

THE RISE OF THE SANJAK OF JERUSALEM IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Butrus Abu-Manneh

Modern theories of nationalism are full of contradictory and intriguing explanations for the birth of nations. On one point they all seem to agree—one should look for a set of complicated and measured socioeconomical and politico-cultural processes which have forged a new identity and novel interpretation of the human reality. One of the important features is the restructuring of a community's boundaries in a way that corresponds to a shared history as well common language and customs, which together can be the precursors of the new national identity.

A major task of a new Palestinian historiography is to find these early transformations which led later to a clear sense of identity and solidarity. This is an important effort against the Israeli claim that only Zionism gave birth to Palestinian identity; otherwise the local Arab population would have been integrated into one of the neighboring Arab national movements.

In this article, Butrus Abu-Manneh, a Palestinian historian from Israel, describes the rise of the sanjak of Jerusalem in 1872. This administrative act taken by the Ottomans, which helped to formulate a clearer sense of boundaries and belonging in the land of Palestine, centered around the city of Jerusalem. As Abu-Manneh shows, this move also enhanced the social position of the leading family in Jerusalem, the Husaynis, who formed the core of the national movement during the British occupation of Palestine. The failure of the Husaynis later on to mobilize the rest of the notable families, and with them the whole of Palestinian society, is part of the self-criticism expressed by Palestinian historians who are not content with just blaming Israel for the Nakbah. The historical roots of this event—the essence of which is now the focus of Palestinian historiographical research—can be traced in this article.

Throughout the Ottoman period and until the early decades of the nineteenth century Jerusalem was regarded as an ordinary sanjak.¹ On the whole, it was part of the province

of *Sham* (Damascus) and subject to its governor. Its jurisdiction was limited to the Judean hills.² The coastal plains from Jaffa to Gaza formed administrative units of their own: the sanjaks of Gaza and Jaffa.³ Indeed, the sanjaks of central and southern Palestine were, until the nineteenth century, of marginal importance to the Ottomans; they contributed a small share to the expenses of the *Haj* caravan of Damascus.⁴ While the coastal areas functioned also as a bridge connecting Anatolia and Syria with Egypt, their governor was responsible for the safety of that part of the route. In the eighteenth century, due to the decline of law and order in the empire, those sanjaks were neglected and went through a period of substantial decline.⁵ In the nineteenth century, however, this situation changed radically. New challenges facing the Ottoman Government during that century aroused the need for reinforcement of Ottoman rule in the area. Consequently, the sanjaks of Jerusalem and Gaza acquired a renewed importance for the Ottoman authorities.

First of all, the international status of Jerusalem and indeed of Palestine as a whole began to rise. Religious revivals in England and America since the early nineteenth century, archaeological enthusiasm and a desire to study ancient and biblical history led to a stream of scholars and travellers who exposed the Holy Land to the Western reader. The use of steamers, moreover, made sea travel shorter and safer and travelling became easier and cheaper. Consequently, curiosity and devotion brought yearly a constantly increasing number of pilgrims and visitors from many Christian countries.⁶

In other words, the interest in Palestine grew substantially among the Christian peoples in the course of the nineteenth century. This interest manifested itself in the erection of new churches or in restoration of the old ones; in the building of convents and especially in missionary activities which led to the establishment of schools and hospitals in Jerusalem and other towns. Almost all the European powers took part in the drive to establish "a presence" in the country—perhaps, we might suggest, not without Ottoman blessing.⁷ Moreover, towards the end of the century, British commercial interests grew substantially as well as French economic investments.

Modern historiography points to a connection between the rise of European presence and interests in the country and the decision of the Ottoman Government to separate the sanjak of Jerusalem from the province of Syria and to constitute it as an independent sanjak subject directly to Istanbul.⁸ Thus Tibawi wrote: "...the complicated religious character of the city and the increased foreign interests in it...[were] among the considerations which brought about the change."⁹ Porath, on the other hand, saw this administrative measure as "rooted in the international interest in Jerusalem and the dispute between various Christian sects over rights to the holy places."¹⁰ Parkes regarded it as due to the "increasing European population drawn to the country which in 1889 included the first Jewish colonies."¹¹

Though there is a great deal to say in favor of these arguments, they are not fully convincing as the only, or the decisive causes which led the Porte to decide upon direct control over the sanjak of Jerusalem and southern Palestine. Such arguments err in regarding nineteenth-century regional history as simply a reflection of European interests and politics. Were this the case, then why was not the sanjak of Acre included? To state that the Porte established direct control over Jerusalem owing to considerations connected with European interests is only half the truth at best. These statements ignore the new political set-up which emerged in the area during the first half of the nineteenth

century and which, it is believed, was equally decisive in the formulation of Ottoman policy towards the sanjak of Jerusalem in the last few decades of the century.

An early facet of this policy could be illustrated by the special interest that Sultan Mahmud II showed in Jerusalem, its Muslim inhabitants and its sacred shrines. Extensive repairs and restorations were undertaken by the sultan in the Muslim holy places.¹² He tried, moreover, to foster ties with local notables. For instance, in 1813 he invited a Muslim dignitary of Jerusalem to Istanbul and received him as an honored guest.¹³ Perhaps this was an attempt on the part of the Sultan to improve his image in Muslim eyes. At a time when the Sultan was trying to have his assumption of the Caliphate widely accepted, such acts were, it seems, deemed necessary—especially since the holy places in the Hijaz had fallen to the Wahhabis and, after their reoccupation by Muhammad Ali Pasha of Egypt, had been kept under his control for almost thirty years. This special interest which the Ottoman sultans showed in Jerusalem continued under Mahmud's successors and indeed reached a climax in the later days of Abdulaziz and especially under Abdulhamid II.

But if the city of Jerusalem and its holy places started to acquire a prime importance in Ottoman eyes, the occupation of Syria by Muhammad Ali was a turning point in Ottoman policy towards Syria as a whole and towards the sanjak of Jerusalem in particular. Already in 1830, on the eve of Muhammad Ali's invasion, the sanjaks of Jerusalem and Nablus were transferred to the control of Abdullah Pasha, the governor of Acre.¹⁴ By this act, the whole of Palestine was united under Acre,¹⁵ which suggests that the Porte was working to reinforce the Syrian front in face of Muhammad Ali's ambitions.¹⁶

With the Ottoman restoration in 1841, the sanjak of Jerusalem began to enjoy a special status among the Palestinian sanjaks—long before foreign interests in Palestine became substantial. Its jurisdiction was widened to include the districts of Gaza and Jaffa (permanently) and the sanjak of Nablus (until 1858).¹⁷ Thus, for the first time in its history under the Ottomans, Jerusalem became the administrative center of central and southern Palestine. In the same year, the new sanjak was separated from the province of Damascus and put directly under Istanbul; a governor of high rank was nominated to govern it.¹⁸ But this arrangement was short lived. Again in 1854 at the time of the Crimean War, Jerusalem became an independent sanjak, and even was raised temporarily to the status of a province.¹⁹

In spite of the fact that Jerusalem became an important administrative center after 1841, the tendency at the Porte during the Tanzimat period was to keep it and its sanjak within the framework of the province of Damascus. Due to the struggle with Muhammad Ali, the leading Tanzimat statesmen gave priority, it seems, to the strengthening of Ottoman rule in Syria as a whole, including Jerusalem. Much of their policy in Syria after 1841, and indeed the intensity and nervousness which marked the application of the Tanzimat reforms, were apparently due to this intention.²⁰ But the events of 1860 in Damascus had shown them that to secure stronger Ottoman control over the country was in itself not enough. They felt that there was a need to reinforce internal consolidation and to lay the basis of social integration. Thus, with the application of the *vilayet* law of 1864, 'Ali and Fuad decided to unite the provinces of Damascus and Sidon (which included the former province of Tripoli) into one. The new province—called "Syria"—extended from south Aleppo to Akaba and from the Mediterranean Sea to the desert (Mt.

Lebanon excluded). ‘Ali appointed as its governor his protege, the capable and enlightened Mehmet Rāshid Pasha, who—for five and a half years—worked indefatigably for the internal integration of the provinces.²¹

However, the death of ‘Ali in September 1871 brought a basic change in this policy, as it did in much of what the Tanzimat statesmen represented. Mahmud Nedim, his successor as Grand Vezir, had his own ideas about reform, and about what policies were best needed to preserve the integrity of the empire.²² One of his first acts after his rise to power was to dismiss Mehmet Rāshid Pasha from the governorship of Syria. Later, in the summer of 1872, Nedim separated the sanjak of Jerusalem from the jurisdiction of Damascus, under which it had been for centuries, and constituted it as an independent sanjak subject directly to Istanbul.²³ For about two months even the sanjaks of Balka (Nablus) and Acre were added to it, and the three formed a province officially called “Kuds-i Şerif Eyaleti.”²⁴

This measure moved the British consul in Jerusalem to report of “the recent erection of Palestine into a separate eyalet.”²⁵ But no sooner did Mustafa Surayya Pasha, the new Vali, arrive in Jerusalem than he received a telegram that the two sanjaks of Nablus and Acre were rejoined to the province of Syria.²⁶ Thus Jerusalem with the districts of Gaza, Jaffa and Hebron only formed the “sanjak of Kudus.”²⁷ It stayed so until World War I.

No official explanation could be found as yet for this measure. We might assume, however, that Nedim sought means to reinforce Ottoman rule in the areas bordering Egypt. He apparently saw that, as an outpost on the border of Egypt, it would ultimately better serve Ottoman interests than to create an entity of Syria—for the emergence of Egypt as an autonomous state under a dynasty of its own brought with it, according to Bernard Lewis, a “rivalry between Ottoman Istanbul and Khedival Cairo which throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was an important element in Middle Eastern political life.”²⁸

Unable to undermine Egypt’s autonomy or install a friendly Khedive, the Porte prudently chose to strengthen its hold over the neighboring provinces.²⁹ Indeed, the Porte had more reason to do so in light of the (sometimes unveiled) ambitions of the Khedives to restore their influence in the adjacent areas lost by Muhammad Ali in 1841.

Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876–1909) was, it seems, of similar opinion to Nedim concerning the sanjak of Jerusalem, which he kept separate and subject directly to Istanbul. He took care, moreover, to choose honest, earnest and capable Ottoman governors to govern it.³⁰ By the late 1890s the Sultan started to suspect the intentions of Abbas II towards him. By then, indeed, the Sultan and the Viceroy were not at all on the best of terms.³¹ Thus, by the autumn of 1897, Abdulhamid began to send governors to Jerusalem from his own immediate entourage, in whom he apparently had more confidence.³²

In February 1898, three notables of Gaza, the mufti Hanafi Effendi al-Husayni, his brother Abdulhai and his son ‘Arif, were arrested and sent into exile in Anatolia. The British Consul in Jerusalem reported the possible connection between this act and the intended visit of the Viceroy to al-Arish:³³ “For fear of intrigue they were sent out of the way as the mufti has influence over a large section of the Arabs (Beduins),” he added.³⁴

A year later (1899) an *irade* was issued by the Sultan authorizing the establishment of the district of Beer Sheba into a *qadā’* to be governed by a *kaim-makam* (a district

officer).³⁵ The intention of the government, wrote an authority on Beer Sheba, was “to establish an administrative center on the Egyptian borders.”³⁶ In this way, the Sultan evidently intended to prevent intrigue and to put the Beduins of the Negev under tighter control. A new township (Bi’r al-Sabi’) was founded for that reason and its *kaim-makam* was raised to the rank of deputy *Mutassarreif* (governor of a sanjak).³⁷

The existence of the sanjak of Jerusalem for almost two generations as a separate entity from the other regions of Syria was of tremendous importance for the emergence of Palestine about fifty years later. It also did much to determine the character and future of Palestinian politics, and contributed to the emergence of Palestinian nationalism as distinct from Syrian-Arab nationalism.

But to be a separate administrative unit is not in itself sufficient to create an image with which the people identify more than with a greater pan-Syrian entity. This image emerged as a result of a combination of factors—partly religious (both for Christians and Muslims) as has been analysed by Yehoshua Porath.³⁸ But, above all, it came about due to the character of the administrative reforms applied by the Ottomans in the Tanzimat period, to social changes and other factors.

First of all, the Tanzimat reforms imposed a centralized system of government where formerly the shaikhs and chieftains of the Judean hills enjoyed a *de facto* local autonomy each in his own district. The new Ottoman administrative system brought about the destruction of their power and opened their districts, perhaps for the first time in many centuries, to government institutions run by officials who applied new laws and rules. Centralization not only brought uniformity but above all it established the domination of the city, especially of Jerusalem, over its hinterland. The countryside became more than ever dependent upon the city.

Now, in the city itself, the Tanzimat opened the way for the local notables and dignitaries to enhance their power and influence. They succeeded in dominating the provincial government to a considerable degree and through it the entire sanjak. Thus where formerly the notables of Jerusalem had not enjoyed any power over the countryside except perhaps a moral one,³⁹ in the course of the century they acquired great power and influence.⁴⁰ What has been said about Jerusalem could also be said about Gaza, Jaffa and Hebron.

Consequently, a small number of families in the urban centers of the sanjak, headed by those of Jerusalem, became the new political and social elite of the country and utilized the power put in their hands. The new Tanzimat laws eased their way to acquire lands or even whole villages cheaply. Their sons were sent to the higher institutions of learning in Istanbul. Returning half-Ottomanized, they held offices in the sanjak or in the neighboring districts, such as *kaim-makams*, judges, officials, police officers, inspectors, etc. For a hundred years this new elite dominated the country and held its fate in their hands.

It was perhaps unfortunate from the Palestinian point of view that this elite was divided into two rival factions—led by the Khalidis on the one hand and the Husaynis of Jerusalem on the other, with their respective followings throughout the urban centers of the sanjak.⁴¹ This division was not just competition for office, influence or gains, but above all had an ideological background—and, indeed, was part of the split which divided the Ottoman elite in the 1870s into two hostile camps over the system of

government of the state. Broadly speaking, the former—the Tanzimat supporters—regarded the ending of the Sultan’s arbitrary rule, the establishment of orderly government and the social and political integration of non-Muslims, as an absolute necessity for the preservation of the integrity of the empire; the latter believed that nothing should be done which might weaken or limit the powers of the Sultan and the domination of the Muslim element in the state.⁴²

The Khalidis of liberal outlook supported the first trend, represented in the 1870s by Midhat and Rashid Pasha and others. Shaikh Yasin, a senior member of the family, represented Jerusalem in the General Council of the province of Syria during the governorship of Rāshid Pasha. When Rashid was dismissed in 1871 “the position of most of his supporters who belonged to the Reform Party (*Hizb al-Islah*) was shaken.”⁴³ But the ousting of Mahmud Nedim from his second Grand Vezirate in 1876, and the deposition of Sultan Abdulaziz shortly thereafter by Midhat and his friends, resulted in the improvement of the position of the Khalidis. Yusuf Diyā’,⁴⁴ a brother of Yasin, was elected as the representative of Jerusalem in the first Ottoman parliament and, along with Nafi’ al-Jabiri of Aleppo and others, led the opposition to Sultan Abdulhamid’s government. Consequently, when parliament was suspended in 1878, he was among those ordered to leave Istanbul without delay.⁴⁵ In the early 1880s we find him in Vienna, teaching Arabic, and at the end of the decade as a governor of a Kurdish district in the *vilayet* of Bitlis. Having learned Kurdish, he wrote, significantly enough, a Kurdish-Arabic dictionary.⁴⁶ Yusuf Diyā’'s brothers and other members of the family were also employed throughout the Hamidian period in various provinces of the empire. In spite of a temporary restoration of some prestige to the Khalidis in the late 1890s,⁴⁷ it could be safely assumed that their power in Jerusalem declined with the fall of the Tanzimat statesmen at the end of the 1870s.⁴⁸

While the base of Khalidi power in Jerusalem was the *shar-‘ia* court—the chief clerkship of which passed through the family for a number of generations—the Husainis held the posts of the *Hanafī Mufti* and *Naqīb al-Ashraf* of Jerusalem almost uninterruptedly (especially the former) from the late eighteenth century.⁴⁹ By virtue of this they supervised Muslim religious life in the city. Having been in disfavor during Ibrahim Pasha’s rule, the Husainis managed to preserve their position, if not to strengthen it, in the Tanzimat period.⁵⁰ Generally of a conservative outlook, the Husainis, it seems, supported Sultan Abdulhamid and his policies. Consequently, they improved their fortunes and increased their power in the sanjak. During this period, they held two very influential posts in the city: that of the *Hanafī Mufti* and the head of the municipality. According to an observer, Selim Effendi al-Husayni—mayor for almost two decades—“occupies a high position in this city and exercises considerable influence over the mutessarif...[and had] a considerable influence at Constantinople.”⁵¹ Many other members of the family filled key posts in the administration of the sanjak. The twentieth century found the Husayni family in a dominant position—though not without rivals, particularly among the Nashashibis. The latter family started to gain prominence following the weakening of the Khalidis, and especially after the rise of the Young Turks.

To sum up: in the course of the forty to fifty years that preceded World War I, Jerusalem was emerging both as an administrative and a political center, similar to those of Damascus and Beirut. Indeed, the separation of Jerusalem and its sanjak from the rest

of Syria led the way for the emergence of a new polity. This development happened due to Ottoman policies in the area rather than as a result of advance planning. Even after the establishment of Mandatory Palestine through the joining of the sanjaks of Jerusalem, Nablus and Acre, Jerusalem held its primacy; yet, for a long time, there existed another two centers, Nablus and Acre (or Haifa), the notables of which were not always ready to take the lead of those of Jerusalem.

NOTES

Dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Uriel Heyd of Jerusalem.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial help rendered me by the University of Haifa for my research of this paper.

1 Sanjak was the traditional title of a subprovince in the Ottoman Empire. In the last few decades of the nineteenth century, the term *mutasarriflik* (Arabic *Mutasariffiyya*) was alternately used to denote the same administrative division. For the sake of convenience, we shall use in this paper the term sanjak only.

2 See A.Cohen, *Palestine in the Eighteenth Century* (Jerusalem 1973), p. 169.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 144ff.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 150f.

5 Cf. C.F.Volney, *Travels through Egypt and Syria* (New York 1798) II, pp. 183ff., 203f.; Cohen, pp. 171f.

6 D.S.Margoliouth, *Cairo, Jerusalem, and Damascus* (New York 1907), pp. 362ff.

7 Consul Moore, British Consul for about three decades in Jerusalem (see F.O. List of 1880, p. 150) expressed his astonishment “that the Russians and French should be able to obtain permission to build edifice after edifice (in Palestine) in rapid succession....” Moore-White, F.O. 195/1690, desp. 3, Jerusalem, 15 February 1890.

8 See below, note 23.

9 A.L.Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria* (London 1969), p. 181.

10 Y.Porath, *The Emergence of the Palestinian-Arab National Movement* (London 1974), p. 16.

11 J.Parkes, *A History of Palestine From 135 A.D. To Modern Times* (London 1949), p. 221.

12 M.Kurd All, *Khitat al-Sham*, 6 vols. (Damascus 1925–1928), V, p. 269; ‘A.al-‘Ārif, *Tarikh al-Haram al-Qudsi* (Jerusalem 1947), pp. 28f and 52; see also by al-‘Ārif, *al-Mufasssal fi Tarikh al-Quds* (Jerusalem 1961), pp. 306f and 504 (hereafter ‘Ārif, *al-Mufasssal*).

13 A.Cevdet, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, 12 vols., 2nd impression (Istanbul A.H. 1309), X, 111. That dignitary was shaikh Abu al-Su’ūd Effendi, after whose arrival in Istanbul the Sultan himself paid him a visit first because of the fatigue and old age of the shaikh; he died in Istanbul a few weeks later. (*Ibid.*)

14 I.al-Nimr, *Tarikh Jabal Nablus Wa’l balqa’*, vol. 1, 2nd impression (Nablus 1975), p. 310; see also an appendix by B.B.Hubaish in Shihabī, *Tarikh alUmara’ at-Shihabiyeen*, ed. A.Rustum and F.A.al-Bustani, 3 vols. (Beirut 1933), p. 800; A.Rustum, *al-Usul al ‘Arabiyya*, 5 vols. (Beirut 1930–1933), 1, pp. 23, 24f., and 30f.;

- Spyridon, ed., *Annals of Palestine 1821–1841* (Jerusalem 1938), p. 55 (stated mistakenly as 1831 instead of 1830); cf. also G.J.Koury, *The Province of Damascus 1783–1832*, a dissertation submitted to the University of Michigan in 1970, p. 188.
- 15 The districts of Jaffa and Gaza were then within the jurisdiction of Acre, the seat of the province of Sidon. See Ib. al-‘Awra, *Tarikh Wilayat Sulaiman Pasha al-‘Adil* (Saida 1936), pp. 388f.
- 16 In addition, the Ottomans were, since about 1827, reorganizing the fief holders in Syria and Palestine which constituted the local military forces. See Khoury, pp. 182f.; Rustum, *al-Mahfuzat at-Malakiyya al-Misriyya*, 4 vols. (Beirut 1940–1943), 1, pp. 74ff; al-Nimr, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 304; 11, pp. 210f. and 249ff.
- 17 Nimr, 1, p. 343; J.Finn, *Stirring Times*, 2 vols. (London 1878), 1, 161 f.
- 18 See a firman dated *Awasit Jumada al-Ula* 1257/1841—copy in register (*sijill*) no. 283 of the *Shari‘a* court of Jerusalem, p. 36; see also M.Maoz, *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine* (Oxford 1968), p. 33 n. 6.
- 19 *Ibid.*, pp. 122f.
- 20 For the application of the Tanzimat reforms in Syria between 1841–1861, see M.Maoz, *Ottoman Reform*.
- 21 For two short biographies of Rāshid Pasha, see *Sicill-i Osmani*, II, pp. 356–357; S.Faris (ed.), *Kanz al-Ragħia‘ib fi Munt akhabāt al-Jāwaib*, 7 vols. (Istanbul A.J. 1288–98), V, pp. 332–334. I am engaged at present in a study of Rāshid’s rule in Syria.
- 22 On Nedim’s Grand Vezirate, see R.Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton 1962), p. 280ff.
- 23 Some Arabic sources stated that this act took place in 1870. See, for example, Kurd Ali, *Khītat III*, p. 236; or in 1871, see *al-Muqtataf LII* (1918), p. 35; ‘Ārif, *al-Mufasssal*, p. 311; or simply “after 1870” as with Sarkis, *Tarikh Urshalim* (Beirut 1874), p. 192. However, the above date is based upon Moore-Elliot F.O. 195/994, desp. 6, Jerusalem, 27 July 1872; *Sicill-i Osmani*, 11, p. 621; *ha-Havatzet* (a Hebrew weekly that appeared in Jerusalem), II, no. 37 dated 12 July 1872; cf. M.A.Awad, *al-Idarah al-‘Uthmantiyya’ fi wilayat Suriyya 1864–1914* (Cairo 1969), p. 339. Modern historians such as Tibawi (p. 181) and Parkes (p. 221) stated without giving evidence that the act of separation took place in 1887 or 1889 respectively. This, it seems, is a common error as it is mentioned in other publications; see, for instance, the *Hebrew Encyclopedia* (Heb.), VI, p. 503. But the fact that it is repeated may give rise to the idea that the edict of 1872 was later cancelled and finally reimposed in 1887. It was not so. The *Salnames* (year books) of the central government of the following years which it was possible to check stated unequivocally that Jerusalem was “independently administered”; thus, the edict of 1872 was never cancelled. See the *Salnames* of A.M. 1291 (1874–75), 1292 (1875–76), 1296 (1878–79), 1297 (1879–80), 1299 (1881–82), 1301 (1883–84), 1302 (1884–85), 1303 (1885–86), 1304 (1886–87), 1305 (1887–88).
- 24 See Register no. 348 of the *Shari‘a* court of Jerusalem, pp. 211–12, an edict to the “Vali” of “Kuds-i Şerif eyaleti” dated 4 Jamada 1 1289; see also pp. 218 and 231.
- 25 Moore-Elliot, *ibid.*
- 26 See *Sicill-i Osmani* 11, p. 64.
- 27 The boundaries of the sanjak according to a dispatch of the British Consul in 1900 were defined as the following: It was bounded on the north by a line which may be said

- to run from the coast of the Mediterranean near the mouth of the river Auja [Yarkon] eastward...to the bridge over the Jordan near Jericho; on the south by a line drawn from the Mediterranean midway between Gaza and al-Arish to the town of Akaba; on the east by the river Jordan, the Dead Sea, and the valley running south...to Akaba and on the west by the Mediterranean. He added that it very nearly corresponded to the Roman province of Judea as distinguished from Samaria and Galilee. See Dickson-O'Connor, F.O. 195/2084, desp. 15, Jerusalem 11 May 1900.
- 28 B.Lewis, *The Middle East and the West* (London 1968), p. 52.
- 29 In addition to Jerusalem, the sanjak of Bengazi on the western border of Egypt was also made, according to one source, an independent sanjak at about the same time. See A.S.al-Dajani, *Libya Qabl al-Ihtilāl al-Itāli* (Cairo 1971), p. 199.
- 30 Such were Rauf Pasha who governed Jerusalem for almost 13 years (1877–1889) and Ibrahim Hakki Pasha (1890–1897), see Moore-White F.O. 195/1648, desp. 10, 6 May 1889; and Dickson-Currie, F.O. 195/1984 desp. 55, 8 November 1897.
- 31 L.Hirszowicz, “The Sultan and the Khedive 1892–1908” in *Middle Eastern Studies* VIII (1 972), pp. 287–311.
- 32 *Thamarāt al-Funun* , no. 1154, 8 November 1897, p. 3; Dickson-Currie, *ibid.*; Dickson-O'Connor, F.O. 195/2106, desp. 29, 15 May 1900; Dickson-O'Connor, F.O. 195/2175, desp. 46, 12 August 1904. This change took place two months after the first Zionist Congress in Basel in which it was decided upon “establishing for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine.” Whether there was a correlation between the two events is a matter for investigation.
- 33 Abbas II visited al-‘Arish early in March 1898 and reached up to the border marks near the township of Rafah. See N.Shuqair, *Tarikh Sinā* (Cairo 1916), p. 555.
- 34 Dickson-Currie, F.O. 195/2028, desp. 10, 1 March 1898 and enclosure. This story was confirmed to me by Mr. Hamdi al-Husayni whom I met in Gaza on 10 February 1977. He added that they were taken to Ankara where they spent 8 years during which Hanfi Effendi died and was buried there.
- 35 *Thamarāt al-Funun* , no. 1236, 26 June 1899, p. 3.
- 36 ‘A.al-‘Arif, *Tarikh B’ir al-Sabi’ wa Qabailiha* (Jerusalem 1934), p. 244. Dickson-O'Connor, F.O. 195/2062, desp. 43, 30 November 1899.
- 37 M.M.al-Dabbagh, *Biladuna Filastin*, vol. 1, part 2 (Beirut 1966), p. 382.
- 38 See Y.Porath, pp. 6ff.
- 39 Nimr, comparing between the positions of Nablus and Jerusalem *vis-à-vis* their countryside in the pre-Tanzimat period, stated that the Nablus families held the governorship, over the district but the Jerusalem notables “*Effendies*”—i.e., office holders such as *Qadis*, *Muftis*, and *Naqibs*, etc., had no power over the countryside but were divided among themselves along with the factional division in the district. See *Tarikh Jabal Nablus wa al-Balqā’*, vol. II(Nablus 1961), pp. 386ff; p. 405 n. 1, and vol. I, p. 343 n. 1.
- 40 See report of Ekrem Bey, Governor of Jerusalem between 1906–1908 in Israel State Archives (ISA), 83/11, undated.
- 41 Moore-Jocelyn, F.O. 195/1153, desp. 10, 14 April 1877; Dickson-Currie, F.O. 195/1984, desp. 7, 8 February 1897. See also G.Frumkin, *Derekh Shofet bi-Yerushaleim* (Heb.) (Tel Aviv 1954), pp. 282ff.

- 42 A.H.Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age* (London 1962), pp. 105 and 262.
- 43 Ruhi al-Khahdi, *al-Muqaddima fi al-Mas'alah al-Sharqiyya* (Jerusalem n.d.) p. i; on the outlook of the Khalidis, cf. 'Arif, *al-Mufassal*, p. 274.
- 44 On Diyā', see Zirikh, *al-A'lam*, 10 vols., 2nd ed. (Cairo 1954), IX, pp. 310–11 and X., p. 254; R.Devereux, *The first Ottoman Constitutional Period* (Baltimore 1963), p. 267 n. 40.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 148, 156, 166–7, 247–8.
- 46 *Al-Hadiyya al-Hamidiyya fi al-lughah al-Kurdiyya* (Istanbul A.H. 1310). See Kahhala, *Mu'jam al-Muallifin*, 15 vols. (Damascus 1957–61), XIII, pp. 330–1.
- 47 As a sign of that we find that Shaikh Yasin served in the late 1890s as a mayor of Jerusalem for a short while between two terms of a Husaini mayor. (See *Thamarāt al-Funūn*, no. 1204, 31 October 1898, p. 5); cf. Dickson-Currie, F.O. 195/1984, desp. 7, Jerusalem 8 February 1897.
- 48 On the Khalidi family in general, I had two fruitful talks in December 1976 with Mr. Haydar Kamil and Mr. Hazim Mahmud, two senior members of the Khalidis presently living in Jerusalem. To both of them my thanks are due.
- 49 According to the family tree of the Husainis, a copy of which is possessed by Mr. S.I.al-Husaini, presently living in Jerusalem.
- 50 The senior member of the family 'Umar, the *shaikh al-Haram* and a previous *Naqib al-Ashraf*, and *Tahir Effendi*, the Mufti, were exiled to Egypt in 1834 by Muhammad Ali. See Rustum, *al-Mahfuzat*, I, pp. 171, 188–9; 'Arif, *al-Mufassal*, pp. 281 and 284; Spyridon, p. 93; cf. also *Mahfuzat*, 11, p. 489.
- 51 Dickson-Currie, F.O. 195/1984, desp. 7, 8 February 1897. See also Frumkin, p. 283; Porath, pp. 13f.