damascus. Compare: Raymond, al-Awāmīr al-Arabiyya, pp. 32-35. The saray in Damascus was heavily remade between 1830-32, changed into the residence of the military governor in 1271/1854-55, and its last remains were destroyed by the French Mandate powers in 1945. Compare: Fr. 48 and Weber, Margh-Platz, No. 82.
42 The Mamluk still used the Nurid Dār al-ʿAḍl south of the citadel as a court of law. The Mahkamat al-Bāb is first mentioned in court files of the late 16th century, but the location of the court changed several times at the beginning of the 17th century. During the twenties and thirties of the 16th century the court was held in the Madrasa al-Gawāziyya, then in the Madrasa as-Sumaytiyya, then in the Madrasa al-Bāḍrīyya, then again in the Madrasa al-Gawāziyya in 971/1570 the Qaṣīf ʿAlī ibn Sinān and Rāmād moved the court to the Bayt ibn Aslān south of the citadel. See: Ibn ʿArabi, Kawaṭid Dimashq, pp. 312, 333; Ibn ʿArabi, Haddāt al-Ẓamān, vol. II, p. 87, 89. Compare: Bāshī, Damascus, p. 120. For the Mahkamat al-Bāb: A. Rafeq, The Province of Damascus 1722-1783, (Beirut, 1966) p. 309; Sack, “extra muros”, p. 280; Sack, Damascus, No. 4, 41; Walsh, Theotist and Watzinger, Damascus, E/4-D. The Dār al-ʿAḍl was partially destroyed by Ahmad ʿAbbās ʿAbbās, who built his takṣīya at this spot (see below). Its last remains were still visible around 1032/1623-24, when Qāsim al-Kurīr erected his building on the place of the former Dār al-ʿAḍl. Compare: al-Muhibbi, Haddāt al-ʿAtar, vol. III, p. 293.
triggered by the erection of religious complexes by Mehmed II and his vizirs? This was a very common practice, as is demonstrated by the quarter of Darb al-Ahmār in Cairo, where the Mamluk Sulṭān an-Nāṣir Muhammad ibn Qālūn (693/1294 until 741/1341 with two interruptions) had arranged for his Unānī to build their complexes. Darwīshiyā-Street is part of the Darb al-Hāğı, or the Taṭīf al-Sulṭānī, and furnishing this street with petite jewels of Ottoman architecture can be understood as the creation of an Ottoman self-image. There are nonetheless not enough examples to talk of an imperial program of construction or of imperial architecture in Damascus. An Ottomanization of the urban architecture in Damascus is not a declared goal, but it seems to be the product of a self-image by which high officials defined the city as Ottoman.34

Sultan Selim I had tried, from the beginning of Ottoman rule, to integrate Damascenes into the empire, and it is probable that local notables themselves became promoters of the cultural change. The tomb of Muhḥammad b. Zayd ibn ʿArabī was restored right after the conquest and furnished with a takīya and a mosque by Sultan Selim I. On the other hand, he supported Şāhya of mystical circles. During his stay in Damascus, Sultan Selim visited Şāhya Ḥusayn al-Ghadīwādī (d. 926/1519), who had played a key-role during the Ottoman conquest, in the Şāhya's house. The Zāwīyā al-Ghadīwādī was erected by the Sultan near the house of the Şāhya.35

The example of Muḥammad ibn Hallāb as-Saḥmādī (d. 948/1541-42) who, with the financial support of Sultan Selim I, erected the Zāwīyā as-Saḥmādīya of the Qādrīya Order (at-Ṭarīq al-Qādrīya), was mentioned above. The erection of the Taṭīf al-Mawlawīya (993/1585)36 and the undated Taṭīf ad-

34 It is interesting to note that nearly every conquered city became Ottomanized in the same way. A process of Ottomanization of urban architecture took place after the conquest of Crete in the 17th century. How no imperial decree was active, but rather a common idea of high ranking officials as to how an Ottoman city should look. See: I. A. Bierman, “The Ottomanization of Crete”, in I. Bierman, R. Abou-el-Haj, D. Preziosi, The Ottoman City and its Parts. Urban Structure and Social Order. (New York, 1991), pp. 53-75.

35 Compare Bakht, Damascus, pp. 181-82. This is not to be confused with the Zāwīyā as-Saḥmādīya (952/1544-45) near the cemetery Bībi-ās-Saḥmādī al-Maṣṭabat Sād ad-Dīn al-Ghadīwādī (982/1574, enlarged twice in 995/1587 and 1005/1596-97) in Midān, and which was built by his son and grandson. The Zāwīyā of Husayn al-Ghadīwādī was rebuilt, according to the inscription of 1331/1813-14. The importance of this building is proven by the fact that it was restored by Sultan Abdūlhamid in the course of his policies of centralisation and Islamicisation. The restoration inscription, with the tughr of the Sultan, mentions Abdūlhamid explicitly. The restoration is also recorded in the official yearly report of the province of Syria. Compare: Sāriye Vilâyetnî Plan, vol. 21 (1317/1899-1900), p. 132. For the Zāwīyā as-Saḥmādīya (952/1544-45) near the cemetery in Bībi-ās-Saḥmādī, see: Talas, Appendix, No. 122, and for the Maṣṭabat Sād ad-Dīn al-Ghadīwādī, see: 22.

36 For this building, see: Ibn Gam'a, al-Baširīﾊ starts, p. 19; Ḥusayn b. Ḥusayn, “al-Hayāt al-ʿUmrāniyyah”, p. 186; Meinecke, “otomanische Architektur”, p. 583, no. 25; Pascual, XVII Sècle, tab. 1; Sack, Damascus, No. 47; Talas, Appendix, No. 5; Weber, “Marqa-Plate”, No. 80; Wulzinger and Wulzinger, Damascus, A/3-5.
Darwișiya (as-Suyyas / al-Qaṣṣāṣ, not to be confused with the nearby mosque of Darwiș Bāsā) for the Mawlūwī (Mevlevi) Order, are to be seen in this context. The same is true of the mosque of Murād Bāsā (976/1568–69 until 983/1575–76), which offered rooms to the Naqībūndiyya Order. In this way parts of the society of Damascus were reached by Ottoman civil institutions. The objects of Ottomanization became carriers of Ottoman cultural institutions with membership in a ṣūq.

The individual patrons followed a unified concept even if central planning cannot be proved. This can only be explained through the acquisition of new elements of structure and design by means of a new cultural self-conception.

II.2.2. The ṣūq of Damascus

The Ottoman ṣūq encountered new urban territory in Damascus. The ṣūq finally moved from the trade centre of the earlier dynasties, around the Umayyad Mosque, along the Qaymariyya-Street, and the Via Recta, to the area south-west of the Umayyad Mosque. The contemporary Ṣūq Gāma (Mīlāḥ Bāsā), al-Hajjiʿān, al-Qalbāqīyya (Bāb al-Bard), al-Ḥarīr, and al-ʿArwān formed the centre of the new commercial area of the city. In fact, the modern shape and structure of the ṣūq date from the 16th century onwards. The development of the ṣūq and Darwiṣiya-Street was initiated by the same patrons for the most part, and has to be understood as a single, connected urban development. Some reasons for this phenomenon will be discussed here, before the evolution of the new Ottoman ṣūq of Damascus is described in detail.

The large waqf foundations played an especially important role in this development. Not only the Ṣūq Ṣūṣūnī, but also the new commercial area, were shaped by the large waqfs. Like Aleppo, the city of Damascus witnessed a remarkable boom of waqf foundations. Ṣūqs, hāns and hammāms all settled in the new commercial area within the first hundred years after the Ottoman conquest. The Ottoman Empire was, in economic terms, a customs and trade union which also secured the long trade routes within the empire. The integration into the Ottoman Empire, and Damascus' special role for the Ḥāǧī, caused an economic boom which was manifested in the changing urban texture of the city. Members of prominent families and officials of the empire crossed the borders of the provinces to follow this economic boom, and invested in trade constructions all over the empire. Investors, like local governors or other high ranking officials, could expect high profits. Some of the high ranking officials showed an unusual energy. Sinān Bāsā, for example, invested in his huge complex at the Bāb al-Ǧābiyya two months before he became a grand vizir, and he still constructed public buildings in Damascus after the end of his governorship.37 Similar tendencies can be observed in Aleppo. Mu-

37 Balāḥī, Damascus, p. 118; On Sinān Bāsā, see: Pascual, XVII Siècle, pp. 32–35; and for an account of his enormous wealth: Ibn Ḥumra, al-Bāṣānī waʾī Ǧaġāṭ, pp. 20–22.
hammad Bāšā, a son of Sinān Bāšā, erected trade buildings in Aleppo without ever holding political office in this town.\textsuperscript{38}

The installation of a waqf had an immense potential for integration into Damascene society at the socio-political level. This is illustrated by the example of Barawīz ibn 'Abdallāh, since they provided necessary social and political commodities. Amīr al-Imārāt Barawīz (Parviz) ibn 'Abdallāh (d. 1015/1666-07) built a small mosque for himself close to his home next to the Ḥammām al-Bakrī, and after he left his official position he became its mu'addin and imām.\textsuperscript{39} The potential of a waqf for integration on a socio-political level was immense. The waqf of Sinān Bāšā, for example, provided 444 persons with livelihood, that is, livelihood for almost 444 families, 203 of whom lived exclusively in Damascus.\textsuperscript{40} It is not to be forgotten that the waqfs were the economic insurance of high ranking government officials at a time in the last decades of the 16th century when the first signs of recession and decline had become evident. The hāns and sūqs were the sources of economic wealth during the beginning of economic crisis and inflation in 1584. This was true of mosques and madrasas as well, which secured the financial well being of individual notables. The desire for economic security was surely a motivation for construction activities.

Let us turn to the development of the Ottoman sūq. In Damascus, as in Aleppo, enormous transactions must have taken place to achieve the acquisition of appropriate plots of land. Several fires facilitated the erection of the new commercial area. The fire of the year 930/1524 destroyed the areas around Bāb al-Barid and al-ʿAšrūnīya where the Ottoman trade institutions found their location later on.\textsuperscript{41} This event was the trigger for another important development. Still under the impact of the fire of the year 930/1524, the Qādī al-Qādī Wāli ad-Dīn bin al-Fārūf built his new sūq from stone and most probably had the vaults covered with cupolas (932/1525-26). “Nothing of its kind had existed among the sūqs in Damascus.”\textsuperscript{42} The now destroyed building


\textsuperscript{40} Gupta, Arabische Inschriften, No. 150; al-Kawākibī, al-Ḥayāt al-ʿUmrānīya”, p. 189; Sach, Damascus, p. 108; al-Talas, Appendix, No. 2; Watzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, 1/3-2.

\textsuperscript{41} Compare: Ibn Ḥumayn, al-Bāšawī wa-l-Qādī, p. 8. For another fire in the sūqs north-west extra muros (tābiʿ at-Ṭalā) in 927/1520: see Ibn Ḥumayn, al-Bāšawī wa-l-Qādī, pp. 2-3.

\textsuperscript{42} “wa-lam tāṣṣad tābiʿ al-Bāšawī fi-l-ʿaswāq bi-Dināsī,” Ibn Ṭūlūn, Qādī Dīnāsī, p. 312. For this building, see: Ibn Ṭūlūn, Qādī Dīnāsī, p. 312; al-Kawākibī, al-Ḥayāt al-ʿUmrānīya”, p. 184; Pauwels, XVF Sīče, tab.1. Ibn al-Fārūf was perhaps inspired by his two journeys to Acre and Jerusalem. Compare: Ibn Ṭūlūn, Qādī Dīnāsī, pp. 369, 310. Further construction enterprises of the Qādī Ibn Ṭūlūn, Qādī Dīnāsī, pp. 312-13; Pauwels, XVF Sīče, tab.1; Talas, Appendix, No. 172.
near the Tall al-Qadi was the first domed trade-building in Damascus, and is therefore of immense significance, as we shall see. It is interesting to note that the first central dome in a mosque can be found in the same year at the Zawiya as-Saniyya.

The construction of the Sūq al-Ḥayyān (950/1543), around which a number of public buildings sprang up, is significant for the locality of the Ottoman sūq. The building boom began in the fifties of the 16th century, judging from the remaining structures. Šamsi Âmajd Bāṣā founded a takīya (964/1557), and the Sūq as-Sibāhiyya (962/1554 until 963/1556) south of the citadel. The sūq was possibly the first Ottoman trade building in this area and stood on the very location of the palace of the Mamluk governor, Dār al-Saʿāda, and the Mamluk court of law, Dār al-ʿAdī. The most two important Mamluk administrative institutions vanished completely when their land was usurped, and their remains were probably reused as construction material.

Of the takīya, only the Âmajd Bāṣā Mosque survived, having been completely renovated in this century, but the Sūq as-Sibāhiyya corresponds to the modern Sūq al-Arwām (Fig. 22). The Sūq al-Arwām is therefore the oldest existing and largely unaltered Ottoman trade building in Damascus. It played an important role in the urban development of the city. This sūq was not only the point of departure for the later Sūq al-Ḥaṣfī, dating from the late 18th century, and as such for the Sūq al-Ḥarīrīyya of the late 19th century. Its significance lies in its close connection with the undated saray and the construction of the takīya and sūq of Âmajd Šamsi Bāṣā on the location of the Palace of the Mamluk Governor. The saray already existed towards the end of the 16th century, and it could have been erected by Âmajd Šamsi Bāṣā as a logical outcome of the destruction of the Dār as-Saʿāda. The commercial area moved further west into muros during the development of Darwišiya-Street with its

---

mosques and the suqy. Perhaps Ahmad Şamsî Bâşî undertook the decisive step in this direction in the fifties of the 16th century.

A number of inner-city caravanserais sprang up, one after the other, in the west of the old city. The Hân al-Gûhîya (973/1565-66, fig. 23) is the oldest dated hân of its time, with the possible exception of the undated southern port of the Hân aş-Saçhârî.\(^4\) The trade buildings of Darwîs Bâşî and Murâd Bâşî, not far north of the Hân al-Gûhîya, constitute the actual commercial centre. Around the Sûq al Qalbaqûfiyâ (Bâb al-Barîd) are situated the Hân and Sûq al-Hafir (981/1573-74)\(^5\), the Hâmîmî al-Qiçânî (981/1573-74) of Darwîs Bâşî, the Bedesten Murâd Bâsî’s (later Hân al-Gümruk)\(^6\), the Hân al-Murâdîya (1002/1593)\(^7\), as well as the Qâysârîyât al-Haramayn (1017/1608-09, the later Hân Şâûf Qâtanâ al-Kâbirî\(^8\) and the Coffeehouse al-Haramayn (the later Hân Şâûf Qâtanâ aş-Saçîrî, the structure of which was later changed considerably).\(^9\)

The Sûq al-Arwaâm and the Sûq Ibn al-Farîfûr established the new construction type of the bedesten (a hall for shops which can be locked) in the city. The

---


\(^5\) For this building, see: Sack, "intra muros", p. 268; Sack, Damaskus, No. 4.37; M. Schraib, "Der Sûq von Damaskus und zwei traditionelle Handelsanlagen: Hân Qaçâq und Hân Shaqunasi Pâsî", Damascuser Mâteilungen, 1, (1983), No. 11; Wulzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, E/4.5.10.

\(^6\) For the hân: Bâkî, Damascus, p. 117; Gauhe, Arabische Inschriften, No. 68, 124; Ibn Qâsmâ’i, al-Bâbawwî wa-l-Qubûr, p. 17, fn. 1 (the editor al-Munawwâdî quotes al-Gazi here); al-Kawâkîbî, "al-Hâyât al-Umrâniyyâ", p. 186; Kremer, Topographie, p. 8; Meinecke, "ottomane Architektur", p. 585; Pascual, XVI Siècle, tab.1.; Sack, "intra muros", p. 267; Sack, Damaskus, No. 4.34; Sauvaget, Les monuments historiques, No. 76; Schraib, "Sûq von Damaskus", no. 3; Wulzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, E/4.4. For the Sûq al-Hafir: Ibn Qâsmâ’, al-Bâbawwî wa-l-Qubûr, p. 17, fn. 1 (the editor al-Munawwâdî quotes al-Gazi here); Pascual, XVI Siècle, tab.1.; Sack, "intra muros", p. 281; Sack, Damaskus, No. 4.33.


\(^8\) For this building, see: Ibn Qâsmâ’, al-Bâbawwî wa-l-Qubûr, p. 23, fn. 6; Pascual, XVI Siècle, tab.1., pp. 108; 116; 12; ar-Rîhîî, "Hanût", p. 62; Sabu and Salzwedel, Typologie, pp. 46-47; Sack, "intra muros", pp. 266-67; Sack, Damaskus, No. 4.28; Wulzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, E/4.11.

\(^9\) For this building, see: Kremner, Topographie, p. 9; Pascual, XVI Siècle, p. 113; ar-Rîhîî, "Hanût", p. 63; Sabu and Salzwedel, Typologie, pp. 44-45; Sack, "intra muros", p. 266; Sack, Damaskus, No. 4.29; Sauvaget, Les monuments historiques, No. 80; Schraib, "Sûq von Damaskus", no. 15; Wulzinger and Watzinger, Damascus, E/4. J. Markâz al-Waṭî‘iq at-Târîf, 1212/33 (1321/1033).

\(^10\) For this building, see: Kremer, Topographie, p. 9; Pascual, XVI Siècle, p. 113. Markâz al-Waṭî‘iq at-Târîf, 1212/33 (1321/1033).
typical Ottoman dome bedesten found its most beautiful example in Damascus in the bedesten of Murad Bâsha (1017/1608-09, fig. 24). In this shopping street, 58 larger and eight smaller shops are lined up together with 40 depots. The most outstanding features of this bedesten are its originally nine well-rounded typical Ottoman domes, which are arranged in an L-shape. Even if Murad Bâsha calls the bedesten in its waqfiyya "...demeurant au cours des temps, unique..." (29), we have to note that already in 1553 a European traveller informs us about a bedesten 50 years earlier than the bedesten of Murad Bâsha and one year before the Sîq al-Arwâm (30). It is possible that he refers to the southern part of the Han as-Sadran, which can be dated to the 16th century, or the Sîq of Ibn al-Farrîr, which had already been constructed as a domed trade building in 932/1525-26. Whether the latter initiated the exceptional form of the hans in Damascus has to remain hypothetical, but the concept of a domed trade building like the bedesten had a strong influence on the shape of the hans in Damascus.

What did the hans look like? Many hans, and several hammâms that survived up to our days are early Ottoman foundations, such as the Han al-Qaâniyya (1565-66), Han al-Farrîr (1573-74), Ibn al-Muradiyya (1593), Han az-Zayt (1601-02) (31), the Bedesten Murad Bâsha with the Qaysâriyyat al-Haramayn (Han Shayb Qatana, 1608-09), the Han Ghaqmaq (32) (in its present shape), and several other hans. Unfortunately no Mamluk han has survived in its original form, so we cannot determine the Mamluk influence on the Ottoman han. A few of the Ottoman hans follow the traditional Ottoman principles of construction. The Han al-Farrîr, for example, with its closed galleries, and the Han az-Zayt (fig. 25) with open galleries, correspond to the common elements of construction, a large court and galleries, similar to those elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire.

The oldest surviving Ottoman han of Damascus, Han al-Qaâniyya (973/1565-66, fig. 23), already differs clearly. It initially stood out by virtue of its original dome-arrangement, which no longer exists. The idea of covering buildings with domes was perhaps transferred from the bedesten to the han. If this conception originated in Damascus, it cannot be traced back to the Sîq al-Arwâm, which was topped with cross-vaults. The only possible models are the Sîq of Ibn al-Farrîr or even the undated southern part of the Han as-Sadrai. The
betelten of Murad Bâshâ cannot have served as a model, since it was constructed 27 years after the Ḥan al-Ġūjîya. The Ḥan al-Ġūjîya, with its two domes placed behind each other, marks the very beginning of a special Damascene development of domed hâns, even if the origin of the idea is not totally clear. All over the city, one can find structures with one, two, three, or even four domes. This development reached its apex in the Ḥan Asʿad Bîshâ al-ʿAzîn (1753) and its famous nine domes (fig. 26).66 The impressive hall, with its four pillars supporting the domes, is a perfect example of the Ottoman understanding of space. The hâns, which are resplendent with local techniques and decoration, and which also represent a Damascene variation in structure, are nevertheless the product of an Ottomanization of the Damascene architectural language. The Ḥan Asʿad Bîshâ is the climax of the local Ottoman style of Damascus. This paradox, of an evolution of a pronounced local style and the contemporary permeation of Ottoman principles of construction, will be analysed in the following section.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN OTTOMAN LOCAL STYLE IN DAMASCUS

The Takîya as-Sulaymâniyya played a decisive role in the importation of Ottoman forms of construction. Ottoman forms of building previously unknown in Damascus can be found in Damascus following the takîya’s erection. The Takîya Sulaymâniyya is of course a product of Ottoman central politics and central planning, but this is not sufficient to define the architecture of its time as imperial: all other buildings, to my knowledge, were locally planned and designed.67 The buildings erected shortly after Mîmar Sinân’s Sulaymâniyya point towards a local Ottoman style. The development of a local style proceeds as a continued evolution of local, formerly Mamluk, forms, and of a simultaneous Ottomanization of the architecture of Damascus. This is no contradiction, since buildings develop with an Ottoman understanding of space and form and primarily local techniques of construction and decoration. It is here that the local techniques receive the decisive encouragement for a further development. The coloured pastes, especially, evolve into the typical Damascene element of decoration. The technique of filling carved stone with multi-coloured pastes began under the Mamluks. The use and modulation of this tech-

66 For this building, see: Gaebe, Arabische Inschriften, p. 67, No. 123; Kromer, Topographie, p. 5; Ruley, The Province, p. 188; Sack, "irra muros", p. 281; Sack, Damasus, No.; Sauvaget, Les monuments historiques, p. 115, No. 86; Walther and Watzinger, Damascus, pp. 81 ff., Fig. 2.
67 The significance of this overall quite small takîya is demonstrated by the fact that members of the al-Mulûk family were buried here after they were exiled from the last Ottoman Sultan, Mehmed VI Vahdeddin (1861–1926, Sultan between 1918–22). Many descendants of Abd al-Hamid II (1876–1909) and Mehmed VI rest here.
nique undergoes a pronounced change in the second half of the 16th century and first half of the 17th century (fig. 27) and lays the ground for the splendid colour pastes façades of the late 17th, 18th, and the early 19th centuries (fig. 28). Ottoman art in Damascus becomes strongly 'localised', a phenomenon which finds its parallels in the social-life of the city. The integration of Ottoman officeholders into Damascene society took place to a certain extent towards the end of the 16th century. This trend was manifested in art-historical terms as follows:

The Madrasa as-Salimiya of Selim II (fig. 7 above left, 29), erected in the immediate neighbourhood of the Takīya as-Sulaymānīya, is an early and pleasant example of the fusion of different traditions of construction into a new concept. The fusion consists, basically, of an Ottoman plan of construction carried out by local craftsmen. They were ordered to erect an Ottoman building, using local construction techniques.

For the first time in Damascus a ground plan shows a typical Ottoman madrasa, with a rectangular court and a domed mosque at one end. The arcades with the living quarters, which enclose the courtyard, are covered with small domes using the typical folded capitals and pendentives. No Damascene drew this construction plan, but it was certainly implemented by local craftsmen. This becomes clear comparing the two domes. The wide and flat dome of the Takīya as-Sulaymānīya (fig. 10), with its lead cover, its sloping tambour and its small flying buttress, is a typical Ottoman dome. Eleven years later, the Madrasa as-Salimiya presents a typical Damascene steep rising dome without a lead cover, with a polygonal drum (fig. 29). The origin of this form is to be traced back to examples from the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods. The building nevertheless remains an Ottoman construction with a central dome chamber which is connected internally by spherical pendentives. The pendentives used by the Ayyubids and Mamluks differ from the Ottoman ones in their decisively smaller construction. They never start at a low level, and they are often decorated with shallow muqarnas. The façade of the mosque of the Madrasa as-Salimiya (fig. 30) uses Mamluk elements of decoration outside their context without copying them blindly. Such elements include pseudo-keystone-stripes, colour paste decoration and entwined ribbons.

All Ottoman buildings of the second half of the 16th century show the same tendency. The Darwīṣa and Sinānīya mosque still uses the characteristic Mamluk combination of a portal topped with a minaret, but the minaret is now built in the Ottoman pencil-shape (fig. 11, 12). The façade is structured by using entwined ribbons, a feature commonly used in Mamluk mihrabs. A structuring of the façade by using ribbons can be observed at the beginning of the 16th century at the west gate of the Siba'iya Mosque (fig. 31). The Ottomans
adopted this feature, but changed the function of the ribbons. The ribbons not only structured and divided the buildings into different units, but were also used as frames for panels and cartouches. This form of decoration was applied extensively to street façades under the Ottomans, even if it originated with the Mamluks.

The fountain of the Darwīša Mosque (fig. 32), a landmark in the emergence of a local Ottoman style, shows a structuring corresponding to that of the west-gate of the Sibtīya Mosque (fig. 31). The same is true of the Ħārs. The portal of the Ħār al-Ḥārīr (981/1573-74, fig. 33), for example, shows the predominant structuring of the façade with ribbons. Small panels of decoration are divided extensively by ribbons here, as in many minor mosques and ħārs of this period. Isolated forms of decoration survive but are used in a new context, as for example are square panels formed by interwoven bands. This cannot be called a Mamluk influence, but is rather a continuation of a local tradition of design with some adaptations to a new contemporary style. The motif of the interwoven bands can still be found, with slight modifications, in the late 16th century, as in the Ħār al-Ḥārīr, where it is now part of a kaleidoscope façade decoration assembled out of many small motifs. The buildings of Darwīš Bābā have a special significance in this context (Ḥār al-Ḥārīr, Ğarn Darwīš Bābā with attached buildings). They show, for the first time, the principles of this new lay-out of the façade, while the structure of the buildings is an importation of models from Istanbul. We encounter this phenomenon everywhere: The Ottoman structure of buildings is interpreted, and then covered with local forms of decoration which changed under the influence of Ottoman principles of decoration and form.

CONCLUSION

After a short period of architectural and administrative continuity following the Ottoman conquest, a period in which the Ottomans set out to shape the urban landscape according to their ideas, and to change the urban texture. This is demonstrated by the first Ottoman city, its sāqs, the saray, and its Darwīša-street extra musārā.

The development of a local Damascene style started very early. The first central domed mosque and sāq were constructed in 932/1525-26, and we find an enormous input of Ottoman principles of design not later than the mid-16th century. An Ottoman city in Damascus emerged along Darwīşya-street and westwards ḫira musārā, while an Ottomanization of the Damascene skyline was effected. The foundations of a distinct local Ottoman style in Damascus were laid in the last decades of the 16th century, and culminated in its most impressive artistic expressions in the 18th century. This local style can always be
distinguished as Ottoman, but the term *Ottomanization* does not mean *Istanbulization* in the sense of a simple plagiarism of the capital’s art. It involves the assimilation of new principles of design into local planning. Ottoman patterns of construction and decoration were integrated into the language of urban architecture by developing further local traditions of decoration, and became a part of the local canon of forms. All buildings followed a more or less similar conception of shaping while not involving central state planning. The same can be said concerning the shape and the layout of buildings. By the mid-16th century, no single mosque, madrasa, or trade-building shows any signs of Mamluk organisation. Local traditions were not ignored, however, so that an Ottoman madrasa would be topped with a Damascene dome and a centrally-domed mosque would also possess a portal-minaret. Thus, in artistic, architectural and urban developments one can observe commonly accepted and internalised principles of design which were not declared publicly. The Ottomanization of Damascus’ urban landscape must therefore be a result of a new cultural awareness which was displayed to the public. Darwišiyya-Street is more than an arterial road.
Fig. 32 Ğâmi Darwâsî Bâsâ, fountain.
Fig. 31 Ğâmi’ as-Sibā’îya, west-gate.
Fig. 29 Madrasa as-Salimiyah, courtyard.

Fig. 30 Madrasa as-Salimiyah, portal of the mosque.
Fig. 27  Turbat Şalâh ad-Din.

Fig. 28  Bayt al-Ǧabr (1107/1744-45).
Fig. 25 Ḥān 'az-Zayt.

Fig. 26 Ḥān As'ad Būsā al-'Azm.
Fig. 24 Bedesten of Murad Bähā.
Fig. 23 Hān al-ʿUḥlya.
Fig. 21. Mahkamat al-Bab, supreme court.

Fig. 22. Sūq al-Arwām.
Fig. 19  az-Zawiya as-Ṣanādiya, tiles.

Fig. 20  Ottoman Saray, Sīḥat al-Muširīya (photo: IRCICA, c. 1880).
Fig. 18. Törebat Murâd Bâsî, tiles.
Fig. 17 Turbat Şalāḥ ad-Dīn, ülles.
Fig. 15 Ğāmi’ Siyyūq Bāša.

Fig. 16 Ğämi’ Sînän Bâša, tiles of the portal.
Fig. 13 Ğâmi Murâd Bâšî.

Fig. 14 Umayyad Mosque, south-eastern minaret.
Fig. 11 Ğāmi‘ Sinān Bāšā.

Fig. 12 Ğāmi‘ Darwīš Bāšā.
Fig. 9 at-Takiya as-Sulaymiya, living units.

Fig. 10 at-Takiya as-Sulaymiya, mosque.
Fig. 7  at-Takiya as-Sulaymāniya and al-Madrasa as-Salāmiya
(photo: IFAP, c. 1935).

Fig. 8  at-Takiya as-Sulaymāniya, mosque.
Fig. 5. az-Zawiya as-Shamādiya, prayer-hall.

Fig. 6. az-Zawiya as-Shamādiya, prayer-hall.
Fig. 3 Turbat Luqfi Bâša, façade (photo: DAI, c. 1917).

Fig. 4 Masğid as-Saqlîfa, façade (photo: DAI, c. 1917).
Fig. 1 Ğami‘ as-Salimi, prayer-hall.

Fig. 2 Ğami‘ as-Siba‘iya, prayer-hall.
Fig. 33  Ḥān al-Ḥārīr, portal.