

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426845

# THE ROLE OF THE AL-GHAZZAWĪ FAMILY IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE SHĀM HAJJ ROUTE IN THE AJLOUN SANJAK DURING THE 16TH CENTURY

Mohammad Bani Issa<sup>1\*</sup>, Ehab Zahir<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Al al-Bayt University, Mafraq, Jordan

Received: 25/10/2025  
Accepted: 17/01/2026

Corresponding Author: Mohammad Bani Issa  
(mbaniissa22@aabu.edu.jo)

## ABSTRACT

*This paper seeks to trace back the involvement of the Al-Ghazzawī family in the management and organization of the Shām Hajj Route from its origin in the 16th-century. Particular attention will be paid to the contribution of the Al-Ghazzawī family in the context of the Ottoman rule and governance in the Ajloun Sanjak. The paper is based on a descriptive-analytical approach, drawing on Ottoman archival sources such as the Mühimme Defterleri, imperial decrees, tahrir registers, and chronicles relevant to the subject under investigation. The primary sources have been chosen because of their thematic connection to the topic under discussion. In addition, they have been subjected to thorough cross-referencing to guarantee coherence and validity of information. The analysis of these materials has revealed the role played by the provincial elites in the process of Ottoman administration in terms of providing stable pilgrimage infrastructure through cooperation with the empire. The findings show that the members of the Al-Ghazzawī family were instrumental in securing the route against any potential threats due to their participation in the administration and protection of the Hajj Road. Moreover, their roles encompassed the provision of transport services to pilgrims and the maintenance of relations with the local tribes. Therefore, Kansuh Bey Al-Ghazzawī can be considered an example of negotiated governance, as the Ottoman authorities-maintained control over the Hajj routes through cooperation with local elites. As a result, it can be concluded that Ottoman governance of the Shām Hajj Road in the Arab provinces was based on a system of negotiated hegemony. This type of governance reflects the organized nature of interactions between the imperial authority and the provincial elites, which contributed to efficient administration and stability of the route.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** Provincial governance, Ottoman Levant, Shām Hajj Route, frontier administration, tribal mediation, archival historiography, caravan organization, shared sovereignty.

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This study will investigate the administrative, security and socio-political roles of the Al-Ghazzawī family in the Ajloun Sanjak in the sixteenth century. The study examines the mediating role of this family group between local tribes and the Ottoman Court. The study illustrates the way in which Imperial Authority is Localized in these regions through cooperation, patronage, and pragmatic governance. Conceptually, this study is primarily grounded in Hourani's (1968) "politics of notables" framework, while frontier and center-periphery models are used as complementary analytical approaches. The study draws upon Registers of the Mühimme Defter, Decrees of the Imperial Court and Contemporary Chronicles to demonstrate how the Al-Ghazzawī family contributed to ensuring the Safety of Pilgrims and Stabilizing Regional Stability on the Shām Hajj Route within the Provincial Framework of the Empire.

The security of pilgrims and the integrity of the pilgrimage route are contingent upon the allegiance of tribes and the watchfulness of the local Emirs," wrote Sultan Selim II in his Imperial Decree to the Governor of Damascus in 978 A.H./1571 C.E. While this Decree demonstrates the Political Power of the Sultan and Confirms Ottoman Control over the Shām Hajj Route, it was not simply a Transportation Route for Religious Pilgrims. The Shām Hajj Route served as an Imperial Route connecting all aspects of Imperial Policy including Social, Political and Religious aspects. Katip Çelebi (1632), an Ottoman Geographer, noted that "Pilgrimage and Commerce Routes are arteries of Empires" noting both Sacred Pathways and Administrative Lifelines for Imperial Territories. Although the Sham Hajj route is an essential religious and political artery of the Ottoman Empire, the majority of scholarly work on this subject is based upon general administrative/symbolic assessments. Key frameworks for examining elite mediation as well as imperial organization were developed by Albert Hourani's study of the politics of notables (Hourani 1968) and Suraiya Faroqhi's work on Ottoman pilgrimage administration (Faroqhi 1994; 2005). Studies by Jane Hathaway (Hathaway 2008) and Bruce Masters (Masters 2016) also showed that provincial dynamics played a large role in the manner in which the Ottomans governed their Arab provinces. However, very little micro-historically focused research exists regarding individual families, and regional bureaucratic dynamics within the eastern Jordanian territories that constituted a significant land corridor between Damascus and the Hijaz. Comparative cases such as

the Tuqān family of Nablus and the 'Azm family of Damascus suggest similar patterns of elite mediation, yet these models have not been systematically applied to the Ajloun region. Ottoman provincial administration and pilgrimage organization have been studied historically through two interrelated historiographic traditions: the sociology of local elites and the administrative history of the Hajj. In his seminal article "The Politics of Notables," Albert Hourani (Hourani 1968) argued that, ultimately, imperial authority rested in its ability to cooperate with local elites who mediated between central structures and provincial structures. Subsequent studies by Dina Rizk Khoury (Khoury 1997), and Jane Hathaway (Hathaway 2008) built upon Hourani's argument, demonstrating how patronage, taxation, and negotiation defined provincial authority. These studies further highlighted that the extent to which imperial power could be exercised effectively rested on the degree of cooperation between the imperial center and local families, a dynamic represented by the Al-Ghazzawi household in Ajloun. This model however has rarely been applied to south Bilad al-Sham (Jordan), with research being primarily focused on tribal dynamics or later reform efforts rather than elite agency during the sixteenth century. The purpose of this chapter is to identify the Hajj's role as an important tool for demonstrating the Ottoman Empire's legitimacy both politically and spiritually. Feroqhi has identified the networks of pilgrims connecting metropolitan cities with provincial towns based on systems of finance, security and faith (Feroqhi, 1994; 2004). Similarly, İpşirli (2000) and Hanna (2011) demonstrate how the route of the Hajj was a mechanism of integration for governing the empire. While these authors have looked at major cities including Damascus, Cairo and Mecca, they have not given enough attention to smaller towns such as Ajloun and Karak. Authors describing Jordan as being in the "periphery" or as a "frontier zone" include Eugene Rogan (1999; 2009), Raouf Sa'd Abujaber (1989), and Mundy and Saumarez Smith (2007). They all agree that in the periphery of the empire imperial authority is exercised indirectly through tribal and local middlemen. According to Rogan, Transjordan can be described as a "frontier of the empire", as its legitimacy is dependent on mediators between the imperial law and local customs. An example of a family that mediated between the two are the Al-Ghazzawī. Although these studies provide valuable information about the periphery of the empire, there still exists a lack of understanding of how families such as the Al-Ghazzawī interacted with government

entities and other elite families in managing pilgrimages in 16th century Ottoman Jordan. By focusing on a micro-historical case study, this research contributes to broader historiographical debates by linking local administrative practices with wider patterns of Ottoman provincial governance. This study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. What were the administrative and security roles played by the Al-Ghazzawī family in the 16th century regarding the governance of the Ajloun Sanjak?
2. How did the Ottoman authorities use local elite families like the Al-Ghazzawī family as part of their larger network for administering pilgrimage and maintaining regional security?
3. To what extent did political conflict, tribal alliance, and regional politics influence the management of the Shām Hajj Route?
4. How did Kansuh Bey Al-Ghazzawī's leadership contribute to developing institutions and sustaining long-term stability for pilgrimage caravan travel?
5. How did cooperation among the Al-Ghazzawī family and Ottoman officials sustain the religious, economic and political importance of the Shām Hajj Route?

## 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is an analytical-descriptive historic study that examines the role of the Al-Ghazzawi family as an administrative-security institution in the Ajloun Sanjak during the sixteenth-century via a critical analysis of both primary Ottoman archival documents and secondary literature relevant to this subject. The study adopts a source-critical analytical approach, with elements of microhistorical interpretation, to reconstruct the role of local actors within predominantly state-produced records. The primary source materials upon which the research relied include all official Ottoman documents, especially the Mühimme Defterleri (Registers of Important Matters) along with imperial orders; the letters written by governors; and decrees issued from the Sublime Porte. These sources were selected based on their direct relevance to the administration of the Shām Hajj Route, references to the Ajloun Sanjak, and evidence of interaction between imperial authorities and local elites. These combined sources provided insight into how the administrative systems for the Shām Hajj Route functioned, while also illustrating the framework for the relationships between local powers under the Ottoman System.

The Mühimme Defterleri are considered among the

most organized and reliable of Ottoman archives. They were created at the Imperial Chancery, and record the discussions and decisions of the Imperial Council (Dīvān-ı Hümāyūn). Decrees issued by the Imperial Council included directives sent to provincial governors, military officers and judges throughout the entire empire. Therefore, they provide detailed information regarding government practices, tax policy, organizing pilgrimages, and maintaining security at a provincial level. Although these sources are predominantly an administrative view from the "top-down," and therefore important for understanding what the State prioritized, challenged, and intervened into – to counterbalance some of the shortcomings of the research – the study will use a critical reading methodology, which interprets the documents beyond their intended meaning – in order to find evidence of how local agents acted upon, negotiated politically with, or otherwise responded to the State's directives. This critical reading is applied systematically through thematic categorization of documents (administration, security, taxation, and tribal relations) and cross-referencing between multiple archival entries to identify patterns of continuity and variation. By using this methodology, it is possible to infer indirectly about the roles of local actors – specifically, the Al-Ghazzawī family – whose influence is typically implied but not stated explicitly in many of the archives consulted.

A third consideration for selecting Mühimme Defterleri and imperial correspondence as the primary source base for this project relates to the type of administrative data that can be inferred directly from them. They contain information related to the Ottoman government's organizational structure as it pertained to the Ajloun Region -- including its security arrangements; appointments; and the organization of pilgrimage caravans. As well, they provide ample opportunity for detailed chronological reconstructions of major political events – from the initial establishment of Ottoman control in the area through to the emergence of Kansuh Bey Al-Ghazzawī. Since both types of documentation are contemporary, they allow researchers to track changes in Ottoman administrative priorities and governing strategies over time. This study also relies upon other primary sources – such as tahrir defterleri (tax registers); chronicles by Ibn Tulun and al-Ghazi; and contemporary academic histories of the region. The additional materials contribute to contextualizing socially, economically and geographically aspects of history; thereby providing a fuller and more

equitable representation of historical events. All of the sources used in this study have been thoroughly examined and organized by theme, including pilgrimage route development; tribal relations; taxation; and military administration. The researcher cross-checked multiple archive registrations in each case to determine whether there was consistency and/or continuity among administrative policies. This process of cross-verification enhances the reliability of the findings and reduces the risk of relying on isolated or prescriptive archival entries. While valuable, the *Mühimme Defterleri* have limitations inherent in being created as an official/prescriptive document. Primarily, they represent what the Ottoman government wished to accomplish versus the realities experienced by those who participated in the Hajj. In order to address these deficiencies, the study utilizes the archiving process along with other forms of scholarly literature written during the same period (contemporary chronicles/secondary literature) in conjunction with one another. While the archived collection does not comprise all available documentation regarding interactions between imperial power and local autonomy in 16th century Jordanian territory, it represents the largest body of documentation to date that examines these relationships.

### 3 RESULTS

The study of Ottoman records and documents show how the Al-Ghazzawi family progressively developed their position as key figures in regulating and overseeing the Shām Hajj Route through mutual cooperation, combined resources and cooperative agreement. The research has identified a very extensive system of relations between the Ottoman government and provincial elite in Ajloun which were established by gradual stages of administrative accommodation and partnerships. In the early part of the 16th century, letters exchanged by the Ottomans indicate that Ajloun was at first a disputed border area in which the Al-Ghazzawi family and many other local families resisted Ottoman imperialism in order to protect their own regional self-government. After the Ottoman took control of the Levant, Jan Burdi al-Ghazali (died 1521 CE / 921 AH) was made governor over an area including most of modern-day Jordan in 1517 CE/ 923 AH. He had difficulty maintaining control over this territory because it included many tribes who opposed him; he declared himself independent from the Ottoman Empire in 1518 CE / 924 AH. (Al-Nimr, 1938, p. 25. There are contemporary accounts from authors such as İdris-i Bitlisi's *Heşt Behişt* which show how important the

Syrian and Ajloun area were to the Ottoman empire by documenting the impact of these events to integrate them into the Ottoman Empire (Serdar, 2016), and the *Selīm-nâme* is a detailed account of Sultan Selim I's rapid military responses to suppress the revolt (Mustafa, 1990). In the end, the revolt was crushed and Iyas Pasha reestablished control over the region with punishment of local elite families including the al-Tarabay family (Öksüz, 2016; Emecen, 1993). Milwright (2008) has noted that the efficient use of tax revenue and military assets in the Ajloun area created conditions in which cooperation could be developed between the Ottoman state and regional elites. Subsequent to that, the Ottomans transitioned towards a conciliatory approach toward local leadership and incorporated local leaders rather than removing them. The selection of Muhammad Sa'īd Al-Ghazzawī is an example of this balance of imperial authority versus tribal autonomy (Al-Shuqairat, 2017, pp. 24-25; BOA, E.8120). As members of the Ghazzawī tribe had both Arab and Bedouin ancestry, their territorial identity reinforced their influence within the region (El-Atrūz, 2014); and subsequent accounts identify other prominent members of the family including Beşir al-Gazzawī and Emir Sheikh Bishr Al-Ghazawi (El-Ra'y, no date given; al-Manasir, 2014). This initial inclusion is representative of the early development of an Ottoman governance model that would rely upon cooperative or negotiating partnerships where local elites provided support to imperial authority in exchange for official acknowledgment and legitimacy.

At the pinnacle of this cooperative effort was the organizational effort of the family's financing and logistical support for Hajj caravans. Under Kansuh Bey Al-Ghazzawī (c. 1564-1574 CE) who led the family's efforts to create a vast logistics and resupply system – including water reservoirs and rest stops – from Muzayrib to Aqaba along the Hajj caravan routes. The 12th *Mühimme Defteri* details the 1570 caravan – the largest of the century – documenting how camels were distributed, where water would be provided, and what military escorts would be assigned to protect these massive caravans (OAB, 1996, pp. XVII, 107-108; A.DVNS.MHM. d.00012/355). This is an example of "cooperative architecture," which combined both imperial direction and local administration. Imperial funding and local revenue were shared through decrees that authorized state funds to be disbursed and markets to contribute toward funding (A.DVNS.MHM. d.00023; A.DVNS.MHM. d.00025), thus providing the Hajj economy with a significant element of cooperative government.

It can be seen, based on a sultan's decree (A.DVNS.MHM. d.00056/375), that the Ottomans provided incentives for local leadership and military service personnel through timars and monetary rewards for their protection of the hajj route. It is evident that, in addition to being a religious duty, the protection of the hajj route had also become a contractual relationship; thus, it strengthened the power of the Al-Ghazzawī family and encouraged the wider regional population to participate. According to İnalçık and Quataert (2000) this practice reflects the fusion of fiscal incentives with religious obligations inherent within the Ottoman social economic model. Hence, the authority of the provinces would eventually come to be reliant upon the support and maintenance of the Hajj Route, creating a structure of mutually supportive or shared sovereignty.

Additionally, stability within this framework was maintained via organizational and administrative functions of the military. Within the Mühimme Defterleri (registers 3rd-7th) there are numerous commands for the repair of fortifications, deployment of additional janissarie troops in Ajloun, Kerak and Shawbak, and to utilize imperial resources to organize troop deployments. In 1552, Kansuh Bey was permitted to use imperial monies for the organization and restoration of fortifications. In addition to these actions, between 1560 and 1565 several orders were issued requiring that each year sixty janisseries from Damascus rotate annually along the hajj route. Each order included specific stipulations concerning how payments and disciplinary action should occur (3rd Register Mühimme Defteri numbers 1436 - 1437). Such actions allowed for continued militarized presence along the route. Previous imperial orders contained in the Topkapi Palace Archives (Mühimme Defteri nr. 888, pages 195 - 196, 210) indicate Sultan Suleiman appointed Kansuh Bey as governor over the Karak-Shawbak Sanjak and reinforced him with three hundred janisseries which indicated that he formally integrated the Al-Ghazzawī family into the empire's administrative hierarchical structure.

Kansuh Bey's governance of pilgrimage operations was marked by innovative methods of administrative organization and increasing formalized structures for managing pilgrimage activities. Kansuh Bey was given decrees to oversee joint taxation, camel supplies and appointing the Amir-al-Hajj. The decree of 25 RAMADAN 978 AH / FEBRUARY 2, 1571 C.E., ordered that Kansuh Bey should collaborate with the Bani-Na'im tribe in providing camels and water under direct supervision from the sultanate. This is

indicative of the Ottoman Empire's use of centralized policies adapted to the needs of local regions through cooperative negotiation. Despite the level of influence they held, the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the Al-Ghazzawī family was slowly eroded. The 35TH MUHIMME DEFTERI (986 AH / 1578 C.E.) reports that the Sultan had expressed concern over the appointment of Ahmad and Suleiman as sons of Kansuh Bey. Initially, Kansuh Bey was put under house arrest but then reinstated as Amir-al-Hajj (A.DVNS.MHM. d.000509/60). Following the initial decrees (990-997 AH / 1582-1589 C.E.), subsequent decrees would limit his jurisdiction even further, transferring military responsibility to Ottoman administrators (A.DVNS.MHM. d.00064/98) while representing a careful balance of regional authority and imperial control.

The economic dimension of this administrative model can be seen in archival documents that record tax revenue. Commercial traffic generated along the Hajj Route generated commerce in Ajloun, Al-Salt, and Karak where the Al-Ghazzawī family were responsible for collecting taxes on goods and market transactions (BOA, TD 970, p. 82; TD 266, pp. 117-145; TD 185, pp. 90-99). Tax receipts collected from these routes provided financial support for military expenses and infrastructure maintenance and converted the administration of the Hajj into both an obligation of religion and an economic venture. Although the influence of the family began to decline during the first half of the seventeenth century due to centralization and intra-family conflict, imperial archives indicate that the route remained important. Orders contained within OAB, 91 MUHIMME DEFTERI (1056-1057 AH / 1646-1647 C.E., No. 131) stressed the need to maintain the Ajloun-Karak-Shawbak corridor.

By the late sixteenth/early seventeenth centuries, the authority of the Al-Ghazzawī family declined, however, this decline is evident in their administrative difficulties in terms of dismissals. For example, after Mansur ibn Farah was dismissed from his position (OAB, 69 Mühimme Defteri, 1000-1001 AH / 1591-1592, Nos. 20, 23), although the provision of infrastructure and logistic services continued. The family's role in the supply of caravans continues to be shown through later orders (OAB, 78 Mühimme Defteri, 1018 AH / 1609, Nos. 88, 1869; OAB, 75 Mühimme Defteri, 1013 AH / 1605, No. 558). In these documents, we can see that the Ottoman administration continued to rely on local middlemen to support their logistical operations along the Shām Hajj Route for at least the first decade or so of the seventeenth century.

#### 4 DISCUSSION

The Ottoman archives, particularly the Mühimme Defterleri, indicate that the relationship between the Central Authority and Al-Ghazzawi Family in Ajloun developed into a formal partnership based on political negotiation, financial coordination, and administrative integration. Rather than indicating total domination, these relations defined a flexible system of government which was able to adapt to changing political and regional circumstances. From 1565-74, the Ottomans transferred their control over the Sham Hajj Route from military coercion to administrative collaboration. This transformation took place through Imperial Decrees delegating the Emir of Ajloun responsibility for route protection, resource collection and infrastructure management (A.DVNS.MHM. d.0005/211; A.DVNS.MHM. d.00018/52). Faroqui (1994) refers to this as "the bureaucratization of piety", where religious duties are taken up in the official administrative structures. Through his double function as both local authority and representative of the Empire, Kansuh Bey Al Ghazzi exemplifies this model through his integration of public works financing and negotiating for resources while remaining responsible to the central administration. These examples illustrate the broader theme of "centralization through partnership" where elites at the provincial level were integrated into governance. The obligations that were placed upon the Emir of Ajloun – providing camels, financial assistance and fortifications – also demonstrate how institutionalized this cooperation was. Additionally, Feroqhi (1994) points out that these types of agreements established a structure for how the fiscally-based and religio-based responsibilities of governance would be intersected under the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, there is evidence that tribal groups have been integrated into this cooperative model. Patronage by the Ottomans of individuals such as Sheikh Hujjam (985 AH / 1577 CE; 30 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri, No. 756), indicates that the Ottomans strategically employed incentives in order to elicit loyalty and maintain stability at the various sites of pilgrimage. Hourani's (1968) "politics of notables," describes how elite provincial leaders serve as mediators between local societies and imperial authority. In the case of Ajloun, the alliance of the Al-Ghazzawī family and the tribe provided logistical co-ordination and reinforced Ottoman presence in the area without necessitating continuous military presence. The focus on economic incentives rather than coercive measures illustrates the practical nature of Ottoman administration,

wherein fiscal union supports political stability.

The continued rule of the Al-Ghazzawī family is indicative of the "provincial corporatist" model that Khoury (1997) described. He claimed that a style of governance in peripheral areas such as the Jordan Valley could be sustained by long term family ties and the regional experience. That said, it is clear from the records of the 35th Mühimme Defteri (986 AH/1578 CE) relating to the appointment of Kansuh Bey's sons; Ahmad and Suleiman, that the Ottomans preferred administration based upon established heredity within their frontier zones. Nonetheless, the conditions placed upon this type of autonomy are quite specific. For example, the short-term detention of Kansuh Bey, along with the limits subsequently put upon his administrative power clearly demonstrate how the Ottoman Empire sought to maintain an appropriate level of centralized oversight over their autonomous provinces. The latter portion of Kansuh Bey's tenure serves as an example of how autonomy and control may be at odds. While he was temporarily detained by Sultan Murad III for a period of time, he returned to his position as Amir al-Hajj (A.DVNS.MHM. d.000509/60). This is indicative of the limited scope of the Sultan's trust in him. Salibi (1998) views this type of development within the framework of the overall trend toward increased centralization from the end of the sixteenth century to the beginning of seventeenth century, during which the ability of provinces to act independently was systematically diminished. However, it should also be noted that there are continuing examples of local leaders being utilized by the Ottoman government, and therefore remaining key to maintaining effective governance. In respect to the pattern which has been discerned, it appears to resonate with Hathaway's (2008) "negotiated hegemony" concept. This is the lens adopted for this study through which to view the dynamics of imperial power and provincial actors' driver to negotiate them. In Hathaway's view, you have a negotiated hegemony, where the constant negotiation between the imperial state and the various forms of local representation is what allowed the imperial-maintained power to exist rather than its will being forced on them. The long role of the Al-Ghazzawī family across military, administrative, and logistical functions shows that Ottoman rule in Ajloun was premised upon a form of shared sovereignty. Through the collaborative administration of the Empire's pilgrim routes, the Empire was able to create religious legitimacy (through pilgrimage), coordinate economic activity and integrate social networks among the

communities located along the Shām Hajj Route. As such, the case of Ajloun illustrates that while Ottomans governed frontier zones using centralized administrative structures, they still used mechanisms for cooperation that both maintained central authority and allowed for local agency. Ultimately, the Shām Hajj Route was more than simply a religious route; it became an administrative-political structure that converted local loyalty into imperial stability through collaborative negotiations.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

The development of the Sham Hajj route during the 16th and early 17th century, indicates that Ottomans ability to maintain influence/control over the Levant was heavily reliant on their relationship with the regional elite by forming mutually beneficial alliances. As such, the Al Ghazzawi family of the Ajloun Sanjak is an example of how these types of relationships functioned within the framework of administration, logistics and tribal coordination, thus maintaining security for the southern border of the Empire and ensuring safe passage for pilgrims. The Al-Ghazzawī family's power declined significantly over time due to a series of internal conflicts that included the involvement of Emir Fakhr al-Din al-Ma'nī, Ahmad Pasha and the Al-Ghazzī family particularly Hamdan ibn Kansuh and Bishr. These internal conflicts were occurring at the same time that the Ottoman Empire was consolidating their authority throughout the region. (al Manasir, 2014; al Bakhit, 1989) Although the Al-Ghazzawī family had lost much of its authority, it continued to play an important role as an intermediary for regional and external interests. This also meant that the family would continue to have significant influence into the future. For example, Emir Sheikh Bishr al-Ghazzawī was influential in late 19th and early 20th century Jordan (Muhammed el-Manasir, 2014; al-Manasir, 2014).

The data also indicates that in addition to maintaining regional security for the community, the Al-Ghazzawī family fostered and promoted the growth of social and economic activities by developing defenses, water distribution systems, and roadways. Together with the Ottoman Empire they created a mutually supportive relationship using the power of the empire to support their role as local authorities. This model is reflective of "negotiated hegemony" as described by Hathaway (2008), where

regional leaders had a degree of autonomy while simultaneously reinforcing centralized authority. In terms of structure, the Shām Hajj Route served as both a religious route and a comprehensive network of commerce and administration. It acted as a corridor linking religious, commercial and political networks; it exemplified a model of decentralized integration, in which local governance structures were maintained within an overarching imperial framework. From a broader historiographical perspective, this dissertation contributes to work on Ottoman provincial history with a different sort of micro-historical analysis of some of the same questions of state-local relations in a frontier region. The story of the Al-Ghazzawī connects the macro-level sense of imperial governance common to Faroqhi and Hourani with localized processes of negotiation and authority formation. Comparison with other provincial families like the Tuqān of Nablus or the 'Azm of Damascus might also further elucidate some of the variations in techniques of governance around the empire. Interdisciplinary approaches utilizing geographic studies, digital cartography, and economic history would also be fruitful in unpacking some of how the imprint of the Shām Hajj Route on settlement patterns, trade, and cultural exchange manifests itself especially in early modern Bilād al-Shām. In the end, the experience of the Al-Ghazzawī demonstrates the dependence of the Ottomans on adaptive governance through which the integration of local elites into its broader structures is reflected in the process of sustaining political stability and bureaucratic continuity along one of the most important religious and strategic corridors of the empire.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, M.B.I. and E.Z.; methodology, M.B.I.; formal analysis, M.B.I. and E.Z.; investigation, M.B.I. and E.Z.; resources, M.B.I.; data curation, M.B.I.; writing—original draft preparation, M.B.I.; writing—review and editing, E.Z.; supervision, E.Z. Every author has reviewed and consented to the final version of the manuscript

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to extend their thanks to their respective universities for their invaluable support and for creating an environment conducive to conducting this research.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Gazzi, E. A. D. M. ibn M. (1997) *El-Kevākibu's-Sāire*. 3 vols. Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya.  
Al-Nimr, I. (1938) *Tārīkh Jabal Nāblus wa al-Balqā'*. Damascus.

- Al-Shuqairat, A. S. (2017) *Tārīkh al-Idāra al-‘Uthmāniyya fī Sharq al-Urdun, 1864–1918*. Amman, Wizārat al-Thaqāfa.
- Çelebi, K. (1632) *Cihannümâ*. Matbaa-ı Âmire, Boyut Yayın Grubu.
- El-Atrüz, Y. (2014) “Raden ‘alâ Kamhâvî.” Available online: <https://2u.pw/u1rQJsTI> (accessed April 10, 2014).
- El-Ra’y (n.d.) “Abvâb: Beşir el-Gazzâvî.” Available online: <https://2u.pw/0g99z99h>.
- Emecen, F. (1993) “Canbirdi Gazâlî.” *Diyanet İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 7, 141–143.
- Ibn Tulun, M. ibn T. al-S. (2002) *Şafahât al-Mafkûdât*. Damascus, Dār al-Awā’il.
- İnalcık, H. and Quataert, D. (2000) *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi, 1300–1600*. Vol. 1. Istanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Jordan Heritage (n.d.) “Jordan in the late Islamic era – part one: 1389–1656 CE.” Available online: [https://www.jordanheritage.jo/researches/activities-heritage/late-islamic-era-part1/#\\_edn13](https://www.jordanheritage.jo/researches/activities-heritage/late-islamic-era-part1/#_edn13).
- Milwright, M. (2008) *Karak in the middle Islamic period (1100–1650)*. Boston.
- Muhammed el-Manasir (2014) “Emir Sheikh Bishr Al-Ghazawi (1855–1945).” Available online: <https://www.ammonnews.net/article/188923> (accessed April 10, 2014).
- Mustafa, C. (1990) *Selîm-nâme*. Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Öksüz, M. (2016) *Şam Eyaleti’nin Güney Sancaklarında (Filistin) Nüfus XVI. yy*. PhD diss., Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi, Istanbul.
- Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry (n.d.) *Mühimme Defteri*, A.DVNS.MHM.d.00012/355. Istanbul, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi.
- Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry (n.d.) *Mühimme Defteri*, A.DVNS.MHM.d.00023. Istanbul, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi.
- Salibi, K. (1998) *The modern history of Jordan*. London, I.B. Tauris.
- Serdar, M. T. (2016) “İdris-i Bitlisî ve Heşt Behişt eseri.” *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 498.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA).
- BOA (n.d.) *Tapu Tahrir Defteri*, TD 970 Numaralı Mufassal Tapu Tahrir Defteri.
- BOA (n.d.) *Tapu Tahrir Defteri*, TD 266 Numaralı Mufassal Tapu Tahrir Defteri.
- BOA (n.d.) *Tapu Tahrir Defteri*, TD 185 Numaralı Mufassal Tapu Tahrir Defteri.
- BOA (n.d.) *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi*, E.8120.
- BOA (n.d.) *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi*, *Mühimme Defteri*, nr. 888, 195–196, 210.
- BOA (n.d.) *Bab-ı Asaflı Divan-ı Hümayun Sicilleri Mühimme Defteri (A.DVNS.MHM)*: A.DVNS.MHM.d.00018; 00018/52; 00023; 00025; 00040/113; 603–606; 00052/526; 00056/375; 00060/253; 00064/98; 00064/156; 00064/250; 00064/252; 00067/390; 00067/453; 000509/60.
- BOA (n.d.) *Mühimme Defteri (BOA. MHM)*:
- OAB, 2 Mühimme Defteri (963 AH / 1555), no. 584.
- OAB, 3 Mühimme Defteri (966–968 AH / 1558–1560), nos. 1294, 1436–1438, 1455.
- OAB, 5 Mühimme Defteri (972 AH / 1564–1565), no. 1433.
- OAB, 6 Mühimme Defteri (973 AH / 1565–1566), no. 105.
- OAB, 7 Mühimme Defteri (975–976 AH / 1567–1569), nos. 29, 1501, 1506.
- OAB, 9 Mühimme Defteri (977–978 AH / 1569–1570), nos. 27, 66.
- OAB, 10 Mühimme Defteri (978–979 AH / 1570–1571), no. 563.
- OAB, 12 Mühimme Defteri (978–979 AH / 1570–1572), nos. 78, 355, 361, 366, 423, 858, 924.
- OAB, 14 Mühimme Defteri (981–982 AH / 1573–1574), nos. 1152, 1516.
- OAB, 23 Mühimme Defteri (982–983 AH / 1573–1574), no. 443.
- OAB, 26 Mühimme Defteri (981 AH / 1574), no. 420.
- OAB, 29 Mühimme Defteri (984 AH / 1576), no. 11.
- OAB, 30 Mühimme Defteri (985 AH / 1577), no. 756.
- OAB, 33 Mühimme Defteri (985–986 AH / 1577–1578), nos. 75/153, 75/154, 79/160.
- OAB, 35 Mühimme Defteri (986 AH / 1578), no. 589.
- OAB, 39 Mühimme Defteri (987–988 AH / 1579–1580), nos. 376, 378–379.
- OAB, 40 Mühimme Defteri (987 AH / 1579), no. 609.
- OAB, 43 Mühimme Defteri (988 AH / 1580), no. 161.
- OAB, 45 Mühimme Defteri (989 AH / 1581), no. 1799.
- OAB, 47 Mühimme Defteri (990 AH / 1582), nos. 37, 74, 187, 188, 272.

- OAB, 69 Mühimme Defteri (1000–1001 AH / 1591–1592), nos. 20, 23.  
OAB, 75 Mühimme Defteri (1013 AH / 1605), no. 558.  
OAB, 78 Mühimme Defteri (1018 AH / 1609), nos. 88, 1869.  
OAB, 91 Mühimme Defteri (1056–1057 AH / 1646–1647), no. 131.