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ABSTRACT

The Ottoman Province of Damascus in the 16th century comprised a number of liwaʾs (liwaʾ = sanjak). This thesis deals mainly with the liwaʾ of Damascus as a case study. Other liwaʾs are mentioned in this connection in as much as they concern and clarify the general picture. Prescribed limitations prevent full discussion of others. The thesis is composed of seven chapters, each of which deals with certain aspects of the history of the province.

The first chapter is concerned with local events prevailing between the Ottoman conquest 922/1516 and the suppression of al-Ghazālī’s rebellion in 927/1521.

In the second chapter administrative divisions and demography of the liwaʾ during the first three quarters of the sixteenth century are defined. The study shows that the nahiya was the basic administrative unit and records periods of increase in the numbers of the population followed by sharp decline.

The structure of Ottoman administration is the subject of chapters three to five. The first of them outlines the function of the governor as responsible for the maintenance of law and order and for the leadership of the military force whenever called upon. It emphasises his responsibility for the despatch and safe return of the pilgrimage caravan of Damascus. This was assisted by military units distributed throughout the province and housed in fortresses, augmented by the subsidiary forces of timar-holders. All these contingents assisted the Sultan in his wars with Persia, in the Yaman and against Cyprus in addition to their use in the suppression of rebellions. The forces grouped themselves into factions. As they also engaged in trade and industry, the factions vied with each other to win the support of local chieftains.
The administration of justice was the province of the Chief Judge and his deputies from the four madhhabahs. They comprised some of the local population in addition to Ottoman personnel. There were several courts in Damascus and also one court functioned in each of the cities of Ba'aklabakk, Bayrut and Sidon. Deputy judges were usually appointed to dispense justice in the countryside. The office of mufti is also defined in this chapter.

Chapter five chiefly deals with the office of Defterdar and taxation on various types of trade, land, trees, animals, etc.

In chapters six and seven there is an attempt to describe the relationship between the Ottomans and the indigenous population.

Four appendices and three relevant maps have been prepared and are appended.
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NOTE ON THE SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

In this thesis the method adopted by the Encyclopaedia of Islam for transliterating Arabic words has been followed, with the exception that "k" is rendered as "q", the "d" as "j" and the Arabic form of the "ya" has in most instances been rendered as "y". The definite article "al-" has been retained separately, even before antero-palatals ( huruf shamsiyya). This is also applicable when it falls medially in compound names, except when the second part of such names is "Allah". It is then rendered as "ullah", e.g. "Abdullah".

The system followed for transliteration of Turkish names and terms is that employed by İslam Ansiklopedisi. There are occasional discrepancies made in order to render the pronunciation of certain forms more clearly definable, for which I accept responsibility. In this connection the subject form of nouns has been retained regardless of their grammatical position in the sentence.
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MAPS
AN ACCOUNT OF EVENTS FROM 922-7/1516-21
The Ottoman Conquest of Bilād al-Shām

The deterioration of the long established cordial relations between the Mamluks and the Ottomans became more conspicuous in 886/1481. At this time Jem the son of Mehmed II was contending with his brother, Sultan Bayāzīd, for the Sultanate. He sought refuge in Cairo where he was received with great pomp by Sultan al-Ashraf Qāʾītāb. From that time, both Sultans were engaged in severe fighting and many cities and villages were devastated. The last decisive battle was fought on the 25th Rajab 922/24th August 1516, in the plain of Marj Dābir, to the north of Aleppo, when the Ottoman artillery routed the disunited Mamluk army. After confiscating all Mamluk possessions, Sultan Selīm with his army marched on Aleppo, which capitulated after its abandonment by the Mamluks.

The governor of its well fortified citadel, Qānsūh al-Ashrafī, joined the retreating Mamluks without striking a blow, leaving everything, including the Mamluk treasury to Sultan Selīm who confiscated all property to the smallest.


5. Ibn Ḥyās, Badāʾī, vol.v, p. 73.

detail. Sultan Selim, who arrived on the outskirts of Aleppo on Thursday 29th Rajab 922/20th August 1516, entered the city on the following day to perform the Friday prayers in al-Utrush Mosque. Its preacher, 'Izz al-Din al-Sabuni al-Hanafi (d. 922/1516), welcomed him. Later, although no contemporary sources mention that he addressed the Sultan as "The Servitor of the two Holy Places: Mecca and Medina", which title expressed the traditional seniority over all Muslims.

From the outskirts of the city, Selim imposed amnesty fees (māl al-amān) upon the Aleppine merchants who promptly paid them in order to save their lives.

In Aleppo, Sultan Selim faced no more serious incident other than that some of his camels were stolen by Arab Bedouins from the tribe of Zughayb. The Sultan ordered Aljmad b. Ja'far al-Hanafi known as Karaja Pasha (d. 927/1520) the first Ottoman governor of Aleppo, and 'Abd al-Karim Chalabi, the first


10. R. Ḥanbalī, Durr, MS. BM. Add.23978, fol.149a.
Ottoman defterdar in Aleppo, to track down the thieves. At that time a Bedouin amīr by the name of Mudlij with a group of Zughaybis were in Aleppo. They sought the good offices of the judge Taqī al-Dīn b. Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Ṣāliḥ (d.922/1516) to request the responsible authorities to guarantee them safe conduct. This was granted on condition that the stolen camels would be returned. Probably in hope of Selīm's favour, Taqī al-Dīn pledged the fulfilment of this condition. Meanwhile, the Bedouins left the city and the camels were not returned. He was not relieved from the responsibility in the matter and was sent at the head of a squadron to catch the thieves. He was slain by the Zughaybis during a fight against the Ottoman's punitive squadron. Later, Mudlij led his tribes in a savage attack upon the retreating Mamluks and corpses were left scattered from Aleppo to Damascus.

The Aleppines unanimously rose against the Mamluks. They had frequently suffered depredations from them when they passed by on their way to the norther buffer principalities. Now they refused their entrance to the city, killed many and confiscated all their belongings. Ibn Ḥās comments that their suffering at the hands of the Aleppines was worse than that they received during their defeat by the Ottomans.

Sultan Selīm left Aleppo on Sha'ban 18th 922/16th September 1516, for


Damascus, where the retreating Mamluks had begun to gather. Zu'ar roamed the city and its suburbs killing, destroying and sacking. The confusion subsided when on Tuesday 5th Shawal/3rd September, the former governor of Ḥama, Jānbirdī al-Ghazālī (d.927/1521) arrived at Damascus. He was immediately elected by the senior Mamluk amirs as governor of the City. al-Ghazālī forbade the Mamluks to retreat to Egypt till he received instructions from Tūmānbay (d.923/1517). He ordered the gates to be opened and once again restored law and order. He accepted an invitation to lunch with the people of Maydān al-Ḥasā, one of the principal quarters of Damascus. The memory of how the Aleppines had dealt with the Mamluks no doubt impressed him sufficiently to appreciate the value of popular good will.

al-Ghazālī, also succeeded in securing the allegiance of the influential Bedouin Chief of al-Biqa‘, Nāṣir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥanash. Nāṣir approached al-Ghazālī with a bribe and a plan. According to this, Nāṣir would fight the Ottomans for which he would receive the governorship of Ḥoms. al-Ghazālī's part would be to execute Nāṣir's rival the muqaddam (local chieftain) Ālā‘ al-Dīn b. al-‘Imad al-Maqdisī, known as Ibn ‘Allāq, who was at that time imprisoned in Damascus. al-Ghazālī accepted and implemented these conditions.

17. In 921/1515 the people of Ibn ‘Allāq, a local chieftain of Ḥoms region made a predatory raid on the Jewish Quarter in Damascus. Except for this incident his relations with the governor were good. His complaints in 922/1516 against the people of the village of Hayjāniyya carried weight; robes of honour were bestowed upon him and some of his relatives.
To further appease Nāṣir and to gain the loyalty of the Bedouin tribes of Al Mira, whose chief Jānbāy was the brother-in-law of Nāṣir, al-
Ghazālī bestowed a Robe of Honour on them both. In addition, he commissioned Jānbāy to guard the roads in the region of Hawrān and al-Marj which comprises the fertile plains surrounding Damascus. 18

To the great dismay of al-Ghazālī, the governors who had been appointed to govern Homs and Ḥama returned to Damascus on the 20th Shārībān/18th September. They informed him that two Ottoman governors had been appointed to these cities and that Sultan Selim was approaching. al-Ghazālī convinced of defeat, sent his family to Egypt and permitted the Mamluks to leave for Cairo. He, together with his bodyguard, left Damascus on Saturday 23rd Shab‘ān/21st September 1516. Near Bāb al-Jābiya, he was confronted by the zu‘ar. al-Ghazālī had anticipated such a confrontation and had placed the shaykh of Bāb al-Jābiya, al-Maqālī in the front rank of his men. The shaykh was, however, attacked and slain by the zu‘ar. 19 They roamed the city looting and pillaging, even the houses of officials or judges were not spared. 20 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Yusuf al-Ṣāliḥī, known as Ibn al-Ṭahhān, was

His relation with al-Ghazālī while in Ḥama was probably not cordial. He was arrested by al-Ghazālī. His head was the price asked by Nāṣir when he co-operated against the Ottomans. Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufakhat, vol. i, p. 389, vol. ii, pp. 11, 21, 26. Ibn Kannān Muhammad, (d.1153/1740), Ḥadīth al-yāsamīn al-dhikr awāzin al-khulafa’ wal salāṭīn, part of it edited by Muhammad Ḥamād Duhmān, as supplement to Ḥāmān, p. 277. Shorter title Ibn Kannān, Ḥadīth. In Mufakhat the surname was read by the editor as Ibn al-Allāq. Duhmān read it in Ibn Kannān as Ibn al-Allān.

18. Jānbāy was the head of the Bedouin tribes of Al Mira in the region of Hawrān. He was supported by the governor of Damascus against ‘Āmir b. Muqlid and against the tribe of Al Bayād, in 894/1488 and 917/1511 respectively. He helped the governor to guard grateful pilgrim caravans against Bedouin attacks. Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufakhat, vol. i, pp. 98, 104, 196, 248, 256-7, 291, 333-4, vol. ii, p. 26. Tā’lam, pp. 109, 141, 147-8, 173, 176.


their first victim. The house of the Hanafi judge 'Abd al-Qadir b. Yunus al-Nabulsî (d.930/1523) was also about to be burnt, but his family managed to buy a reprieve from the zu'ar. Meanwhile the judge himself had deserted the house. Another intended victim was the rich Shafi'i judge Wafi al-Din al-Farîr (d.937/1530) but he escaped vengeance by a bribe of one hundred dinars. Afterwards, he took the precaution of employed guards. Zu'ar stripped the deputy of the Hanafi judge, 'Ala' al-Din b. al-Fiqi, and took away his clothes and injured his horse. They also attacked the Samaritan quarter in Damascus with the intention of burning it had not a Jew by the name of Zaqqûq appeased them with one thousand dinars. Added to this, fighting

21. Ibn al-Tahhân was first a clerk in Suq al-Tujjâr, in Damascus. In 904/1498 he became market-inspector. His name is mentioned in 907/1501 as judge of al-Barr (the countryside). In 922/1516 he claimed the status of Sharîf which was suspected by Ibn Tulûn who mentions that Ibn al-Tahhân destroyed a few mosques, cemeteries, and sold the material as scrap; he adds that it was said "he deserved to die". Ibn Tulûn, Munâkahat, vol.1, pp.201, 254, vol.ii, pp.6, 27.


25. al-Fiqi, described as black and somewhat ignorant, was appointed in 913/1507 by al-Nabulsî as his deputy. In 924/1518 he was appointed as deputy to the supervisor (nâzîr) of Nûr al-Dîn Mahmûd (d.566/1163) Bimâristân (hospital) in Damascus. Ibn Tulûn, Munâkahat, vol.1, p.313, vol.ii, p.79.

26. Zaqqûq, is mentioned as one of the galat 'iyîn (people working in the citadel). Ibn Kannân says that the amount of money paid was one thousand dirhams. Ibn Tulûn, Munâkahat, vol.ii, p.27. Ibn Kannân, Hâdâ'iq, p.278.
was imminent between the people of the two villages of Dārayyā and al-Nīzza in the south-west vicinity of Damascus. Panic increased when fire broke out during the night in one of the quarters where Kurds lived.  

Damascus remained for six days in a state of turmoil without government. Only the citadel which was controlled and garrisoned by its Mamlūk governor ʿAlībāy, remained calm. During this period of interregnum, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Nabī al-Maghlībī al-Maliki, 28 Shaykh Husayn al-Jabāwī, 29 Shaykh Mubārak b. ʿAbdullāh al-Qābūnī met the leading members of the quarters at Maydān al-Ḥāṣa where they decided to surrender Damascus to Sultan:

27. Ibn Tulūn, Mufakhat, vol. ii, p. 27.
30. Mubārak (d. 944/1537) probably of Abyssinian origin, migrated to Damascus in 897/1491. He campaigned against the widely spread habit of drinking wine. He settled in al-Qābūn, 2½ miles north of St. Thomas' Gate, in a convent which the chief Shafiʿ judge Taqī al-Dīn b. Qādī ʿAjūn (d. 928/1521) had built for him. He appears to have influenced the youth from Damascus and its environs. In 899/1493 his followers policed the road to Damascus, destroyed skins of wine and forbade people to bring it to the city. On hearing this the governor arrested Shaykh Mubārak together with a number of his followers.
When Muslih Mīzān, Sultan Selim’s delegate to the Damascenes arrived at al-Qābūn on Thursday, 28th Sha‘bān/26th September, he sent two of his aides together with Ibrahim al-Samarqandi and Yunus al-Ādili to see if the Damascenes were ready to surrender. They were well received and the city surrendered. Isma‘īl b. al-Akram (d.930/1523) approached the governor of the citadel to join them in surrender but he refused. The chief Shafi‘i judge intervened and Mubarak was released. People from al-Qābūn attacked the jail in Damascus to free his friends. Fighting broke out between them and the governor’s forces and between 70-150 people died. Mubarak had a reputation for magnificent physique and skill in hunting and swimming. He headed a second convent in al-Salihiyah. His son Muhammad was renowned for his excellent recitation of the Holy Qur‘an. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.1, pp.154, 158. Ibn Tulun, al-Qal‘ah id al-jawhariyya fi tarikh al-Salihiyah, 2 vols. (edited by Muhammad Ahmad Duhaman, Damascus, 1949-56), vol.1, p.209. Shorter title, Ibn Tulun, Qal‘ah id. Sharaf al-Dīn Muṣa b. Yūsuf b. Ahmad b. Ayyub al-Ansārī, al-Rawd al-ṣāhir fi tāyassara min akhbar al-qarn al-sabīn ila khitām al-qarn al-ashrīr, MS. Tūsī-Ming, No:9866, fols.267a-b. Shorter title Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, al-Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.ii, pp.245-6.

32. Ibrahim al-Samarqandi, who also spoke the Turkish language, originated from Medina. He travelled widely and visited Persia and the land of the Ottomans. Later he attained a high position in the court of Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī in Cairo. It seems that he was in contact with the Ottomans whom he joined immediately after the battle of Marj Dabiq. When Sultan Selim marched to Egypt, he accompanied him but was killed by a Bedouin who presented his head to Sultan Tūmānbay. The Bedouin received a reward of one thousand dinārs. Ibn Iyās, Bada’i‘, vol.vi, pp.84, 143-4.
33. Yunus al-Ādili began his career as a soap merchant in Aleppo. He became bankrupt and migrated to Cairo where his influence in the Sultan’s court had been great since the days of Sultan Qānṣūh. Sultan Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī trusted him so completely that in 915/1509 he despatched him to Istanbul to buy timber. Yunus, who joined the Ottomans after the battle of Marj-Dabiq, was highly esteemed by them and was exempted from all taxes until his death in Damascus in 936/1529. He accumulated great wealth under both the Mamlūks and Ottomans. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.ii, pp.337-8, 345. R. Hanbali, Durr, Taymuryya, 2/105, fols.201b-202a. Nūrosnāniyya, No:3293, fols. 345b-346a. J. U. A. Y. 3190, fol:244a. BM. Add.23978, fols.215b-216a. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.ii, p.91.
Damascenes, also, sent Muhammad b. Qurqas to Muslih Mizan to announce
the decision made by the people of his city. With about two hundred
people entered Damascus and shut its gates. From the Umayyad Mosque, he
together with the four chief judges and Shaykh 'Abd al-Nabi al-Maghrabi,
went to Sultan Selim announcing the surrender of Damascus and requesting
that no harm should befall it. Muslih distributed his men near the gates and
in the quarters of the city to maintain law and order and to avert further
disturbances. He avoided confrontation with the governor of the citadel,
but paid him a visit of courtesy and received a robe of honour from him. The
newly appointed governor was Yunus Pasha and he arrived at Damascus on
Thursday, 29th Shawal/27th September, 'Alibay and Khayirbay, (d. 920/
1522) the former Mamluk governor of Aleppo, together with a small retinue,
met him. Yunus Pasha asked 'Alibay to man the citadel until the Sultan's
arrival. 'Alibay and Khayirbay with their retinue were each given a robe
of honour.

Selim's Arrival at Damascus

On the Friday previous to his arrival the khutba was read in the name
of Sultan Selim who reached al-Mastaba on Saturday the first of Ramadan
922/28th September 1516. On Sunday, Sultan Selim held an audience during

39. 'Abdullah b. Muhammad al-Badri (d. 854/1488) describes Ma'shabat
al-Sultan in al-Qabun as a high, level piece of land one faddan in
size, approached by more than twenty steps on all sides. At the top
there was a palace which was a temporary residence for sultans or
governors departing from or arriving at Damascus. It was in existence
till 1350/1931 although the ground had sunk to one metre high. It =
which the four chief judges were received and kissed his hand. Later the Ashraf headed by Sayyid Kamal al-Din b. Hanza were received by the Sultan.

Among those present in the camp of the Sultan was the Bedouin chieftain of al-Biqā', Nasir al-Din b. Hanash. When, however, 'Alibay came to hand the keys of the citadel to the Sultan, Selim ordered the arrest of him and his followers. A group of Damascenes headed by Shaykh Abd al-Nabi al-Maghribi and Shaykh Shams al-Din al-Kafarsusi was not allowed to see the Sultan.

was later destroyed by peasants who used the land for cultivation.


In 917/1511, after serving in Aleppo, 'Alibay was transferred to Damascus as the Sultan's dawadar (secretary). In 918/1512 he was recalled to Egypt but returned to Damascus as governor of the citadel in 919/1523 in which capacity he served until the capitulation of Damascus to Sultan Selim. He and his subordinates were then deported to Istanbul. On hearing rumors that the Turkomans intended to free him, Selim ordered the execution of both him and his friends at the village of Harastā. Ibn Tulūn, Muḥakāhāt, vol.i, pp.355, 368, 376, vol.ii, pp.31, 35. Ibn Ḥiyā, Badā'ī, vol.v, p.111. Ibn Zunbul, Tārikh, MS. No:129, fols.25a, b.

Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Kafarsusi al-Šafi'i (d.932/1525) reputed as a learned and pious man, highly esteemed by officials. In addition to teaching he issued fatwās and villagers refused to consult anyone else. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.i, pp.54-5.

Similarly, when 'Abd al-Nabi, together with a group of learned men and a number of his students, called on 6th Ramadān/3rd October, to pay respect to the Sultan, they were not allowed into his presence although he received the Frankish merchants and their consul. 46

Selīm who had camped in al-Qābūn, escorted by a vast number of soldiers, entered Damascus for the first time on Thursday 6th Ramadān 922/3rd October 1516. He bathed and had his beard shaved at the al-Ḥamawi Bath. 47 On the next day, which was Friday, Selīm re-entered Damascus; went directly to the Umayyad Mosque where he performed the Friday prayers. The former Chief Shāfi′i judge, Walī al-Dīn b. al-Farfūr, delivered an eloquent sermon in which he called Sultan Selīm the "Victorious Servitor of the two Holy Cities, Mecca and Medina". 48 After the prayers, money was distributed to the attendants of the Umayyad Mosque. 49 On the 15th Ramadān/12th October, money was similarly distributed in all mosques and schools, both in the city and its suburbs. On the 16th, Sultan Selīm went to the Umayyad Mosque where he again performed the prayers and read from a copy of the Holy Qurān ascribed to Caliph Uthmān b. 'Affān (d. 35/635). 50 On that same night he went to the al-Kallāsah School to visit the sufi Shaykh Muhammad al-Bilkhashī, whose residence was in the school. 51 Shaykh Muhammad refused to accept money from

51. al-Kallāsah School was established in 555/1160. For the history of this school see Nuṣaynī, al-Dāris, vol.i, pp.447-51.
52. The origin of Muhammad al-Bilkhashī is not known. Ibn Ṭulūn states that he was reputed to be of Arabic origin. It is not known when he settled in Damascus. Most likely he was known to the Ottomans =
Selim, who distributed money to the needy on this occasion, but advised the Sultan to be merciful to the people in view of the recent assaults the army had made on the Damascenes.

Ottoman soldiers had invaded houses in Damascus and its suburbs. Many people had been driven from their homes, their belongings had been thrown outside, and no respect or mercy was shown either to old or young. Nor was any consideration shown to the learned, to the Sufis or to the reciters of the Holy Qur'an. Ibn Tulun himself was ejected from his house and his books tossed into the street. He adds that those who were able, left Damascus while others took refuge in mosques and schools. In addition, when Sultan Selim himself moved into Damascus he requisitioned a residence near the great Nuriyah School, and all people living in that quarter were evacuated. The different quarters of Damascus such as Ayn al-Karsh and al-Marja were occupied by soldiers, some of whom desecrated places of Feasts-Prayers and used them as stables for their animals. Others turned the Adhrawiyah School into a shed for sheep.

Sultan Selim was eager to gain the loyalty of the Arab Bedouin tribes and to occupy the various cities in Palestine before the Mamluks could reorganise themselves for attack. Nasir's influential status among the Arab Bedouin


54. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol. ii, p. 34.
55. For the history of this school, see Nu'aymi, al-Daris, vol. i, p. 606, passim.
chieftains was the probable reason why the Sultan reinstated him as the
muqaddam of al-Biqāʾ, also giving him charge of the governments of Sidon
and Bayrūt. In addition he gave Nāṣir the village of Nawā in Ḥawrān
as a private iqṭāʾ provided he would guarantee the loyalty of the Arab
Bedouin tribes. 57

B. Selīm's Expeditions from Damascus

On the 17th Ramadan/14th October, a punitive expedition of
about 4,000 soldiers, led by Yūnūs Pāsha was sent against the no less important
Muḥammad b. Sāʾid al-Ghazzawī, 58 the local Arab Bedouin chieftain of the
district of ʿAjlūn. Sources give no information about the success or failure
of this expedition. Ibn Tulūn says that Sultan Selīm imprisoned Yūnūs al-
ʿĀdili who had accompanied Yūnūs Pāsha when he returned to Damascus because

58. Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abū Sayf Muḥammad al-Ghazzawī was the local chieftain in the district of ʿAjlūn. His relation with the Mamluks was not cordial. Two expeditions were sent against him in 904/1498, and 915/1509, during which much of his land and property were devastated. In 917/1511, accompanied by the famous Sufi Sage Muḥammad b. Khaṭīb al-Ṣamāʾili (d.940/1541) at the head of his followers who were beating their drums, Nāṣir entered into Damascus where he was well received by the governor. Nāṣir presented him with several horses. When he went to the Unāiyad Mosque to perform the Friday prayers, such was his popularity, people gathered everywhere to see him, and to beg God to protect him. There was great rejoicing when peace was concluded between Nāṣir and the governor and the safety of pilgrims was assured. Ibn Iyās considers the submission of Ibn Sāʾid when he went to visit Cairo to be a lucky sign for Sultan Qansuḥ al-Ghawrī. Members of his family continued to enjoy an influential position right to the end of the sixteenth century. Ibn Tulūn, Ḥamā, pp. 90, 194, 196-8. Mutāfahat, vol. i, pp. 335, 343, 355, 360, 362, 365, vol. ii, pp. 36, 38. Ibn Iyās, Badaʾiʾ, vol. iv, p. 246. Ibn Ayyūb Rawḍ, fols. 212b-213a. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Būrīnī (d. 1024/ Tīl5), Tarājim al-aʿyān min abnāʾ al-zamān, 2 vols. - in progress, edited by ʿAlīh al-Dīn al-Munajjīd, Damascus, 1959-1963), vol. i, pp. 186-7. Shorter title, Būrīnī, Tarājim.
he failed to report that Abd al-Karim b. al-Ji'an, an official of the Mamluk chancery, was hiding in Damascus. 59

On Thursday, 11th Shawwal 922/7th November 1516, Selim launched his first expedition against the Palestinian Cities. By the prevention of Mamluk occupation the pilgrimage and the kiswa, which he was eager to send in order to enhance his prestige, 60 would be assured of a free passage. There is little information recorded concerning the progress made by the expedition but it would appear to have been slow. 61 A reinforcement was sent from Damascus on Monday 6th Dhu'l Qa'da 922/1st December 1516, led by the Grand Vizier Sinan Pasha. After ten days, Sultan Selim received the news that his army had taken Jerusalem and Gaza. As a token of thanksgiving, Selim visited the tomb of Muhyi al-Din b. 'Arabi (d. 638/1240) and most of the cemeteries in Damascus, giving alms on his way. 62 Sinan Pasha who carried a letter to Janbirdi al-Ghazali was met by a Mamluk army at al-Sharifa near Gaza, led by al-Ghazali himself who was defeated after a skirmish. 63 Khayr al-Din and Muhammad b. Qorqas realised the specially

59. 'Abd al-Karim was working in the treasury department. He fell prisoner after the battle of Marj Dabiq. On Friday, 26th Shawwal 922/23rd November, 1522, he arrived at Cairo in a bad state. Ibn Iyas, Bada'i', vol. v, pp. 43, 77, 116. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol. ii, p. 38.

60. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol. ii, p. 38. It might be worth mentioning that when Tumanbay heard that Selim was going to send kiswa to al-Ka'ba, he sent kiswa and money to the people in Mecca and Medina via the Red Sea since there was no caravan of pilgrims that year. Ibn Iyas, Bada'i', vol. v, p. 115.

61. The Ottoman campaign was led by Iskandar Pasha and Da'du Pasha, they occupied Gaza after its governor had been forced to leave the city. Tumanbay intended to lead the Mamluks to recapture Gaza. Ibn Iyas, Bada'i', vol. v, pp. 119-120. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol. ii, p. 39.


63. Sharifa is located by Ibn Tulun as being near Gaza. Ibn Zunbul agrees with him but Ibn Iyas mentions it as being near Baysan. Perhaps Ibn Iyas was confused between the name of this place, which is about thirteen miles to the east of Gaza, and the name al-
important status of al-Ghazālī among the Mamluks in Egypt and persuaded Selīm to send a letter to induce him to join the Ottomans. In his communication, Selīm reminded al-Ghazālī that several letters had been sent to him either by himself or from officials of his court but no reply had been received. He assured al-Ghazālī in the name of God, the Prophet and his ancestors that all courtesy would be extended to him and to any of his followers who would join him against the Mamluks. He made it clear, however, that he should not miss this last opportunity for reconciliation. It is not known whether this letter reached al-Ghazālī. It is, however, known that the Ottoman occupation of the hinterland and the coastal cities in Syria was accomplished with little bloodshed. Later, there were massacres in Safad, Ramlah and Gaza. An Ottoman defeat near Gaza was rumoured in these cities; and in Safad, whose people had surrendered their keys to Selīm, people began to attack the Ottomans who shut themselves into the fortification of the citadel. A great massacre resulted, and even greater slaughter occurred in Ramla. Ibn Zunbul who afterwards visited it, depicts it as derelict. He was told that Arab Bedouins from outside the city had poured into it to fight the Ottomans. He was further informed that the population had deserted it upon the arrival of an Ottoman force. Ibn Zunbul adds that later, Sultan Selīm sent an army against the people of Ramla; those who had remained in the city were taken to Gaza and there


\[64. Jalālzāde, Muṣṭafā, known as Niẓāmī (d.975/1567), Maʿāṣir-i Selīm Khan, MS, BM, Add.7848, fols.189a-190a, b.\]

\[65. Ibn Tulūn, Mufakhat, vol.ii, pp.33-41. Ibn Kannān, Hadā'īq, p.290. al-Ghazzī says that Yusuf b. Yunus b. Yusuf al-Munqūr (d.943/1526) was appointed a judge in Safad (date unspecified). The city had been destroyed so he certainly did not go there. Probably destruction was due to the above mentioned fighting. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.ii, p.262.\]
About one thousand of the people of Gaza were put to death by order of Sinān Pāsha in reprisal for their rebellion against the Ottomans. Four hundred Ottomans had been slaughtered by them when the false rumour of the Ottoman rout by al-Ghazālī reached them. Sinān Pāsha's soldiers in addition searched houses for stolen Ottoman belongings and afterwards many of them were burnt.

A similar situation could well have arisen between the Damascenes and the Ottoman garrison when rumours reached Damascus that the Mamlūks had defeated the Sultan's army. On the 22nd Muḥarram 923/14th February 1917, the zu'ar in Damascus began to attack Ottoman supporters and turned their attacks against the Ottomans who fortified themselves in the citadel. The zu'ar appear to have controlled most of the city for five days until the governor, on the 27th, paraded his forces in an effort to frighten them and impress the people. Fortunately for the governor, two letters arrived at Damascus: one from Nāṣir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥanash and the second from the Bedouin chieftain of Marj Banū ʿAmir Ṭabarāy b. ʿArāja. They brought news of Selim's victory. Ṭabarāy and Nāṣir received orders from Selim to arrest Mamlūks fleeing from Egypt who might pass their region. He commanded both of them to return senior officers to Cairo and to execute ordinary

69. Ṭabarāy b. ʿArāja was appointed by the Mamlūks in 885/1480 to succeed his slain father as chieftain of the region of Marj Banū ʿAmir. After the defeat of the Mamlūks in Marj Dābq, Ṭabarāy allied himself with the Ottomans who confirmed his position. His prerogatives in 945/1538 included supervision over al-Ghawr in ʿAjlūn district, Banū Kināna, Banū ʿAtika and Banū Ṣāma. When Sultan Selim left Damascus he was among the people who came to bid him farewell. Ibn Tulūn, Muḥakhat, vol.i, p.22, vol.ii, p.82, T.D. No:152, pp.1, 11, 39, 44-7, 95-6, Topkapı Saray Arşivi, Document No:6341.
soldiers. Sultan Selim also sent a communication to the governor, by
four couriers, which arrived on Friday, 6th Safar 923/28th February 1517, with
the news of his victory. He gave details of the fighting against the Mamluks
near Gaza and of their final defeat in Raydaniyya. The governor was
instructed to fire a salute from the citadel to announce news of the victory
and to allow everyone to join in the celebrations. These lasted for seven
days and were, in some cases, an excuse for mischief.

The resulting disorder presented an opportunity to the governor to
challenge the power of the zu'ar. On the night of 20th Safar/14th March, he
imposed a curfew and on the morning of the 21st every one was commanded to
assemble. At that meeting the names of all zu'ar and their guardians (waman
tadarrakahū) were noted. Poles were erected in every quarter of the city
on which to impale thieves, and an example was made of one thief from the
village of Mannin. The governor emphasised his action by impaling the
most notorious thief by the name of Zughayb in the Mazābil Quarter. His
authority was now well established and on the 18th Ramadan 923/5th October
1517, he caused town criers to order roads and quarters to be cleared, especially
that of al-Marja, where the Sultan would camp.

70. Ibn Tulūn, Mufakhat vol. ii, p. 43. I'lam, pp. 221-2. Topkapı
    Saray Arşivi, Document No:6341.
C. Selim’s Return to Damascus

The next morning Selim arrived in great pomp. His soldiers were billeted on the houses and many people suffered as a result. Those soldiers who were unable to find billets camped in the orchards outside Damascus. One immediate result of this was a rise in prices. 77

On Saturday, 24th Ramadan 923/11th October 1517, the Sultan held his diwan and made the decision to spend the winter in Damascus.78

On the recommendation of his imam, Halim Ghalabi (d.923/1517), probably during his diwan, Selim gave orders to build a mosque over the tomb of Muhayii al-Din b. ‘Arabi.79 It would seem that he was eager to see the mosque completed before leaving Damascus. Perhaps to accelerate the progress of the work, an Ottoman supervisor was appointed and ten thousand dinars were placed at his disposal. The Sultan himself approved the design and then ordered its enlargement and also gave orders to build a convent (takiyya) for sufiis to the north of the mosque. Columns were carried from the Vice-regal Palace (Dar al-Sa’ada) to the mosque. The expenses of maintenance and upkeep of both mosque and convent were endowed by the revenue from several villages. On Friday, 24th Muharram 924/5th February 1518, the Sultan, escorted by his senior amirs and the learned men, performed in it the mid-day prayers. On that occasion, shops were closed and largesse distributed.80

78. Feridun Bey, Munshā‘at, vol.i, p.455.
79. On the same day the diwan was held, Walī al-Dīn b. al-Farūr went with Shihāb al-Dīn b. al-‘Attār and designed a mosque to be built over the tomb of Ibn ‘Arabi. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.ii, p.68.
Three days after its completion, Selim left Damascus. 81

During his stay in Damascus, Sultan Selim was eager to expedite the caravan of the pilgrims to Mecca and Medina. The caravan was delayed by the mustering of Arab Bedouin tribes in the region of Hawrān. Fearing that they would block roads and perhaps attack the pilgrims, Jānbirdī al-Ghazālī was sent to prevent such an occurrence on the 28th Ramāḍān 923/14th October 1517. Added to this, Muhammad b. Sā' id who resided in the area reported that the tribes were fighting amongst themselves and that the pool of al-Ukhaydīr on the way to Mecca had not been filled with water that year. 82 Unfortunately there is no information concerning the success of the expedition.

D. Selim's Relationship with Local Chieftains

The dismissal of Nāṣir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥanash by Sultan Selim for sheltering refugee Mamluks increased the tension in Hawrān, al-Bīqā', Sidon and Bayrūt. Nāṣir wrote several letters to Sultan Selim before he was finally dismissed. He implored Selim not to listen to any false charges which his detractors might make against him. Yet another letter, written in Syrian Arabic dialect to the Sultan was sent after he had actually been dismissed. He expressed his astonishment at the measures taken by the Sultan. He pointed out


82. For the description of the pool in this station, and number of soldiers who were drawn from the Janissaries of Damascus to man its citadel, see Ibrāhīm b. `Abd al-Rahmān al-Khayārī al-Madani (d. 1083/1672), Tuhfat al-udābā' wa salwat al-ghurabā', vol. i, (edited by Rajā' Samarrā'ī, Baghdād, 1969), pp. 50-3. Shorter title Khayārī, Tuhfat.

that he had faithfully served him. Nasir added that, when the Sultan returned from Egypt, a decree of reaffirmation was sent to him. He had immediately sent his son to the Sultan who had treated him with kindness and conferred an honour upon him. He, himself, remained faithful to the Sultan in spite of dismissal and had sent some of his men to hand over Sidon to al-Ghazali in obedience to his command. The latter had been sent to seize it for Muhammad b. Qorqas who was appointed to replace Nasir. By this action, Nasir cleverly disassociated himself from any future troubles which might be attributed to him. He appealed to the Sultan to desire al-Ghazali to treat his people well and to spare damage to his cultivated land since he had no other source of income. He begged to be allowed to remain in his land. To him it would be unthinkable to seek refuge under any other shaykh or ruler. It would seem that Selim ignored Nasir's appeal and Nasir fled to al-Jawlân. The Sultan pursued him but failed to capture him and returned to Damascus.

Contemporary sources provide no information concerning Selim's relations with the chieftains in Mount Lebanon. According to the Maronite historian, Istifan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704), Sultan Selim, after conquering Syria and Egypt, summoned the local chieftains from the Lebanese Mountains to Damascus in order to maintain law and order. Amir Qorqas b. Yunus b. Ma'n, Amir Jamal al-Dîn al-Yamanî, and Amir 'Assaf, obeyed the Sultan's command.

84. For the Turkish summary of Nasir's letters see Topkapi Saray Arşivi, Document No:6341. The number of the still extant Arabic letter is 10734. It is noticeable that its tone is not submissive.

Qorqmās was appointed as the amīr of al-Shūf, Jamāl al-Dīn as the amīr of al-Gharb and Assaf was made amīr of Kīrswān and Jubayl. They were instructed by the Sultan to improve their lands. Later, Lebanese historians such as Amīr Haydar Aḥmad al-Shihābī (d. 1835) and Tannūs Shidyāq (d. 1861) claimed that a certain Fakhr al-Dīn al-Mānī headed the Lebanese chieftains' delegation. There Fakhr al-Dīn delivered an eloquent address which impressed the Sultan who bestowed the title of Sultan al-barr (Sultan of the Countryside) upon him. An event of such importance could not have escaped the notice of the Druze historian Ahmad b. Sībāt al-Ālīhi (d. 927/1520) who grew up among the Maʾnids. According to Ibn Sībāt, Fakhr al-Dīn was arrested in Damascus in 911/1505 and died in the following year. Duwayhī confirms this statement, which invalidates the assertions of al-Shihābī and al-Shidyāq.

Qorqmās died when hiding in a cave in 992/1584 during an Ottoman attack on al-Shūf after the tribute of Egypt had been sacked in the vicinity of the Bay of Ḥākkār.

If Duwayhī's version is to be considered, Qorqmās must have been a young lad when he went to Damascus in obedience to Sultan Selīm. It is strange if Duwayhī's version is to be considered, Qorqmās must have been a young lad when he went to Damascus in obedience to Sultan Selīm. It is strange


that contemporary sources do not refer either to this journey or to his long
chieftainship. Even the Mamluk's court historian the Hanafi Ahmad al-
Khālidī al-Safādī (d. 1034/1624) does not mention that he was permitted audience with
Sultan Selīm. Al-Duwayhi's version of the affair is, therefore, open to
suspicion of exaggeration.

II. Selim appoints al-Ghazālī as Governor of Damascus

While Sultan Selīm was camping at al-`Iṣtāba, on his return to
Istanbul, on Tuesday, 924/1518, he chose to confer
the governorship of al-Shām on Janbirdī b. `Abdullāh al-Ghazālī, an
experienced Mamlūk.!

90. al-Khalīdī Ahmadī Muḥammad, Lubnān fī ʿahd al-Amīr Fakhr al-Dīn
al-Maṣrī al-Jāhānī, (edited by Asād Rustīm and Fu`ād Bustānī, 2nd print

91. Janbirdī b. `Abdullāh al-Charkāsī was purchased during the reign of
Sultan Qā'im ibn Qansūh. He started his career among the private Mamlūks
of the Sultan. He was first appointed as shād, (superintendent), of
the village of Minyat Ghazāl with an area of 1081 faddān, and a
revenue of six thousand dinārs. From this village he derived his
nisba (surname). He was promoted later to be shād of the province of
al-Sharqīyya. Probably during his term of office, he acquainted
himself with local Bedouin chieftains among whom was Ahmad b. Baqar
who, later, supported al-Ghazālī in his rebellion against the Ottomans.
In 906/1500 he was appointed as muhtasib (market inspector) in Cairo
for three months, after which he was transferred to Aleppo to work
in the office of hujūbiyya (chamberlain), where he served until 911/1505
when he became chamberlain of Damascus. In addition to being
chamberlain, he was appointed in 915/1509 as governor of Jerusalem
and Karak-Shawbak. Two years later he became governor of Sha`fād for
one year during which he had a serious misunderstanding with Sibāy,
the governor of Damascus. Sultan Qāinsūh's intervention reconciled
them. From Sha`fād he was transferred to Hāmā where he governed
until the defeat of the Mamlūks. Ibn Ḥayyān, Bada' i, vol. iv, pp. 6,
pp. 293, 333, 353, 355, vol. ii, pp. 20, 82. Ibrāhīm, pp. 178, 183,
197, 228. Ibn al-Jīān, Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā b. al-Makār (d. 385/1480)
Khitab al-tuḥta al-sanīyya bi ṣmāʾ al-Billād al-Misriyya, (edited
As chamberlain (hājib) of Damascus he endeavoured to maintain justice. Ibn Tulun reports that in 911/1505 he reproved the Governor for supporting zu'ar oppression. He used his influence to abolish the tax imposed on every animal slaughtered in the slaughter-house; he also co-operated with the governor to clear and close all public drinking houses which were a menace to law and order and against religion. No one was allowed to carry a knife and this measure checked the zu'ar. Such measures were greatly appreciated by the Damascenes and caused al-Ghāzālī to be held in esteem.92

Under the Ottomans, al-Ghāzālī used every opportunity to gain the respect of the Damascenes. The practice of beating the drum thrice nightly, which roused Damascenes to prayer, was again restored and much appreciated.93 He attended religious events, for example the tarāwīḥ and also the Prophet's birthday celebrations.94 He facilitated the departure and guaranteed the safety of the pilgrims' caravan and made a special point of joining the procession preceding the departure.95 Furthermore, in 924/1518, he himself met the pilgrims on their return. His action was justified as in this year the caravan was attacked by Jughaymān tribes which the escorting infantry was able to repulse.96

93. The three drums of the citadel were beaten three times nightly, the first time once, the second twice and the third, three times, to wake the populace to attend dawn prayers. The custom was established by Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Zangi when his wife, ʿĪṣmat al-Dīn Khatūn (d.581/1185), overslept one night and failed to wake in time. Sultan Selīm deemed it a Mamlūk custom and cancelled it. Badrī, Nuzhat, pp.63–4. Nucaymā, al-Dāris, vol.i, p.510. Ibn Tulun, Qahāl, vol.i, pp.59–60.
25.

The precautions he took in 925/1519 were no less than those taken in the preceding year. On Sha\‘ban 19th 925/16th August 1519, before the departure of the caravan, al-Ghazal\½ hastened to Hawr\‘an to arrest the Bedouin chieftain, Jughaym\‘an, whom he anticipated to be a threat to the pilgrims. When he failed to arrest Jughaym\‘an he instructed the caravan to go by the Damascus-Gaza route in order to avoid a possible clash with Jughaym\‘an. 97 In the meantime, he went as far as Ma\‘\‘an where he took Jughaym\‘an by surprise. Jughaym\‘an escaped but his relative Duway\‘ir (Zuway\‘ir?) together with eleven other men were captured. They were taken to Damascus as prisoners, and but for the respect in which their governor was held, the mob would have stoned them. 98 Through the mediation of Ahmad b. Qasim b. Baqar, known as Abu a I-\‘ahwarb (d.928/1521) they were released on Saturday 15th Safar 926/16th February 1519, just one day after being taken to Damascus. 99 On Sunday, 21st Rabi\‘ I, 926/2nd March 1520, Jughaym\‘an’s son arrived at Damascus as an envoy and for a short time there was peace between them. 100 News of more


99. Ibn T\‘ul\‘un, Mur\‘akhat, vol.ii, p.97. He mentions that Jughaym\‘an was released but as he was never arrested, it is probable that his relative is meant in this connection.


In order to lessen Jughaymān’s power, al-Ghazālī supported his rival Mūliḥm. Their forces together moved against Jughaymān who defeated them, and on Tuesday 13th Jumādā I, 926/2nd May 1520, al-Ghazālī himself, at the head of a punitive force, went to fight Jughaymān. The result of this expedition is not known but it would appear to have been successful. On 25th Jumādā I/14th May, al-Ghazālī was in Damascus where he was received with great pomp.101 The traditional route to Mecca and Medina was apparently safe for on Saturday 17th Shawwāl 926/21 September 1520, the largest pilgrim caravan for seventy years set out for the Holy Places. The greatness of al-Ghazālī’s achievements is reflected by the knowledge that Jughaymān’s son was among those who patrolled the route to add to its safety. There was now a peaceful situation and Mūliḥm was arrested and jailed in Damascus. 102

In addition to his ability to subdue and control the various tribes which threatened the pilgrim route, al-Ghazālī was able to discipline Tūba the muqaddam of Nābūs. After Tūba was dismissed, he rose against al-Ghazālī’s officials and among others he killed Muḥammad b. Bulaybīn al-Jaljūlī the son of the nāzir al-jaysh. al-Ghazālī despatched an army immediately which was instructed to kill the dignitaries of Nābūs and anyone else who had been connected in any way with the rebellion. 103 Little is recorded in available sources concerning the achievements of this campaign. Ibn Tulūn, however, relates that on Monday, 5th Shawwāl 926/9th September 1520, Aḥmad b. Ismā‘īl, son of the Shaykh of Nābūs, together with the son of Ibn Sā‘īd and his grandson, were hanged. 104 No further confrontation is reported and

friendly relations appear to have existed between al-Ghazālī and the tribes. In confirmation of this, when al-Ghazālī's dawādar Aslān (d. 927/1521) returned from the countryside he was accompanied by Bedouin chieftains bearing many gifts for his master. 105

A. al-Ghazālī's Policy in Damascus

al-Ghazālī's policy aimed at maintaining law and order while keeping cordial relations with the Damascenes. He skillfully avoided a clash with the zu'ar and seems to have relied on persuasion and appeasement rather than enforcement. Several small incidents confirm this view. According to Ibn Ṭūlūn two of the zu'ar came to him in 926/1519, to seek pardon through the mediation of personnel in his retinue; they remained free and unquestioned. 106 On Monday, 19th Jumāda I, 926/18th May 1520, while al-Ghazālī was absent from Damascus, Ahmad b. Qubayyā, one of the zu'ar, celebrated the circumcision of his son. He invited several youths from the suburbs and villages to share the celebrations. They arrived armed and assembled in al-Salihiyya quarter. Possibly inspired by al-Ghazālī's methods, the officials allowed them to form a procession, even lending seven decorated horses for the purpose. It moved peacefully through many parts of the city until it reached the Yamani quarter where fighting was imminent because the procession mainly comprised Qaysī followers. The governor's deputy was, however, on the alert and managed to avert a crisis. 107 Except for one instance, incited by al-Ghazālī himself, the zu'ar neither theived

105. Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufak̔ahat, vol. ii, p. 84.
nor murdered during his governorship. He took no measures against any of the city’s communities except that on Sunday, 16th Safar 926/8th February 1520, he attacked the Kurdish community which was described as foreign to the city and a hotbed of thieves. This incident emphasises al-Ghazālī’s desire to maintain law and order.

While he was maintaining good relations with Sultan Selim, his policy towards the officials working in the government departments in Damascus was directed towards the elimination of recently introduced Ottoman procedures. He endeavoured to curb the power of the Ottomans and their sympathisers among the administration. al-Ghazālī first came into conflict with Hasan bey, an Ottoman who had been given eighteen villages belonging to the deceased Nāsir al-Dīn b. al-Ḥanash as an iqṭāʾ. The annual revenue derived from them was ten thousand gold pieces. Hasan bey wrote to Istanbul accusing al-Ghazālī of supporting mischievous people in the region of al-Biqa’. al-Ghazālī despatched his dawādār, Qānim, with a gift of horses to Sultan Selim and a letter of complaint against the behaviour of Hasan bey. The Sultan sent Sinān, a

108. In Muḥarram 926/February 1516, a Jew journeying from Egypt was found killed. Some villagers of Dārayyā and Masjid-al-Qadam were found to be responsible. When theft increased in al-Ṣāliḥiyā al-Ghazālī intended to reside there as a deterrent. Later, he found that the thieves came from neighbouring villages, and he arrested and jailed the muqaddams for harbouring them. When Ibn al-Fīlī, prefekt (`arṭīf) of the eastern quarter in al-Ṣāliḥiyā, was found killed, it was discovered that a man from Ḥama was guilty and he was put to death. Only in one case, when zuʿar were responsible, al-Ghazālī himself incited them to kill Ibn Qudaydir, Bab al-Jabiyah Shaykh, in Muḥarram 926. Ibn Tulun, Muḥākāt, vol.ii, pp.91, 98-9, 101, 103.


member of the muteferrika, to investigate the case. Sinan found al-Ghazālī free from all the charges which had been levied against him. al-Ghazālī took advantage of the opportunity and again wrote to Selim. He suggested that the Sultan should add some of Hasan bey's villages to his own khāṣṣ and the rest to the land under al-Ghazālī's own supervision. He felt that the presence of Hasan bey in al-Bīqaʿ would be a strain on the people. The Sultan dismissed Hasan bey and appointed Yusuf Sinān al-Rūmī to replace him. There were a number of cases when al-Ghazālī plotted against people working under him in the government of Damascus. One of his victims was Abū al-Fath b. Muẓaffar al-Dīn al-Makki the mutawalli (supervisor) of Selim's convent in Damascus. On the recommendation of al-Ghazālī he was slain in al-Bīqaʿ at the beginning of Muharram 926/ca. 24th December 1519. al-Ghazālī may have wanted to seize his wealth because on 16th Šafar 926/4th February 1520, he ordered the deceased's belongings to be confiscated and sold. The historian Ibn Tulun states explicitly that Sayyid Ahmad al-Jurayhī, the supervisor of al-Ghazālī's khāṣṣ, was suffocated on Tuesday, 11th Šafar 926/30th January 1520, by orders of al-Ghazālī himself because he was pro-Ottoman. al-Ghazālī may have done that to ally himself more with the population (nas).

112. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.ii, pp.92-3. Yusuf arrived at Damascus on Tuesday 26th Muharram 926, which indicates that the dispute between al-Ghazālī and Hasan was during 925/1519.

113. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.ii, pp.91, 97. Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.1, p.163. It may have been that al-Ghazālī secretly wanted to gain the alliance of the "mischievous people" who, Ibn Tulun says were happy when he died.
because Ibn Tulun adds that due to this everyone was grateful for the release 115
from his mischievous behaviour. al-Ghazālī used assassination alike
against his subordinates, or potential foes. On Thursday, 22nd Jumādā II, 926/
10th June 1520, he arrested al-Jā'barī the dragoman of the Franks, in
Damascus, together with al-Jā'barī's second son, both of whom were jailed.
He was accused of bringing Muslim women to the Franks and he was charged
before al-Ghazālī. Although he is described as one of al-Ghazālī's closest
friends, his property was confiscated. Five thousand dinars were offered to
al-Ghazālī who thereupon set him free.116 Later, Sayyid 'Alī b. al-Sayyid
'Umar al-Fayqī, the Sultan's delegate, came to Damascus in Ramadān 926/
August 1520, to replace Mamlūk currency by Ottoman. al-Jā'barī begged
Sayyid 'Alī to persuade al-Ghazālī to return some of the money he had paid
in order to free himself. al-Ghazālī, however, produced evidence that al-
Jā'barī had provided Shāh Ismā'īl with weapons.117 Ibn Tulun believed
that the accusations were unfounded, but nevertheless al-Jā'barī was strangled
on Friday, 25th Ramadān 926/24th August, 1520. It may have been that al-
Jā'barī had become aware of secret contacts made by al-Ghazālī with
the Franks or possibly with Shāh Ismā'īl himself because a document retained at
Topkapi Saray Arşivi contains an undated report of an embassy sent by al-Ghazālī
to Shāh Ismā'īl to suggest a mutual alliance against the Ottomans.118

117. Ibn Tulun, Mufakahat, vol.ii, p.120.
118. Topkapi Saray Arşivi, Document No5469.
Other victims of al-Ghazālī were Zayn al-Dīn b. al-ʿAllāq, the former Marj mutakallim (local chief), and ʿĪsā b. al-Ṭawīl, the Shaykh of the village of Ghuzlāniyya. Zayn al-Dīn fled from Marj to Hama where Sultan Selīm granted him an iqṭa. It would seem that Zayn was not on good terms with al-Ghazālī who was suspected of sending Ibn Maqdūh al-Kurdi, who was amīr of Marj at that time, to kill Zayn. On Saturday, 15th Rajab/2nd July al-Ghazālī strangled ʿĪsā b. al-Ṭawīl, who was reported to be a supporter of Zayn.

Fearing assassination, the Hanafi judge in Damascus, Wali al-Dīn b. al-Farfūr (d.937/1530) fled to Aleppo, leaving Damascus on Thursday, 14th Muharram 926/5th January 1520, while al-Ghazālī was in Hawran waiting for the return of the pilgrims. The cause of his fear was a letter he had sent to the Sultan which complained of al-Ghazālī's behaviour. His messenger had been arrested and the letter confiscated and sent to the governor. Ibn Iyās, writing from Cairo, believed that Ibn al-Farfūr intended to inform the Sultan of al-Ghazālī's intended rebellion and of the Mamluks assembling in Damascus. Both men had a different concept of court administration. al-Ghazālī advocated Mamlūk procedure which precluded fees and was popular among the people, and incidentally enhanced his own popularity. Ibn al-Farfūr advocated

Ottoman procedure, and this was a source of friction between them. 124

al-Ghazālī endeavoured to make a reconciliation with Ibn al-Farfūr while he was in Aleppo, but failed to do so. 125 He did not return to Damascus until the Ottoman army marched against it to quell the rebellion led by al-Ghazālī after the death of Selīm. It is noteworthy that after Ibn al-Farfūr’s flight to Aleppo, al-Ghazālī ordered that no letter should leave Damascus until it had been approved by the rayyīs al-su‘āt (head courier). Many people suffered from this prohibition. 126

al-Ghazālī, in his relatively short period of government, paid great attention to the repair of government buildings as well as to mosques, schools and canals. It is noticeable that on his return to Damascus after the Sultan’s departure he ordered the restoration of the Viceregal Palace (Dār al-Sa‘āda) together with its stable. The work was carried out promptly. 127 In addition, he build six watch-towers (sing. bawwāba) which had loop-holes, in as many quarters of Damascus. He intended to erect other watch-towers in the wilderness from which to control the activities of thieves. 128

On Wednesday 10th Ramadān 924/15th September 1518, al-Ghazālī received an appointment as nāzīr (supervisor) of the Umayyad Mosque to which he

---

devoted great attention. He changed its floor; its marble was checked both inside and outside and damages were repaired. Columns and gates were scraped; some were re-painted and others ornamented with gold. Its revolting and verminous mats were replaced. Bannisters and windows were also either refixed and painted or replaced. The cleaning and repairing process cost about eighty thousand dinars. He showed great interest in repairing schools. When people who lived near the Mankilānīyya School complained that the structure was merely a derelict shelter for wild dogs, al-Ḡazālī was furious with the ṣāḥib (supervisor), Shīhāb al-Dīn b. al-Khaydarī who was stealing its endowments and revenue. He gave orders to strangle him but he repealed the sentence thanks to the mediation of others, and finally released him. His treatment of Muḥibb al-Dīn b. Manṣūr, supervisor of the endowments of the cemetery of Nimsha was different. He received corporal punishment and was later released on condition that he put the cemetery in order. He dismissed the dishonest endowments supervisor of Abū ʿUmar School, Muhammad b. Zurayq, who had sold many of its endowments. In this connection he appointed al-ʿAlī b. al-Mātānī on the 4th Ramadān 926/30th August 1520. This appointment was surrounded with pomp to such an extent that when he passed through the streets of

133. For the history of Abū ʿUmar School see Ibn Tūlūn, Qalāʾīḍ, vol.i, pp.165-03.
Damascus and al-Ṣālihiyya, flutes were blown, drums were beaten and
town criers announced the appointment, which no doubt reflects the importance
al-Ghazālī attached to the post. Advised by al-Ghazālī's deputy,‘Ubayd b. al-Tawil the Shaykh of al-Ṣālihiyya commenced the restoration
of the park of al-Rabwa which had been derelict for five years although many
futile attempts had been made to reconstruct it. Further, al-Ghazālī
cleaned the canals of the River Yazīd and the River Thawra with the least
possible discomfort to the people in Damascus.

B. al-Ghazālī's Rebellion and its Suppression

While in Bayrūt, al-Ghazālī received news of the sudden death of
the middle-aged Sultan Selīm, and hurriedly returned to Damascus. On his
way he dismissed Yusuf b. Sinān al-Rūmi, the Ottoman Supervisor of al-Biqā‘,
and appointed Ahmad b. Nāṣīr al-Dīn b. al-Ḥanash in his place. On Saturday,

137. On 28th Shawwal 926/12th October 1519 Frankish pirates attacked
Bayrūt in the hope of occupying it. The Bayrūtīs defended their
city and repulsed the Franks. Ibn Ṭūlūn first gave their casualties
as 400. Later when the Bayrūtīs reached Damascus two days after
the attack, he says that the Frankish casualties numbered five hundred
and eighty six. Losses among the Bayrūtīs were first estimated at about
one hundred. Later, the number was said to be only five, which
appears unlikely to be correct. On Sunday, 2nd Dhul Qa‘da 926/
15th October 1519, al-Ghazālī left Damascus for Bayrūt to assess
the value of Frankish booty and to inspect the towers and ammunition

15th Dhu'l Qa'da 26/28th October 1520, the Ottomans, following the advice of Yusuf b. Sinān, fortified themselves in the citadel after they had disconnected the bridge in front of the main gate. al-Ghazālī laid siege to the citadel with the help of shabāb (youths) from the quarters of al-Shāghūr, al-Ṣālihiyya and Maydān al-Ḥaṣar, in addition to the services of the Damascenes who were working in the citadel under the Mamluks, which fell on Monday the 17th of the month. There were in it about 150 Ottomans among them theologians and Sufis. Only two of them lost their lives: one of whom killed his wife fearing rape and afterwards killed himself. Sixty four people were arrested and the rest were set free. Yusuf b. Sinān and al-Qassāb Ahmad, the governor of the citadel, were sent to Jerusalem. al-Ghazālī pillaged the Ottoman houses and shops and confiscated the pilgrims’ deposits which had been left with the Ottomans in Damascus. When al-Ghazālī entered the citadel, he immediately restored the Mamluks’ mode of dress. 139

On the Tuesday following his conquest of the citadel, he despatched one of his men, Qānish al-Muqarqa to take Ḥamā, which he occupied after its Ottoman governor had fled to Aleppo. 140 On his way to Ḥamā, Qānish killed the Ottoman subashi of Ḥamā and entrusted the government to Ibn Ḥarfūsh. 141 Aware of the importance of Tripoli, al-Ghazālī sent his second dawādar, Qānim, there. Its governor fled to Aleppo and Qānim annexed the city. 142

141. The Ḥarfūsh was the leading Shi’a family in the region of Baṣ labakk. It continued to enjoy prominence in the government till the nineteenth century. Later it was converted to Christianity. The first name of this Ḥarfūshī was unable to be established. Salībī, Kamal, “Ḥarfūsh,” E.L.2, vol.iii, pp.205-6. See also Ibn Tulun, lām, p.232.
al-Ghazālī hurriedly began to assemble an army comprising the Mamluks who had gathered in Damascus, Kurds and Tukomans, probably from the region of Kisrawān in the Lebanon. There were Arab Bedouins from the tribes of Ibn al-Ḥanash in al-Biqā‘ from the tribes of Nablus, from Wadi al-‘Ajam tribes under the leadership of Yūnus b. al-Qawwas and a tribal force from the neighbourhood of Damascus under the command of a muqaddam by the name of ‘Umar b. al-‘Azhī (al-Gharghī?), al-Ghazālī inspected the shabāb of the Damascene quarters but their participation in the mobilized army to march against Aleppo is not confirmed in contemporary available sources. It seems that few people from Damascus joined the army although it would appear that the heads of the quarters were with al-Ghazālī. The total force numbered about twelve thousand soldiers, five hundred of them were armed

143. For the background of ‘Assaf family in Kisrawān, see Duwayhi, Tārikh al-jā‘ifa, pp.124, 156. Tārikh al-azmina, pp.238, 244. al-Shidyāq, Akhār, pp.346-7. See also Chapter VI, pp.204-6.

144. Ibn al-Qawwas is described by Ibn Tulūn, in 895/1489, as the bitter enemy of the Bedouins. His relation with the governors in Damascus was not always cordial. In 907/1501 the deputy governor attacked Ibn al-Qawwas’ village, looted it, stole his camels, and sheep, and plundered his belongings. As a probable reprisal, Bedouin tribes later attacked Damascus causing Qawwas to flee to Şafād. Qānsūh al-Burjī, the governor of Damascus, went to al-Şubayb Castle near Şafād in an attempt to crush Ibn al-Qawwas who again fled. He offered Qānsūh money which earned forgiveness and a robe of honour. Thereafter he supported the government and was the principal Arab Bedouin chieftain who allied himself with al-Ghazālī. After the defeat of al-Ghazālī, Iyās Pasha, the Ottoman governor of Damascus, beheaded Ibn al-Qawwas in 927/1521. Ibn Tulūn, Mufakhat, vol.i, pp.124, 244-7, 250, 264. Ibn Tulūn as quoted by Sharaf al-Dīn Musa b. Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.110b. Šā‘lamm, pp.141, 142, 154, 226, 237. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.i, p.170.


146. Ibn Tulūn as quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.109b.
with guns; he also possessed about twenty cannon. 147 Probably to provide provision for his army, al-Ghazālī ordered the closure of Selim’s convent and confiscated all kinds of provisions which were stored there. 148 While in Damascus he sent part of his army under the command of his dawādar Aslān towards Aleppo accompanied by the governors of Jerusalem and Ṣafad. 149 al-Ghazālī spent almost a month in Damascus and before leaving the city for Aleppo, on Wednesday, 14th Dhu’l-Ḥijja 926/26th November 1520, he appointed Qaṭā Darḍī, his third dawādar, as deputy in his absence and ʿĪsā ʿĀkram b. al-ʾĀkram as the citadel’s governor. 150

When Karaja Pasha, the Ottoman governor of Aleppo, heard news of the departure of an army from Damascus against Aleppo, he employed people to fortify the city and to brick up its gates. 151 From Aleppo, he attacked the two villages of Sarmin and Darīk to avenge the Ottomans who had been slaughtered by the people of these two villages and probably to use the booty he acquired as provisions. On his return to Aleppo, he was intercepted by a unit of al-Ghazālī’s

R. Hanbali, Durr, MS. Taymuriyya, No:2105, fols.46a, b. ʿūnūmānīyya, MS. No:3293, fol.77a. T. A. Y. No:3190, fol.53b.


army. Karaja was defeated and the booty was regained; Karaja escaped and returned to Aleppo.\footnote{152}

The vanguard of al-Ghazalī's troops arrived at al-Ansārī in the outskirts of Aleppo on Tuesday, 23rd Dhu'l Hijja 926/5th December 1520. From Aleppo an army emerged which engaged with al-Ghazalī's force. A victory was not proclaimed by al-Ghazalī's army although his troops seem to have been superior. The city was invested, arrows and cannon were used, also the water supply was cut off. The situation became more tense with the arrival of al-Ghazalī on Saturday, 4th Muharram 927/1st December 1520. For two days there was fierce fighting and about two hundred Aleppines were killed by stray arrows or fire, although al-Ghazalī had warned the population to keep off the streets. Houses in the quarter of al-Ansārī were pillaged to such an extent that even doors and windows were taken away.\footnote{153} The reason for this was because the siege was made during the bitter winter of Aleppo. It continued until the 9th Muharram/21st December when al-Ghazalī raised it. It would seem that losses in al-Ghazalī's army were slight; Ibn Tulun states that only a few were killed. The reaction of the Aleppines, whose loyalty Karaja Pasha suspected, is not known.\footnote{154} It was from the Mamlūk Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Shāh al-Ḥalabī (better known as al-Maydānī, d.934/1527) that reaction came and he

\footnote{152} Ibn Tulun, Iklām, p.233.


roused the people of Aleppo against al-Ghazālī. 155

al-Ghazālī was forced to raise the siege on 9th Muharram/21st December, and to return to Damascus. He received news that Khāyīrbāy was advancing against him from Egypt 156 and probably also learned that ʿAlī b. Shāh Siwār (d.928/1521) the local governor of Elbīstān was marching against him. 157 It was almost a month later, on Friday, 8th Safar 927/19th January 1521, that he reached Damascus. He immediately began to improve his position and strengthen his force by mobilizing the shābāb (youths) of Damascus and the neighbouring villages, in addition to the Bedouin tribes. He organised propaganda for this purpose and on Saturday, 16th Safar 927/27th January 1521 he met the Damascene armed shābāb in al-Maṭa (the public square of Damascus) where he asked them not to fight the Ottomans for his sake but to defend their families. 158 On Monday the 18th he summoned the learned men, theologians and merchants to the Umayyad Mosque in the hope that they would invest him as Sultan. They did not come to fulfil his desire. 159 The next day he summoned the people from the quarters and they answered promptly. When they were assembled, his dāwār Aṣlān and the chief judge Sharaf al-Dīn b. Muflih were commissioned to swear the loyalty both of themselves and the people to


160. Ibn Ṭūlūn, as quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd , fol.110b.
al-Ghazālī. 161 Probably because the learned men were reluctant, he sought popularity by prohibiting wine and hashish (cannabis) and abolishing the taxes (mukūs) imposed by the Ottomans. 162 On the same day, al-Ghazālī went to al-Maṣṭaba, where he inspected the forces of zuʿar and tribes from al-Ghawṭa. A vanguard of two thousand cavalymen (fāris) drawn from these forces was sent to meet the Ottomans. 163 Possibly in order to punish the apathetic merchants who did not support him as did the shabāb, he was suspected of causing a blaze in four of the great markets of Damascus on Wednesday, 20th Safer/31st January 1521. 164 al-Ghazālī was announced as Sultan al-Ashraf of the two holy shrines, a title accorded to the senior Muslim Sultan, on Friday, 22nd Safer/2nd February 1521, in the Umayyad Mosque. Ibn Tūlūn records that when his procession passed the mob (ruʿā al-nāṣ) prayed and begged God to give him victory. There is no mention of any merchants or learned men being present during this ceremony. The day after he was invested, as Sultan, youths from the quarters of al-Qaṣāb and al-Maṭābil, and from the villages of Mizza, Barza and Kafarsusa, were inspected by him. On Sunday he received homage as Sultan. 165 The lack of any reference to the presence of learned men or merchants on this occasion is also noticeable.

162. Ibn Tūlūn as quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawḍ, fol.110b.
163. Ibn Tūlūn as quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawḍ, fol.110b.
In spite of popular support there seems to have been some anxiety about the future of the city when news of the advancing Ottoman army reached Damascus. There was an influx of strangers from the countryside and from the neighbouring villages, in addition to pilgrims from Hama, Aleppo and from other lands of the Sultanate who had been compelled by al-Ghazālī to return to Damascus. This caused some people to move their families outside Damascus and many who lived near the walls vacated their houses. Many could only pray that the fighting would be away from the city walls.

Fortunately for the Damascenes the actual engagement took place on Tuesday, 26th Şafar 927/6th February 1521, to the east of the village of Barza. In the short fight that ensued al-Ghazālī was deserted by his supporters. About three thousand and sixty people were killed; al-Ghazālī and many of his aides such as Aṣān and Qaḍā Bārdī were killed. Mamluks who could escape fled to Egypt where they were executed by Khayrībāy. Among them, in 928/1521, was Ahmad b. Qāsim b. Baqar who had supported al-Ghazālī and fought at his side. The number of casualties is not surprising since the Ottoman army was composed of thirty thousand soldiers and about four thousand janissaries. They bore with them approximately 180 cannon, a larger number than Sultan Selīm had used at the battle of Marj Dābiq. To announce the news of victory, the head of al-Ghazālī and one thousand ears were sent to Istanbul.


The Ottoman army swept through Damascus and its suburbs. It invaded houses, pillaged shops and stores. Women, learned men, Sufis, the young and the old were badly treated by the Ottomans to the extent that women assembling in the school of Abu 'Umar were attacked and stripped of their clothes. In his autobiography, Ibn Tulun mentioned that a number of his own works were lost during this period of chaos.

On Wednesday 27th Safar/7th February 1521, Farhad Pasha, the commander of the army, accompanied by the former chief judge Wafid al-Din b. al-Farfur entered Damascus. They went to the citadel where the keys were handed to them by Isma'il b. al-Akram. Isma'il accompanied them to al-Salihiyia and paid a visit to the tomb of ibn 'Arabi. In every quarter and village they stationed a subashi to control the behaviour of the army towards the people. At the same time a new subashi was appointed as governor of the citadel. Farhad remained at the head of affairs in Damascus until 15th Rabi'2/27/24th February 1521, when Iyäs Pasha became the appointed governor of Damascus and its dependencies. Gaza, Jerusalem and Safad were not under his direct jurisdiction. Farhad Pasha left Damascus with the army on the 15th Jumada 1/25th March 1521. One thousand janissaries arrived by sea two days later to help Iyäs Pasha with the government.

172. Ibn Tulun as quoted by Ibn Ayyüb, Rawd, fols. 111a-b.
CHAPTER II

THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS AND THE DEMOGRAPHY

OF THE LIWĀ' OF DĀ'MASCUS
On Tuesday, 5 Safar 924/16th February 1518, Sultan Selim entrusted Janbirdi al-Ghazali with the niyaba (province) of Damascus and its dependent villages. His governorship was extended from Damascus to al-‘Arish to include: Safad, Nablus, Jerusalem, Gaza and Karak-Shawbak. Ottoman governors were appointed in Homs, Hama and Tripoli.

When Janbirdi lost his life in a rebellion against the Ottomans in 927/1521, the jurisdiction of his successor Iyās Pasha was reduced to Damascus and its mu‘āmala. The other townships were each accountable to their special


ssanjaqbeys who had been appointed after the rebellion; each of these sanjaqbeys was subordinate to the governor of Damascus.

The morning after Sultan Selim entered Damascus on Sunday, 2nd Ramadān 922/28th November 1516 a census (iddat) was taken of all the residents of Damascus. Houses, shops and other buildings were also enumerated at the suggestion of Zayn al-Ḥādīn al-Faranī (d.926/1519) the Ottoman judge of the city. Although the results of the census have not survived, a number of surveys which were carried out during the 16th century are still available and contain valuable information.

From these surveys an attempt to assess the administrative divisions of the liwā' of Damascus and its demography during the reign of Sultan Selim I and the beginning of Sultan Selim II's reign is presented in this chapter. It is noticeable that numbers given in the Tapu Defters do not always coincide with the number of the recorded names. The discrepancies are mainly slight. The numbers given in this study follow the figures supplied. The liwā' which was divided into nahiyās will be dealt with in rotation from north towards the south.

4. Ibn Tūlūn, Mufakhat, vol.ii, p.31. For the life of Zayn al-Ḥādīn, who was later appointed in Aleppo, see Ibn Tūlūn, Qudāt, p.305. Raḍī al-Dīn al-Ḥanbālī, Durr, MS. BM. Add.23976, fols. 103a, b.
1. Nāḥiyat Qāra

The demographic data is provided on the basis of households (khāna) and bachelors (mujarrad), whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish. Those who provided religious service to the community and Ashraf are recorded separately as they were given tax exemption. The data available concerning this nahiya are presented in the Tapu Defters as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Christian Households</th>
<th>Christian Bachelors</th>
<th>No. of households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.7-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.144-63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.358-96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of eight villages of this nahiya are repeated in these three surveys. Their census was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian Households</th>
<th>Christian Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second table indicates that there was a steady growth in the population of these eight villages. It is noticeable that in this nahiya, Christians constituted approximately one-third of the population. Ibn Jubayr (d.614/1217) states that the entire population of Qāra were Christian, while Yāqūt (d.626/1229) says that most of its population were Christian. These surveys taken

some three hundred years after Yaqt, give a Muslim majority which would seem to indicate the continuous process of Islamization.

It is worth mentioning that Tadmur, which was a separate *anflal (an administrative unit) in the fourth *afqa under the Mamlūks, was part of this nābiya.

2. Nāhiyat Qalamun

Demographical literature concerning this nābiya which, under the Mamlūks, was part of the barr of Damascus, is available in four surveys carried out at different times, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp. 1-5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp. 139-43)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263 (pp. 349-55)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474 (p. 261)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that although the number of villages in this nābiya was small, the population of each village, compared with others in the rest of the province, was high. By comparing the figures provided in T.D. 430 and T.D. 401, it is observed that the population was almost three times as great. In the first three surveys, the names of three villages are repeated and the result


11. Yaqt mentions that it was part of the country of Damascus, while Dimashqī refers to it as a separate iqlīm known as iqlīm Sinnīr. Muṣjam, vol. iv, p. 166. Nukhbat, p. 198.

of their comparison in the different surveys is worthy of note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticeable that by comparing the figures of T.D.430 and T.D.401 that the number of households is almost three times as many, followed by a slight decline. The name of one village, repeated in four surveys, confirms these figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the numbers tripled then gradually declined.

3. Nāḥiyat Jubbat al-*Assāl

The figures for this nāḥiya which was part of the barr of Damascus, are available in three surveys which have reached us. Its population during the period under consideration was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.115-38)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.308-12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.265-76) (pp.584-632)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demography of nine villages, the names of which are repeated in the three surveys, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures, it will be noticed that the population was rising steadily; and the village of Saydnāyā remained Christian, and, also, they grew in number.

In the census of the thirty-two villages whose names appear in the survey of T.D.401 and T.D.474, the following is noticeable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observation here is that the number of Muslim households decreased while the number of Christian households increased.

4. Nāḥiyat al-Zabadānī

Under the Mamlūks it was part of the barr of Damascus. In available data from four defters, the number of villages and the population is recorded as follows:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Imams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.451-65)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.304-25)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.287-95)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are thirteen villages whose figures are provided in T.D.430 and T.D.401, also showing an increase in the population as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticeable that there was an increase in both Muslim and Christian populations. The names of sixteen villages also appear in T.D.430, T.D.401, and T.D.474. Their demography was as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table, also, the number of both Muslim and Christian households increased, followed by a considerable decline in the households of both.

5. Nahiyat Wadi Barada

Three complete surveys of this nahiya, which was part of the barr of Damascus are available and a fourth incomplete. According to these surveys the demography of this nahiya was as follows:
Fourteen villages whose names also appear in the following surveys
give the total population as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.442-50)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.316-23)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.300-6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.278-85)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet again, there is an increase in the population then a decrease.

This is also supported by comparing the census of the five villages whose names appear in the lists of the four surveys:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same pattern is repeated with first an increase then a decrease in the populations.
6. نَاحِیَة یُلیم دارانی ۱۵

Four surveys of the above are available; and their figures were in this manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.467-75)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.331-7)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.288-95)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.481-3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T.D.430 and T.D.401 provide statistical figures for the same villages showing an increase in the population, but if the total population of the two villages which are common in all these four surveys are compared, the same rise and decline appears:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. نَاحِیَة وَدی المAjam

Under the Mamlūks, this نَاحِیَة was part of the barr of Damascus and the remainder was part of the *سَفَقَة* of Banyās of the Southern Safqa. ۱۶

15. Dimashqī speaks of an iqlīm by the name of Dārayyā; دارانی is the nīsba form of Dārayyā, the largest village in it, and which was noted for its water-melons. Yāqūt, *Mus̱jam*, vol.ii, p.536.


defters provide demographic information about it, which was recorded as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp. 477-99)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp. 338-54)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263 (pp. 273-9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 275 (pp. 1-12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474 (pp. 487-93)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The census of twenty-five villages whose names are mentioned in T.D. 430 and T.D. 401 give the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. 401</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the population shows an increase and appears in the same manner in the census of the four villages which is recorded in T.D. 430, T.D. 401 and T.D. 263 as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sayyids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no difference in the pattern when comparing the statistics of the four villages mentioned in T.D. 474, viz:—
Available surveys show the following demography:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Turkomans</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sharifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Nāḥiyat Marj al-Qiblī Wal-Shamālī

This nāḥiya, under the Mamlūks, was part of the barr of Damascus. 17

An increase in the number of the villages recorded is noticeable here. In addition, by comparison with other regions, it was more densely populated, and the Turkoman element emerged with significant growth. The same pattern, here also, of increase and decrease in population is repeated. This is ratified by comparing the total population of the forty-six villages whose names appear in three surveys:

17. al-ʿUmārī, Taṣrīf, p.177. Qalqashandī, Subh, vol.iv, p.97. Dimashqī points out that it was an iqṭilim. In this respect he probably used the term of iqṭilim to denote an area and not in the administrative sense as a specific area with its own administrative apparatus. Nukḥbat, p.198.
9. Nāḥiyat al-Ghawja

This, another part of the barr of Damascus under the Mamluks, concerning which demographical literature is provided in three surveys.

Its fertility, compared to other nāḥiyās, attracted a larger population.

This also, in spite of its increase began to decline by the second half of the sixteenth century as shown by the next table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Turkomans Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sharīfs</th>
<th>Jews Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. D. 401</td>
<td>(pp. 52-83)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. D. 263</td>
<td>(pp. 181-218)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. D. 474</td>
<td>(pp. 494-518)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here there is a palpable increase of 248 which, according to T. D. 474, falls by 574 households. A Turkoman element is discernible in this nāḥiya as in Marj, while a Jewish element constituted a fair-sized minority in the village of Jawbar.18

18. According to Ibn Ṭūlūn, Jews in Jawbar were the majority and Muslims were few there, but Tapu Defters show that Jews and Muslims were almost numerically equal. It may be that Ibn Ṭūlūn was the only Muslim historian who referred to Jews in Jawbar. Neither Yāqūt nor other Arab geographers referred to Jews in that village. In the year 1521-22, five years after the Ottoman conquest, an Italian Jewish Rabbi by the name of Moses Bassola (d. 1560) visited Damascus and Jawbar. He referred to the native Jewish community of the latter as comprising sixty families and also referred to a beautiful synagogue there. John Sanderson, when he visited =
Twenty villages are concerned in these surveys, their names recurring in each. A comparison of the numbers in these villages shows a similar pattern of increase and decrease:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Turkomans</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Damascus

Statistics which concern the city of Damascus are available in three surveys. They quote the names of the mahallas (districts) and enumerate the zuqāqs (streets) constituting each mahalla.¹⁹ The growth of the population and its decline as reflected by these surveys is as follows:—

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahalla</td>
<td>Bach-Imāns</td>
<td>Holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.2-51)</td>
<td>36 7213 358 70 546 31 519 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.11-174)</td>
<td>37 8119 393 136 704 96 516 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.28-201)</td>
<td>39 7054 322 80 1021 164 546 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these, there were ninety-two sharifs and four natwans (disabled, weak). Each Kurd and Turkoman community living in Damascus had its own zuqāq. Kurds constituted nineteen households and those of the Turkomans comprised twenty-four households and two bachelors. 20

Added to these were twenty zutt (gypsy) households living in Mahalat al-Kharāb. 21 Those families, together with others of the same stock in the liwā, paid 1,000 akches per annum in taxes before 950/1543, and paid later (955/1548) 25,000 akches annually. 22

The figures show that the number of Christians steadily rose. It is probable that some Christians migrated from the countryside to Damascus. They had nineteen zuqāqs in Damascus, among these were four jamāʿat (groups) unidentified with any zuqāq. Their particular sects were not mentioned but the Maronites had their own zuqāq, 23 and their own patriarch. 24

---

20. T.D.401, p.10. T.D.474, p.138. There was, also, another zuqāq named Zuqāq Bir al-Aknā. The population comprised 50 households, two bachelors and two sharifs. It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of Kurds among them. T.D.401, p.38.

21. T.D.474, p.84.


23. The Jacobite and Melchite patriarchs were the only ones recognized by the Mamluk Sultans. al-Umārī recommended a form of waṣliyya (oath) for each one of them. al-Umārī, Taṣrif, pp.144-6. al-Qalqashandi, Subh, vol.4, p.194. T.D.474, pp.188-9, 190-1. Ziadeh, N., Urban Life, pp.115-6.

24. Duwayhī records in 936/1529 that the Maronite Patriarch of Damascus died and was succeeded by Jirīs al-Ihdirī. In 985/1577 he mentions =
The number of Jews did not increase. They were identified in the defters either according to their origin or sect, or their own particular district.

They were classified as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jama' at Yahud</th>
<th>T.D. 401 Households</th>
<th>T.D. 263 Households</th>
<th>T.D. 474 Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama' at Szqaliba</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Slavs) 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama' at-i Musta'riba</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustan al-Ghit</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(includes Jews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama' at-i Mahallat-i</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Annaba 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama' at-i Qara'In</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Karaites) 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritans of Bayt</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihya</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama' at-i Yahud</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifranj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahud Bayt Liya</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the Jews appear to have been of local origin. The number of the Ifranj Jews is conspicuously large and possibly includes those expelled from Spain. The Samaritan community, many of whose members held clerical posts, worked under both Mamluks and Ottomans; and during the sixteenth century it was noted for this type of worker.

It is apparent that the population in each nahiya increased and sometimes doubled prior to the decade preceding 950/1573, after which there was a decline, sometimes gradual and sometimes sharp. This pattern is applicable to the population of Damascus. Disease, droughts and earthquakes which had struck Damascus probably offer a partial explanation. In 930/1523, plague was rife in Damascus so that at its climax the victims daily numbered 200 in the city alone.

= in Arabic sources as two distinct sects, the Karaites and Rabbiites. al-*Umari, Tarif, pp.142-3. Qalqashandi, Subh, vol.iv, p.194. Ibn Iyas Badawi, vol.iv, p.244 where he mentions that Samaritans, Karaites and Rabbiites were compelled to pay money in 917/1511. Ziadeh, Urban, pp. 115-6.

29. Visiting Jewish travellers gave the number of Jews and Jewish Synagogues in Damascus. R. Detachia of Ratisbon (1174-1187) said there were ten thousand Jews under their own “prince”. Meshullam Ben R. Na’ahem gave their number as four hundred and fifty Jewish households who were both “rich and honoured”. Jewish Travellers, (edited by Elkan Alder, London, 1930), pp.85, 90, 110, 126, 199.


and 30 in its suburb al-Ṣāliḥiyā. In that year, also, Aleppo had been similarly stricken, the disease taking a toll of 20-30 victims daily. In the year 934/1527, drought struck the area and caused a sharp rise in prices. İstisqa prayers were held in Jumāda, and the Sahih al-Bukhari was read. It was said that light rain fell followed by heavy rain. In the next year, heavy rain fell for eight continuous days in Jumāda. It was so severe that many houses fell down and about fifty people were buried among the ruins. Four years later plague struck Damascus and every village of its dependencies, with the exception of al-Mizza, had its victims. Cases of plague were also reported in Aleppo during this and the following year. Ibn Ayyūb records that an old man told him that during Ramadan 950/December 1543 there were not enough people to fill even the front row in the Umayyad Mosque. This may have been due to plague which was again reported in Damascus in 951/1544. Five years later, the River Barada flooded and houses on its banks were swept away and
many people were killed. According to an eye witness, such a flood had not
occurred in living memory. Suq al-Bimāristān, near the citadel, was completely
flooded as was Suq al-Naṭārīn, near Bab al-Farādis. It swamped at Marja
and deluged the Yalbunga Mosque.\(^{40}\) Subsequently in 975/1567 a drought
hit Damascus to an extent that the entire family of Hasan al-Būrīnī, the
historian, was forced to leave Damascus for Jerusalem where they remained until
979/1571 when they returned to Damascus.\(^{41}\) The poet Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid
b. Māmāl al-Rūmī (d.985/1577)\(^{42}\) graphically describes how an earthquake
struck Damascus at dawn. This he attributed as a punishment for corruption, lust
and fraud.\(^{43}\) Possibly such diseases and disasters partially explain the decrease
in the population. Another possibility may be the inaccuracy or otherwise of
surveys.

However, the population of Damascus during the last quarter of the
century began to increase. Ibn Ayyūb, writing in 997/1588, says:-

---

40. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.13a, b, 228b-229a. For location of these
places see Papper, Egypt and Syria, vol.i, pp.38-40, also maps Nos:
15 and 16.

41. al-Muḥibbī, Muḥammad (d.111/1699), Khulāṣat al-athar fī ularyān
title, Muḥibbī, Khulāṣat.

42. Ibn Māmāl, from Istanbul, started his career as a janissary in the
corps of Damascus. In 960/1552 he went on a pilgrimage; later he
was dismissed from the corps. He worked as an interpreter both in
the Kubrā and al-Qisma Courts in Damascus. He was distinguished in
the arts of mawwāl, zajal, and muwashshahat. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.
252a, b-257a,b. Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.iii, pp.50-1.

43. Rawdat al-muṣḥaṣ wa bahjat al-ushshāq, MS. Alexandria Municipal
Library, No.2079. A photocopy available in the department of
manuscripts of the Arab League, and another photocopy in the library
of the Arab Academy in Damascus; both were consulted; fols.190a,b
in each case. Shorter title, Ibn Māmāl, Diwān.
The population of Damascus is now innumerable but its indigenous people do not exceed twenty thousand. The rest are either Egyptians, Aleppines, Hamawi, Hijazi, Rumi, Barlabakkis, Safadis, Saydani or from Gaza, Qudsii, ‘Ajami, Maghribi and Safidi. All these inhabit Damascus and own properties, fill posts or are craftsmen...

While in Ramadān in 950, there were not enough persons to complete the front row of the Mosque, I found that in the middle of Sha’bān in the year 997, as also in the year 998, I could not find my way except with difficulty, when I went to perform late evening prayers (al-‘ishā’) in the Umayyad Mosque because it was so crowded. Praise be to Almighty God who gives and does not forget anyone. 44

From this it would seem that people were migrating to Damascus with a consequent crowding and resumption of its markets. This is confirmed by the fact that the precincts around the Umayyad Mosque became shops for selling perfumes, rose-water and stationery. All of this reflects a return of prosperity to the city. 45

The Lebanese part of the province of Damascus on its Western side, may be divided into three parallel areas: hinterland, mountain and coast. The hinterland was composed of the following nahiyās:-

1) Barlabakk 46

Statistical data about the city of Barlabakk is available in three surveys.

It was as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sayyids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.22-34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.6-35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.168-79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


45. Ibn Ayyūb, Tadhkira, fol.224b.

46. Under the Mamlūks, it was a niyāba in the northern ṣafqa, its governor =
The same pattern is repeated here; first an increase then a drop in the Muslim population. Tapu Defters do not refer to Shi'a in Ba'labakk since the Ottomans did not recognise the Shi'a and registered them as Muslims without specifying their madhhab. Christian churches are not specified but Maronites are referred to as a separate group. Contrary to the Muslims, the Christian population of Ba'labakk did not decrease, neither did the number of the Jews in Ba'labakk. Similarly, Tapu Defters do not specify their sects.

2) Nähiyat Ba'labakk

During the Mamlük period Ba'labakk had a separate wilaya comprising several villages, the names and number of which are not provided in Mamlük sources. In the sixteenth century the number and size of the population of the villages are given as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.34-79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.39-111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.177-215)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet again, the figures present an increase followed by a decline, both of which are applicable to Christians. This is traceable by comparison with the figures given for the twenty-eight villages whose names appear in the three surveys.

47. Around 937/1530, their number was 28 households, whereas before 955/1548, their number was 23 households. T.D. 383, p.34. T.D. 401, pp.76-7.

48. Neither Yağût, al-ʿUmari, nor Qalqashandī make any reference to Jews in Ba'labakk, Dimashqī claims that there were ancient buildings and...
In these instances only the Christian population showed an increase.

3) Nāhiyat Karak-Nūḥ

In the Mamlūk period the town of Karak Nūḥ was the centre of the 'amāl of al-Biqa' al-'Aẓīzī; Tapu Defters show the same cycle of increase and decrease:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Imams</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.430</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.383</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.401</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of thirty-four villages appear in the three census with the following demography:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sayyids</th>
<th>Sharīfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Sayyids</td>
<td>Sharīfs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.430</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.383</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Con.401</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And monuments related to the times of Abraham, Moses and Solomon. It is not known whether Jews lived there out of religious attachment or whether they practised their rites in one of these buildings. Nukhbat, p.199. See also Lewis, B., Notes and documents, p.23.

The increase and decrease are applicable to Muslims only but in the case of Christians a steady increase is apparent.

4) Nahiyat Qūrna

This territory stretched to the south of Karak Nūh. Arab geographers do not appear to mention a place by this name in Lebanon. Its demography is as given below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imam</th>
<th>Sharīfs</th>
<th>Blind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.120-48)</td>
<td>30 1198</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp.179-97)</td>
<td>26 1550</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.245-65)</td>
<td>25 1331</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474 (pp.300-13)</td>
<td>26 1200</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here there is a decrease in the number of villages and, also, in the population. This is confirmed by comparison with the census of the twenty-one villages whose names are repeated in the four surveys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern, first of increase then of decrease, continues.
5) **Nahiya Hammāra**

This nahiya comprised the eastern hills overlooking al-Biqa‘ to the south-east of Qurna. Four surveys provide statistical information about this nahiya whose demography was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.160-77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.234-52, pp.612-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.290-303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.353-64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again an increase in the population then a fall is confirmed and proved by comparing the total population of the nineteen villages whose statistics are available in the following surveys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again the pattern of increase then decrease is noticeable among the Muslims while Christian numbers rose.

---

50. Neither Yāqūt nor other Arab geographers mention it. Ibn Tulūn mentions that its muqaddam, Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Dīn, was slain by mobs in Damascus in 842/1438. al-Ǧazzīrī refers to Hammāra as belonging to the ṭamal of Biqa‘, *Ila*m, p.51. *Kawākıb*, vol.iii, p.30.
6)  

Nahiyat Iqlim al-Billān

The number of villages and their populations in this nahiyah, as provided by the available surveys was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christian Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.432-41)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.323-30)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.282-5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.477-9, 775-6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison between the total number of the population of the eleven villages whose names appear in both T.D.430 and T.D.401 shows that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Christian Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a noticeable increase in population of the two villages repeated in all surveys and a considerable decrease immediately follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Yaqt does not refer to this place, but it remains one of the few in Syria which retains the title of Iqlim. Muhammad Kurd `Ali, Al-Ghawja, p.145.
Four available surveys provide information about the number of villages and the size of population in Wāḍī al-Taym. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.208-23)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.366-83)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.450-72)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.366-94)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing the total population in the twenty villages whose names are repeated in this surveys the following appear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a sharp increase, a decrease ensued. It is worth mentioning that these defters do not refer to Drūze since the Ottomans did not recognize this sect but registered it as Muslim. Ibn Ṭūlūn mentions that the people of the village of Jaramāna in al-Ghawtā were Tayāmna (Drūze) and appeared to be

migrating. He expressed surprised at this since the entire inhabitants of al-
Ghawṭa were Sunna.

8. Naḥḥiyat ʿArqūb

According to T.D.430 and T.D.401 it was combined with Wāḍī al-Taym.

In T.D.263 and T.D.474, it had its own census taken. Its demography was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.206-23)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.366-83)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.473-6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.395-9)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four villages repeated in these surveys with a census as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows how the population rose, fell, then rose again.

53. In his scanty information about Wāḍī al-Taym, Ibn Tūlūn gives the impression that they were robbers and had terrified the population since the Crusaders. He refers to a ḥān built by the Sultan in 886/1481 in Wāḍī al-Taym, and to visits of inspection made by the naʿīb to this place. Under the Shiḥābis, formed their own contingent in the army of Fāṭḥ al-Dīn II, which was a menace during the looting of Damascus in 1015/1606. Ibn Tūlūn, Musḥakahat, vol.1, pp.46, 132, 370; Qalqūlī, vol.1, p.39; Darb, p.155; al-Būrīnī, Ḥasan (d.1024/1615), Tarājīm al-aʿyan min abnāʾ al-zaman, 2 vols.; (Damascus, 1959, 1963), vol.ii, p.280. Shorter title, Burūrī, Tarājīm; Muḥammad Kurd ʿAli, al-Ghawṭa, p.35.

54. This is not mentioned by Yāqūt or other Arab geographers.
9) Nahiyat Iqlim al-Zabib 55

The demography of this nahiyat is shown as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.421-31)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.354-65)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.251-72)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.452-74)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these surveys the names of twelve villages appear and their census produced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuous rise then a sharp fall are again conspicuous. In addition, a small number of Christians is discernible.

10) Nahiyat al-Sharara

Under the Mamluks, it was one of ten tamals which constituted the Southern Safqa of the Mamlaka of Damascus 56. It was governed by an ordinary

55. It is not mentioned by the geographers. Al-Khaliqi al-Safadi mentions, later, that Fakhr al-Din II in 1028/1618 divided this nahiyat and Wadi al-Taym between the brothers Ahmad and Ali the sons of Shihab. Tarikh, p.84.

The census of this nahiyah is provided in four surveys giving the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams Kurekpiyan</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp. 405-20)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp. 531-49)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263 (pp. 400-17)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474 (pp. 437-52)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are five villages whose demography is provided by all these surveys as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>160 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>485 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 263</td>
<td>558 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474</td>
<td>297 212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similarity of increase and a sudden decline is again revealed and is confirmed by comparing the total population of the twenty-three villages whose names appear in T.D. 430 and T.D. 401:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Kurekpiyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>1666 216 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>883 192 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this nahiyah, as in al-Hula, there is a group called Kurekpiyan (hard labourers) which is, also, referred to as renjberan. This group was employed

---

to cultivate çeltuk (rice).

After the Ottoman conquest, the state participated in the cultivation of rice. Kürrekçiyân were brought in to augment the labour force. The date of their introduction is not certain but most likely it was in the late forties. References are made to them in connection with villages and farms which possessed rivers. The state claimed half of the produce in addition to al-üstübr of the other half of the produce and kürrekçiyân were exempt from all other taxation.

In spite of state assistance in rice growing, production was insufficient. Bilad al-Sham continued to import its rice from Egypt, but the Sultan issued a hukûm (order) to prohibit its importation. This, naturally, caused hardship to the people and in 977/1569, the Sultan lifted his ban and it was again imported from Egypt. He also commanded the governor to grow rice in al-Sham and its neighbourhood as it was done in the old days. This decision was taken in order to divert imports from Egypt to Istanbul where there was hardly sufficient rice to meet demand. A similar order, some ten years later, was issued to lift the prohibition from the Sultan’s imaret in Jerusalem, and again rice was allowed to be imported from Egypt.


60. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.132-3.
During the year 999/1590, Damascus suffered hardship from drought. Supplies of wheat, barley and rice were affected and prices soared. Ibn Ayyūb (d. c.1000/1592) refers several times to this fact which implies that rice was an article of diet together with wheat and barley.  

11) Nāḥiyat al-Ḥamāma

Under the Mamluks, according to al-Ẓāhirī, it constituted an iqlīm belonging to Bānyās. Its census is provided in four surveys which enumerated the population as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Kūrektīyān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.389-403)</td>
<td>20 plus 3 mazra‘ās</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.551-67)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263 (pp.421-47)</td>
<td>15 plus 11 mazra‘ās</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.401-30)</td>
<td>17 plus 9 mazra‘ās</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that there was a large number of kūrektīyān, because the humidity and abundant water rendered it suitable for the growing of rice.

The table shows that the number of kūrektīyān residents decreased and this fact, also, is applicable to the total population of the ten villages whose names appear in the four surveys as presented in the table below:-


74.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even this rich area shows a decrease in population.

The Mountain of Lebanon within the province of Damascus comprised the following nāhiyās:-

1) Nāhiyat Kisrawān

Dimashqī referred to Kisrawān as being part of the amal of Bašlabakk.63

Little information remains concerning its administration. Šāliḥ b. Yahyā, when quoting al-Nuwayrī, mentions that in 706/1306 it was given as an iqta' to three hundred Turkoman cavalry with instructions to guard its roads from Antilyās to the borders of the mu'allakah of Tripoli and watch the shore. This was still the situation when Šāliḥ b. Yahyā wrote his history.64 Suspected persons were prevented from reaching Nahrist al-Kalb unless special permission had been obtained from the amirs of al-Ghurb.65 However, later under the Ottomans it became a separate nāhiya with demography as shown below:-

63. Dimashqī, Nukhbat, p.199.


The increase and the decrease in the Muslim populations is again apparent. In addition, the number of Christians in this nahiya had vastly increased until it almost equalled the size of the Muslim population. The names of twenty-four villages, which appear in all these schedules, provide the following statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.226-44)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.353b-88)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.385-401)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the increase in the number of the Muslims is negligible. The number of the Christian population has also risen. Duwayhi mentions that after the resuscitation of Kisrawān and Jubayl, following the Ottoman conquest, Twelver Shi'ā moved from neighbouring (jihat) Bar' labakk to settle in the villages of Farayyā, Harājil and Biq'āṭā; Sunnites came to al-Biq'ā and Fatqā and also to the coastal villages of 'Almā and Fayṭarūn. In addition, Drūze came from Matn and Jurd to live in Brumnānā and to inhabit the farms of Kisrawān, while Christians who had migrated to Tripoli returned. This influx probably accounts for the halt in decrease of the Muslim population and the increase of the Christians.

---

66. Duwayhi, Tārikh al-azmina, pp.152-3. For the location of these villages and places see Sānī, "Northorn Lebanon", pp.150-1.
2) Nahiyat Matn

Administrative details of this area under the Mamluks are scanty and vague. Most likely it was under the supervision of the Turkomans in Kisrawán.

A census given in three surveys has survived:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christian Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp. 270-6)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp. 277-299)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp. 426-35)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The almost complete absence of Imāms is noticeable, and probably reflects the larger Druze population of the area. 68

The Christian element is noticeably small.

There are nine villages whose names are repeated in the three surveys with the following demography:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An increase and a decrease are noticeable as ever.

67. Little information is provided by available printed sources about Matn Sālih b. Yahya mentioned that Sa'd al-Dīn Khādr b. Muhammad b. Hajī, a Duhaylī amīr (d. 713/1313) sent his horses to graze in Matn and Kafar Silwān, Duwayhi said that Druze came from Matn and Jurd to live in Brummana, Tarīkh, p. 56. Tarīkh al-azmina, p. 153.

3) **Nāḥiyat Jurd**

The following figures are given for this nahiya:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.258-69)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp.341-61)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.415-24)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of the increase and decrease is retained. This is attested to by comparison of the total population of the thirteen villages whose names appear in the three surveys given below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Nāḥiyat al-Gharb**

Under the Mamluks, this area was conferred upon various members of the family of Banū Buḥṭur as an iqṭā'. It was considered as part of the muṣāmalah of Bayrūt. Its recorded demography is as follows:-

---

69. Dimashqī mentions that it was part of the ṣamal of Baʿlabakk. Ṣālīḥ b. Yahyā refers to some villages like Baṭlūn, Bṭārīr, which were in Jurd as part of the jihat of Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥajjī (d.697/1297), and remained in the hands of his grandsons until the time of Ṣālīḥ. Later Ibn Ṭūlūn refers to the village of Majdal Maʿāwsh which was in Jurd as part of the muṣāmalah of Bayrūt. It is worth mentioning that Ṣālīḥ calls it Jurdayn, Nukḥbat, p.199. Tarīkh, pp.51, 53, 55, 161. Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufqakahat, vol.i, p.359. Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.i, p.277.

70. Under the Mamluks, Gharb was conferred as an iqṭā' to Banū Buḥṭur. al-Gharb was considered as part of the muṣāmalah of Bayrūt and amirs from Banū Buḥṭur were several times appointed to official positions in Bayrūt which was in their darak. See Ṣālīḥ b. Yahyā, Tarīkh, pp.40, 72, 85-7, 106-7. Saltbi, K. "The Buḥṭurds of the Gharb, medieval lords of Beirut and Southern Lebanon", Arabicā, vol.viii, (1961), pp.74-97.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Blind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.277-300)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.300-37)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.436-53)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the twenty-four villages whose names are repeated in the above mentioned surveys, the census gives:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, both the increase and the decrease are slight.

5) Nāḥiyat Shūf al-Ḥarrādīn

Demographical information about this nāḥiya is given in four surveys together with the number of villages and their population as under:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Blind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.150-8)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.227-32)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.265-72)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.474 (pp.315-27)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of eleven villages reappear and their demographics are shown in the surveys as follows:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Sharifs</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.179-205)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp.197-222)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.635-41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.277-89)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 474 (pp.329-347)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention must be paid to the presence of Christians in this nahiya. No reference is made to their presence in the first survey which indicates an immigration to this area after the first census had been taken. The census of seventeen villages is available in the four surveys which survive:

---

71. Available Mamlūk printed sources do not mention it. For comparison of its size during the nineteenth century see Tannūs al-Shidiyāq, Akhār, pp.31-2. He calls it al-Shūf al-Bayḍā with a male population of 1,000 Muslims plus 17,473 Christians, p.34.
The sharp rise occurs as elsewhere and the usual decrease also appears.

7) Nahiyyat Shuf Ibn Mar'n wa al-Hayti wa al-Shuwayrani

The demography of this nahiya was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.302-29)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.511-63)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.453-74)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of villages shows an increase; in addition, no reference is made to Druzé in this nahiya which was a stronghold for them. The names of thirty-five villages and their demography appear in all these surveys as follows:


73. According to Shidyaq there were in this iglim 1,325 male Christians and 3,517 Druze males. Alhbar, p.34.
The demography of this nahiyat appears as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.383-6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.447-58)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.523-7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One point emerges forcibly: no Christians lived in this nahiyat during the first half of the sixteenth century.

There are five villages, whose names appear in the three surveys, whose demography is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these groups of figures, the population shows a steady increase but no census is available for 976/1568 which prohibits the possibility of knowing whether a tendency toward decrease would be observable.

9) Nābiyyat Iqlīm Kharnūb

Its demography in three surveys is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.368-80)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp.461-84)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.512-21)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this nābiyya the names of twenty villages appear in the three surveys and their demography was as presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase then the fall are again evident.

10) Nābiyyat Iqlīm al-Tuffāh

Its demography was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.338-56)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 383 (pp.410-48)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.485-500)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


76. Neither Yaqqūt nor Ṣāliḥ b. Yahyā referred to it. Dimashqī stated that it was part of the amal of Damascus. Nukhbat, p.200. Cf. Shidyāq, he gives the population as 1,784 male Christians and 31 male Drūzē, Akhbār, pp.33-4.
There are fifteen villages whose names are repeated in the three surveys and their census was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again the pattern is retained.

11) Nahiyat Iqlim Shumar

The demography of this nahiya was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.357-67)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>382 9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.487-507)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>411 162</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.502-10)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>609 37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in most cases there is an increase in the population but the census of 976/1568 is not available so it is not known whether this tendency continued or not.

12) Nahiyat Bayrut

During the sixteenth century, it comprised only the city and its suburb known as al-Burj; and its demography was shown as:

---

77. Dimashqi mentions it, Nukhbat, p.200.
78. al-‘Umārī says that it was an important ‘amal in the third Ṣafqa. Later, Qalqashandī reiterates the same. He adds that during his time its governor was of the tablakhāna rank. al-Zāhiri says it had its iqlīm to which a number of villages belonged. al-‘Umārī, Tarīfī, p.179. Subh, vol.iv, pp.110, 200. Zubdat, p.48. Šālīḫ b. Yaḥyā, Tarīkhī p.37. Elisseef, N., "Bayrut", E.,1., vol.i, p.1138.
The increase in the population is consistent, in addition to the presence of Jews and Christians in the city.

13) Nahiyat Sayda

Like Bayrut, its nahiya comprised only the city with a population of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Sayyids</th>
<th>Sharifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D 430</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.248-50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D 383</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.253-76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D 401</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.403-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again an increase in population is followed by a decrease. In addition, the Jews, who had their own mahalla (district) do not appear in the third survey.

Finally, no reference is made to any Christians in the city.

79. In the Mamluk times, it was a vast wilaya; and according to Qalqashandi more than 600 villages belonged to it. Ibn Shahinh al-Zahir put the figure as exceeding 200. In its government sometimes there was an amir of ten or an amir of jablkhana. Tarih, p.179. Subhi, vol. iv, pp.110, 202. Zubdat, p.47.

The region of Hawrân during the sixteenth century was divided into the following nahiyas:-

1) Nahiyat Jaydur known also as Nawā

Nawā, under the Mamlūks, was the centre of an 'amal, in the southern Safqa. Its available demography during the first half of the century was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Turkomans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.501-23)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.569-85)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increased number of villages and the presence of Turkomans in this nahiyā are recorded. Names of twenty-three of the villages appear in both surveys and their demography was as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in the number of the population still prevails. Unfortunately, surveys concerning this nahiyā for the third quarter of the century are missing.

81. Hawrân, under the Mamlūks, was part of the southern Safqa. Zahiri says it is sometimes credited with containing several ḫalimus comprising more than one thousand villages. Ta'rif, pp.177-8.

82. Yaqūt defines it as a kūra from the country of Damascus. He refers to it by saying it and Jawlān were considered to be one kūra, Mu'jam, vol.ii, p.173.

2). Nahiyat Banū Kilāb

Its demography was as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.,D.430 (pp.525-37)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.,D.401 (pp.587-99)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the increase in the number of the recorded villages there is an increase in the population. The Christians are more numerous; this is also ratified by comparing the total population of the fifteen villages whose names appear in the two surveys:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Sharīfs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.,D.430</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.,D.401</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Nahiyat Banū Muqīlīd

The census of this nahiyah is available in two surveys recording its demography thus:-

84. Banū Kilāb was among the main Arab tribes who migrated into Syria with the Islamic conquest. After the battle of Marj Rāhīt (64/683) it moved northwards to settle around Aleppō. Members of this tribe were marsh warriors and it was their habit to penetrate the Byzantine land to kidnap boys and girls to sell them later. It is mentioned that it spoke Turkish. It suffered from the absence of strong unifying leadership. It is not surprising to find some branches of it allying themselves with Al Faḍl in Bilād al-Shām. It appears that this nahiyah was named after these branches. al-ʿUmarī, Masālik, MS. Toplaci, No.27:7, vol.iii, part 1, fols.28a, 50a-53b. Qālqashandī, Subh, vol.iv, pp.205, 231-2. Krenkow, F., "Kilāb", E.I.1, vol.ii, p.1065. Zakkar, S., The Emirate of Aleppō, 3:2/1002 – 487/1094, Ph.D. Thesis, London, 1969, pp.63-73.

85. A branch of Banū ʿUqayl was known by this name. Banū ʿUqayl who had founded an emirate in Iraq were dispersed from Iraq when the Seljūks advanced into the country. Most of them returned to Bahrain. If part of the tribe had moved to Havrān, it was probably named after them. Qālqashandī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, Qalāʾīd al-jumān fī al-taṣrīf bi qābāʾīl =
It is worth mentioning that in T.D.430 the names of eight villages were given but their census was not provided. In the same defter the names of two villages were given and it is added that their inhabitants abandoned them. The names of twenty-three villages were provided with their census in both surveys which was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an increase in the number of both the Muslims and the Christians in this nahiya.

4) Nahiyat Banu Malik al-Ashraf

Its demography was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>(pp.543-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>(pp.684-88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. I could not identify a tribe by this name.
A striking increase is shown in the population. The names of six villages with their census appear in both surveys which was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Sharifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in population is noticeable.

5) Nahiyat Banū Nashba

The demography of this nahiya was as presented under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Sharifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430 (pp.538-42)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401 (pp.642-9)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there was an increase in the population. This is also attested to by comparing the total census of the population of the nine villages whose names are repeated in both surveys, viz:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 430</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticeable that the number of the households had almost doubled.

6) Nahiyat Banū Hilāl

The names of twenty-three villages are given but their census is not

---

87. I was not able to identify the origin of this name.
provided. No reference concerning this nahiya in other available sources is recorded.

7) Nāḥiyat Jawlān Gharbī wa Sharqī

As is the case with the Nāḥiyat of Banū Hilāl, the names of eight villages are provided by one defter. Other defters do not refer to it.

8) Nāḥiyat Banū ʿAbdullāh

Data of its census is provided in two surveys as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.565-72)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.690-6)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of Christians is rather conspicuous, especially in the village of ʿAdhirāt where they were more numerous than the Muslims.

There are eleven villages whose names recur in the two surveys and they had the following demography:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89. T.D.401, p.697.

90. Muqaddasi defines it as one of the rasāʾiṣ of Damascus. Yaqūt was vague; he termed it a village which was said to be from the nahālī of Damascus, Aḥsan, p.154. Muʿjam, vol.ii, p.151.


92. Qalqashandī enumerates thirteen tribes by the name of Banū ʿAbdullāh. Two of them belonged to Banū Kināna; one was a Hilālī. If this nahiya was named after any one of them, it is not certain which one it was. Nihayat, pp.312-4.
The consistent increase in the population appears also in both Muslims and Christians.

9) Nahiyat Banū Mālik al-Ṣadir

The names of forty-four villages are provided but their census is not given.

10) Nahiyat Banū 'Ātica

Two defters provide census data for this nahiyat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD.430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.562-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD.401</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.628-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were four villages whose names occur in both surveys, and their census was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TD.430</th>
<th>92</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD.401</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows an increase in the population, but TD.474 is incomplete and its people may have increased or decreased.

11) Nahiyat Banū Kīnāna

Statistical figures for this nahiyat were recorded in this manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imāms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD.430</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.572-82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD.401</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pp.611-26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth mentioning that in the first survey a village is mentioned as having been abandoned by its inhabitants. The census of seventeen villages was provided by the two surveys as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TD.430</th>
<th>175</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD.401</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A noticeable increase in the population is discernible.


95. Banū Mudlij, a branch of this tribe lived in Sarkhad and Hawrān. This nahiyat was, as it appears, named after it. It was a client of Al Mira in Bilād al-Shām. al-ʿUmari, Masālik, fol.47a. Qalqashandi, Subh, vol.1, p.351.
12) Nāḥiyat Banū Jahma

Its demography was thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.584-9)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.600-8)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In T.D.430 the name of a village abandoned by its inhabitants is recorded. There are thirteen villages repeated in both surveys and their census is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usual increase in the population is noticeable. No reference is made to Christian inhabitants in the second survey.

13) Nāḥiyat Banū al-Asar

Two defors provide its demography in this manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.591-6)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.652-661)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. It was not possible to establish the origin of this tribe. Available printed sources do not mention it, unless it is a corrupted form of Juhayna which, according to al-Ḥamdānī, lived in the country around Aleppo. They might have migrated to the south and the place may have taken their name. Qalqashandī, Nihāyat, p.207

97. It was not possible to identify a tribe by this name. al-Samānī mentions a tribe by the name of Aṣar. Perhaps the 'ṣ' is written s, and that it was a possible descendant of Banū al-Aṣar, but this is by no means certain. Samānī, Ansāb, vol.1, p.311. Ibn al-Athīr, al-Lubab, vol.1, p.60. Qalqashandī, Nihāyat, p.43. Kahhala, Muṣjam, vol.1, pp.34-5.
The names of fifteen villages appear in both surveys with a total census as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the usual pattern of increase in the population, the presence of Christians is on record in this nahiya.

14) Nāḥiyat Banū 'Uqba

Two surveys provide its demography thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Imams</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.584-91)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401 (pp.663-4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of Christians is noticeable. There was a general increase in the population. This is supported by comparison with the number of the population of the four villages whose names are repeated in both surveys as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. There were three tribes by the name of Banū 'Uqba. One emanated from Judham which lived in the area between Shawbak and Tabuk. Ibn Khaldūn described it as nomad roaming as far as Medina. The second was a branch of Banū Hilāl, and a third a branch of Kinda. Perhaps this nahiya was named after Banū 'Uqba of Banū Hilāl, who settled there. Al-'Umarī, Masālik, MS. No:2797, fol.26a. Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, vol. vi, p.11. Gaiqashandi, Subh, vol.i, p.334. Nihayat, pp.336-7. Qalā' id, p.65.
Here a striking increase in the number of the population is noticeable.

It would appear that when the nahiya system was introduced, tribal and sectarian boundaries were taken into consideration in addition to other natural elements such as rivers and mountains. Until relevant Mamlûk sources have been carefully examined it is not possible to assert whether this system was introduced by the Ottomans or had existed within the Safqa system under the Mamlûks.

Demographic data reveals that the population of the province was heterogenous. There were four distinct groups of society: nomads, villagers, urban dwellers and Ottoman personnel, the last-named imposing itself as a superstructure over the other groups.

Islam, Christianity and Judaism had their followers and each was subdivided into sects. During the period under consideration there was no persecution of either Christians or Jews who lived in their own special areas in more or less exclusive communities. Non-Sunni sects among the Muslims were less fortunate and the Druze in particular were subject to frequent persecution.

The population was also racially heterogenous. Into it were amalgamated Arabs, Turkomans, Kurds and gypsies in addition to many other ethnic groups.

99. Ottoman personnel is not counted in this chapter; for it see Chapter III, pp.97-108.

100. For campaigns against the Druze, see Chapter VI, pp.187-204.

101. Members of Arab, Turkoman and Kurdish tribes are not included in this survey. For their number and distribution, See Chapter VII, pp.223-32.
There is no apparent reason for the fall in the numbers of the population. On assessing tax payments it is noticeable that even while population numbers fell, tax payments rose. \(^{102}\) A suggested explanation could be that the surveys during the second half of the century were not thorough because of laxity in law and order. Another possibility is that incorrect numbers in households were submitted in order to avoid some occasional taxes. \(^{103}\)

\(^{102}\) For amount of taxes paid, see Chapter V, p.185.

\(^{103}\) For the location of nahiyas see map attached. See also demographic specimen given as an appendix.
CHAPTER III

The Office of the Governor and the Military Force

of the Province
1. **The Office of the Governor**

During the sixteenth century the province of Damascus comprised its liwa’ which was subdivided into forty-eight nahiyas and included the sanjaqs (sanjaq = liwa’ which is an administrative unit) of: Tadmur, Safad, Lajjun in Palestine, Nablus, Jerusalem, Gaza, ’Ajlun and Karak-Shawbak. Its governor resided in the former Mamluk governor’s house which lay outside the citadel and was known as Dār al-Sa’ada. He was appointed for one year and the appointment was subject to renewal. In the Tapu Defters he was referred to as mīr-i mīrān and as beylerbey in the Mülhimme Defteri. The city of Damascus was under his control together with its liwa’. The sanjaqs each had a governor referred to as sanjaqbe, but all were subordinate to the governor of the province.

According to decrees (sing. hukm) issued by the Sultan, the function of both governors and sanjaqbeys was to keep law and order; hold the Bedouins in check; observe the activities of the Drūze and endeavour to crush innovations.

All the posts included cooperation with the defterdar in collecting taxes from the

---


province. It was part of the duty of the governor of Damascus to help the defterdar of Aleppo by sending soldiers to collect taxes. His duties also extended to the maintenance of mosques, schools and fortresses. Another and special duty of officials in the province was to despatch by military escort the pilgrimage caravan to Mecca and ensure its safe return. In common with their colleagues in other parts of the Empire, the governors and the sanjaqbeys themselves led the military forces when necessary.

Ottoman administrative personnel in Damascus were numerically fewer than their Mamluk predecessors. There was a governor at the head of the structure who was granted a khāṣ which yielded one million akches annually. He was assigned the revenue of a number of villages in addition to miscellaneous taxes levied for community services. This was known as bād-i havā and cassiyya in Damascus and its suburbs and Hawrān. It included, also, the fees paid by the tezkeresiz timar-holders for their berät.


6. T.D., 169, p.36. This defter shows a total tax yield of 315,000 akches. Later in 976/1568, it rose to 360,000 akches, T.D., 474, p.206. After 1530, it was the governor’s prerogative to issue berąt to timariots whose timars yielded less than 6,000 akches annually. They were referred to as tezkeresiz. Any timar which yielded 6,000 or more required berąt from the Sultan. These timar-holders were known as tezkeresi. See Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society, vol. i, part i, pp.49-50. L. Fekete, 'Berąt, E.I., vol. i, pp.1170-1. For the legal meaning of barąt in Arabic see R. Brunchvig, "Barąt", E.I., vol. i, pp.1026-7. For these miscellaneous taxes see Chapter V, pp.178-9.
Next in the strata of the hierarchy was the ayay beyi referred to as mür-i ayay-i Şam who was a holder of a ziyāmet. He was the military commander of the province and, on his recommendation, vacancies in the timar holdings were filled. It was his privilege to have a standard and a drum. The first to be recorded as the holder of this post was Ahmad b. Bayezid and the next to be mentioned in the defters was Arslan 'Ali bey. The ayay beyi was assisted by a number of chavushes who had their aqha and ketkudar; and all were incorporated in the timar system.7

The general commander of the janissaries in Damascus was referred to as agha-i yencheryan. The janissaries were divided into böllük, each headed by a böllükbash. Some of them were housed in the citadel, others in the city and the remainder were distributed among the nahiyas of the liwa. The head of each unit in any nahiya was referred to as ser-i asker.8

The citadel of Damascus was governed by a dizdar and there is little information to be found concerning those who occupied this office. Among the few names mentioned is that of Ibrahim Qasim (ca. 930/1523).9 In the following year Husayn al-‘Ajami appears to have occupied and held it until his death in 947/1540.10 The name of a certain Ahmad is mentioned in 976/1568.


as its dizdar and the holder of a zīrāmet. Under the Mamluks, Damascus was policed by āssas and all of them were Mamluk in origin. They were assisted by prefects (sing. ārīf) of the ħārāt who were abolished by the Ottomans and afterwards replaced by soldiers, giving the responsibility for their maintenance to the governor of Damascus. For this purpose, he collected twenty thousand akches annually which was actually a continuation of the ancient custom.

Similar tax collections were made for the same purpose in Baṣlabakk, Bayrut and Sidon.

II. The Fortresses and their Garrisons

The fortresses (sing. gal'a) in the province formed three lines. One of these was parallel to the coast from Bayrut to al-‘Arish; another was on the highway between Damascus and Cairo across Palestine, while a third chain on the road from Damascus to al-‘Ula helped to guard the route to Mecca.

In Bayrut there were five watch-towers (sing. burj) with a total of fifty-two mūstalḥfīzan (fortress-soldiers) to man them. They were paid in

11. T.Đ. 474, p. 691. It is described as yielding 12,400 akches annually.
14. The burjs were al-Qal'a, ʿIlīyīn, Sanbatyya, Barrānī, known as al-Gintāri and Shaykh Taqi al-Din. M.M. 3732, p. 59; T.Đ. 430, pp. 256-7; this defter gives the total number of mūstalḥfīzan as 48. For name of a place in Bayrut similar to the name of the third burj see Šalḥ b. Yahyā, Tārīkh, p. 32. See also J. Sourdel-Thomine, "Burj", E.1.2, vol. i, pp. 1315-8.
cash and it appears that their payment was very little in actual cash, in most
cases less than three hundred akches a year. 15 The upkeep of the watch-towers
was covered by land-endowments which were expected to cover also the main-
tenance of the soldiers. 16 It is worth mentioning that they were issued with
swords, helmets, bows, armour, spears, lances, axes, muskets, cannon and
gunpowder. 17

In Sidon, to the south of Bayrut there were two watch-towers; Burj al-
Julban which had fourteen soldiers to man it and Burj al-Khayyat with only
eight soldiers. The majority of the soldiers were paid one hundred akches
a year. Like those of Bayrut, both of these watch-towers were endowed with
mazārīc, watermills, baths and land. For example, the endowments of Burj al-
Khayyat yielded 9,420 akches annually. The armoury was well equipped
with similar weapons to those of Bayrut. 18

16. T.D. 401, p.271, the revenues were 580 akches; T.D. 474, p.311; the
revenues were 4,200 akches.
17. T.D. 401, pp.256-7; Cf. Parry, J., 'Materials of War in the Ottoman
Empire', Studies in the economic history of the Middle East, pp.219-29.
Rafeq, A., 'The Local forces in Syria in the 17th and 18th centuries', a
paper presented at an S.C.A.S conference, 'War, Technology and
Socio-Political Effects of the Diffusion of Firearms in the Middle East'
presented at the same conference. See also appendices concerning fire-
arms recorded in the Ottoman archives, pp.15-21. See also A.M. Yusuf,
'Sinā'at al-bārūd fi Ḥama fī al-qarn al-sādīs 'ašar', Majallat al-
18. M.M. 3723, pp.68-9; T.D. 430, pp.331, 335; T.D. 388, p.402;
T.D. 401, pp.441, 450; al-Julban Tower was endowed in Tripoli;
T.D. 430, p.331. Qalqashandi quoting al-ʿUmari refers to military
sea-patrols (baḥriyya), cavalry, scouts and other employees in the
citadel of Sidon, Subh, vol.iv, p.202. See also Ayalon, D., "The
Mamluks and Naval Power", Proceedings of the Israel Academy of
Sciences and Humanities, vol.1, (E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1967), No.8,
Further south, in Acre, there was a watch-tower manned by eight soldiers,\(^{19}\) while that at Jaffa had only four.\(^{20}\) In the citadel of Gaza, there were thirty-six müstahfizân in addition to nine from the corps of müteferrika.\(^{21}\) In 967/1559 the Sultan commanded the governor of Egypt to build a fortress at al-ŠArīs which was then part of his province.\(^{22}\) Later in 1602/3 the Sultan approved of the erection of a fortress in Khan Yunus to protect travellers and pilgrims from the attacks of the Bedouins.\(^{23}\)

The citadel of Damascus was, no doubt, the largest in the province. It had fourteen bölbûks of mustahfizân which in 961/1553 amounted to 142 and fell to 86 in 964/1556. The soldiers, who were organized into units identified by the names of their unit leader, were paid between 4-10 akches daily, although average remuneration was 5-6 akches.\(^{24}\) The topçhus (gunners) comprised two bölbûks and totalled twenty-six. Each bölbûk had its head, and over the entire unit was a ser assisted by a ketkhuda. Their range of payment varied between


21. M.M.3723, pp.18-22. For Müteferrika, see Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society, vol.i, part i, pp.87-8. Lybeyer, The Ottoman Empire in the Times of Suleiman, p.129. Piri Reis did not refer to a fortress in Gaza, p.207. In 1660 there were 44 guards in this fortress, see Heyd, Ottoman documents, p.190.

22. Heyd, Ottoman documents, p.103.


5-10 akches a day and the majority received a daily payment of 6-7 akches.

In 964/1556, their number fell to 19 while in 971/1563 it was only eleven.25 There were, also, thirteen arabaciyan but in 964/1556 there were merely eleven and in 971/1563 they had dwindled to six. The average payment per man was 6 akches per day, although in some cases it ranged between 5-10 akches.26 Besides these in 961/1553 there were eleven cebociyan (armourers) but their number in 964/1556 increased by one and dropped to six in 971/1563. They were paid between 5-10 akches a day.27 It is worth mentioning that there were eleven from the müteferrika paid between 5-8 akches daily.28 In the citadel there were also four mehteran, two of them were paid 7 akches while the other two received 8 akches per day.29 En route to Homs in al-Qastal there was a watch-tower which, in 971/1563, had 15 mustabfizan.30

Recurring references in available sources show that there were one thousand janissaries in Damascus. The Damascene Chronicler, Ibn Tulun (d.953/1546) mentions that after the failure of al-Ghazâlî’s rebellion in 927/1521, one thousand jannissaries arrived in Damascus.31 The Ottomans considered it politic

to maintain this number. If vacancies of between 100-200 occurred it was the duty of the governor to report this to the government in Istanbul so that they could be filled by Rum and no Arab or Tāt (non-Turk) was permitted to join the regiment. In spite of this prohibition a number of decrees (sing. hukûm) reveal that Arabs and Tāts managed to infiltrate the ranks of the janissaries. Although in 979/1571 the Sultan ordered the governor of Damascus and the agha of the janissaries to dismiss Arabs and Tāts, six years later the governor was again commanded to confer any vacant position upon capable brave people from the Rum and to ban all Arabs and Tāts. 

The Ottomans took great care to ensure safety on the highway between Damascus and Cairo through Palestine. At Qunaytra there was a fortress garrisoned by forty gündulliyān (volunteers), ten müstahfizān, and three from the müteferrika. In 989/1581 the Sultan adopted a suggestion by the judges of Damascus, Safad, Acre and the sanjaqbey of Safad, and ordered the governor of Damascus and its defterdar to build a fortress at 'Uyun al-Tujjar as merchants and pilgrims passed this way. The fortress was to be manned by ten müstahfizān and thirty fāris (horsemen). A market was to be held there because it would be beneficial to the Muslims. In 987/1579, on the same highway, a fortress was


33. M.M.3723, pp.103-6. For gündulliyān see Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society, vol.i, part i, pp.181, 192. A previous list provides the number as three hisāreriyān and thirty gündulliyān, M.M.3723, p.101.

34. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.110-113, 114-5; the number of the garrison in 1660 was 28 bestehts (cavalrymen), Heyd, p.190.
renewed in Ras al-‘Ayn (Binär-Başlı). One hundred horsemen and thirty fortress-soldiers were assigned there but only thirty reported. The governor of Gaza requested it to be annexed to his sanjaq and he promised to enlist capable replacements. In 1071/1660 it had 54 bashlıs (cavalrymen) and guards. Along the road from Damascus to Cairo through Palestine there were ten manzils (halting-places). At each halt post-horses were kept in readiness, tended by members of 45 households. For this service they were exempted from taxes which no doubt encouraged communities to grow at these points.

At the suggestion of the governors of Nablus and Lajjun in 972/1564 the Sultan consented to the conversion of the caravansaray at Jenin into a fortress. Forty mounted musketeers and ten fortress-soldiers were stationed there. The fortress of Jerusalem had 73 müstahfizan and 22 müteferrika. This large number shows the Ottoman concern for the security of pilgrims to Jerusalem. The fortress of Hebron was garrisoned by thirty müstahfizan; while the fortress at Bayt Jibrin, on the way to Gaza, was manned by thirty-six müstahfizan and four müteferrika.

The Ottomans added many fortresses en route to Mecca. al-Muzayrib, a

36. For location and names of halting places see Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.126-7, also his map.
37. Heyd, Ottoman documents, (in this hülküm, hisâreri and müstahfizan are used synonymously), pp.104-5, p.104, note 2. In 1660 it had 47 bashlıs and guards; Heyd, p.190.
meeting-place for pilgrims, had a fortress which in 971/1563 was guarded by forty five mustahfizan and six müteferrika. It was suggested that a fortress be built to the east, in Buṣrā, where one hundred mustahfizan and one hundred janissaries would be stationed. Camels could be raised there to meet the needs of pilgrims and would add to the protection of the area.

In 967/1559 Sultan Süleyman ordered the construction of fortresses in Qaṭānā, Ma‘ān, Dhat Hajj and Tabūk. Previously, in 938/1531, a fortress was built in al-Ukhaydir. It was manned by twenty soldiers from Damascus and dues were collected from pilgrims to defray the expenses.

In the interior mountainous area, parallel to the pilgrim route, there were four fortresses. Sultan Süleyman commanded one to be built in ‘Ajlūn. South of ‘Ajlūn in al-Salt another was manned by fifty soldiers. The fortress of al-Karak was garrisoned by sixty six mustahfizan and eleven müteferrika; while that of al-Shawbak was manned by sixty eight mustahfizan and six müteferrika.

The governor of the province was assisted by the sipāhs (sepoys) whose remuneration was covered by revenues from specified places in the province. They were composed of two categories: the za‘īms and the timārī (timar-holders).

41. M.M.3723, pp.60-5.
42. M.D.xiv, No:974, 4 Shabān, 978, p.657.
46. M.M.3723, pp.46-8. In an insertion between pp.546-7, a note states that qulūb was paid from the treasury of Aleppo in 971/1563.
47. M.M.3723, pp.28-35.
48. M.M.3723, pp.36-43. In 1660 it had 59 arabacīs. Heyd, Ottoman documents, p.190. For location of these fortresses, see map attached.
The number of the za‘īms in the liwa‘ of Damascus increased gradually. Around 936/1529 there were five who received the equivalent of 258,771 akches; and in 955/1548 their number was sixteen who were paid 442,039 akches. In 936/1529 the average emolument of a za‘īm was 51,754.2 akches while in 955/1540 a za‘īm was paid an average of 27,502.37 akches.

In return, the za‘īms were expected to be ready to fight when called upon. It was their duty also to provide a cebeli for every five thousand akches of their zirāmet, together "with an initial allowance of the same amount for themselves." The timarijī were of two types: tezkereli and tezkeresiz.

Around 936/1529, the number of the tezkereli was 9, rising in 955/1548 to 78, and in 976/1568 it increased to 155 which indicates the diminution of the governor’s power.

Any tezkeresiz referred to in English as timariot, receiving less than 6,000 akches, the tezkere was supplied by the governor. On their part the holders paid fees which constituted part of the governor’s revenue. An examination of the names of the timar-holders discloses that the majority were tezkeresiz but their number gradually fell. Around 936/1529 there were 442 tezkeresiz and in 955/1548, 319 who dropped to 211 in 976/1568. In return for their timars, those whose revenues were in the range of three thousand akches were required to give personal service in time of war if called upon. For every additional three thousand akches they had to provide a cebeli.

50. T.D.169, p.235; T.D.263, p.1; ‘Aynī ‘Ali mentions that in the liwa‘ of Sham there were 87 za‘īms. This statement requires further study. Qandānish-i, p.2.
54. Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society, vol.1, part i, p.50.
many former Mamluks were incorporated into the timar system. It is difficult
to determine their exact proportion but there is a diminution of their names
in the time-lapse of the records. Among these were included the sons and
dependants of those who collaborated with the Ottomans. In addition some
of the local chieftains and their sons, together with some members of the
Sufi Samādī family and some from the family of Tālū were included in the
timar system. The amīr of Medina was also given a timar.56

Other than these there were thirty three Turkoman sipāhs who
were assigned lands which gave an annual yield of 17,000 akches. References
are also to be found about a Turkoman alay with its amīr, all of whom were
incorporated into the timar system.57

Available sources do not specify the number of cebecis in the province
of Damascus who were available for mobilization in case of war. On the other
hand, ʿAynīʿʿAlī (d.1021/1612) says that according to the qānūnname, the province
returned 2,600 cebecis.58

The Ottomans, in the province of Damascus, retained the old Mamlūk
darak system by which the security of the roads was entrusted to local people and

55. T.D.169, pp.59, 80, 85, 92, 95, 101, 115, 127, 159, 176-7,
179, 183, 188, 197, 199, 201, 203, 208, 230; T.D.423, pp.121,
132, 149, 153-4, 166, 180, 185-6, 192, 197; T.D.401, pp.152,
581, 604, 605, 657, 678; T.D.474, pp.699, 712, 734-5; M.M.17812,
p.30. Lewis, B. "Review of Islamic Society and the West," B.S.O.A.S,
vol. xvi, part 3, p.600.


For details about 101 timars which were granted to Turkomans in Ḥawrān
between 956-9/1549-51, see Chapter VII, pp.266-7.

58. ʿAynīʿʿAlī, Qawānīn-i Ālī Osman, p.2.
in return they were exempted from *avārt-i diwāntīyya* and takālīf-i ērfīyya.

The 25 households of the village of al-Qaṣfal, the 172 households and the 55 bachelors in Qāra were all exempted from these taxes and, as was the case under the Mamlūks, it was their duty to guard roads between specified points.  

In Palestine a local Bedouin chieftain asked to be a sāhib darāk in return for a ziqāmet or a sanjaq. Similarly, Salāmah b. Nuṣaym, shaykh of the Mafārijah tribes in Hawrān in 978/1570, sent a petition in which he stated he would be responsible for all routes in the province of Damascus for the grant of a timar for himself and another for his grandson. He claimed that he and his father before him were people of darāk. The Sultan ordered the governor of Damascus to make enquiries concerning his capabilities but no reference is extant to show whether his petition was granted.

The Military Force of the Province and the Wars of the Empire

The military force of the province was called upon by the Sultan to participate in wars against Persia, Cyprus and quell rebellions in the Yaman and in Anatolia led by ‘Abd al-Ḥafīm al-Yāzījī (d. 1010/1601).

In the campaign, Sultan Sūleymān led against Persia in 961/1553 the reward for special gallantry was given in timars and promotions, which were received by some Damascene janissaries. In 986/1578 the governors of Damascus, Jerusalem, Safad and Gaza led 600 timar-holders and 500 janissaries.

---


60. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp. 98-9, 109, 110.


62. M.D. i, Nös: 355, 392, 430, 437, 477, 508, 522, 603, 611, 616, 795, 1677. Most of these decrees were issued in Dhu’l-Qa‘da 961, No: 1137, 23 Šafar, 961; Nos: 67, 73, 79, 80, 87, 93, 95, 110, 111, 136, 962, 1677, 2nd of Rabī‘i, 962.
in the Sultan's campaign against Persia. At least one thousand musketeers commanded by three amirs were sent from Egypt as caretakers of the province during their absence.63

Four years later, in 990/1582, the governor of Damascus led janissaries and timar-holders to join a further campaign against Persia. Only a few timar holders were allowed to remain and those who refused to obey were deprived of their timars. Recruitment extended even to Bedouins who were pressed into service as water carriers for the army.64

A rebellion by Shi'a Zaydis in the frontier province of the Yaman in 975/1567 encouraged by the death of Sultan Süleyman reached abnormal proportions and placed the future of the Ottomans in the Yaman at the mercy of the rebels.65 Armies from Damascus and Egypt were despatched and five hundred janissaries were called from the province of Damascus to crush it. Only three hundred obeyed the call and the acting governor was commanded to enforce obedience and to add one hundred more to their number. The defterdars of Damascus and Aleppo were authorized to give the six hundred a year emoluments in advance for their services.66 In addition 1,500 archers were also to be drawn from the locality. Many preferred to pay rather than serve. This aroused the anger of the Sultan who ordered the return of such money. The procedure was that one person was to report from every twenty-five households and the remaining

---

members to be responsible for his expenses. The defterdar of Damascus was also authorized to give each of the archers one month's pay in advance. In addition, twenty sappers were to join the army and the defterdar, again, was to provide all necessary provisions and equipment for this apparently urgent campaign.  

Soldiers from Damascus were commanded to join Sultan Selim II's campaign in 976/1570 against Cyprus. Three hundred janissaries and a local force took part in the conquest of the island, and archers were demanded from the province of Damascus. The exact number is not recorded, but at least the qadi of Bayrut suggested one from every twenty households was to enlist. Provisions, especially flour, were commanded to be sent to Cyprus via Tripoli, and the pious were to gather in mosques to pray for victory. The timars of the Damascene janissaries who were killed were given to others who had shown gallantry; and those who already possessed them were promoted. A poem by Muhammad Māmāi al-Rūmī (d. 987/1579) was written to commemorate the bravery of those who fought.

In 1009/1600 a force led by the governor of Damascus was commissioned by the Sultan to quell a rebellion led by 'Abd al-Nāṭīm al-Yāzijī in Southern


74. Ibn Māmāi, Diwan, fols. 166a, b.
Anatolia but the force owing to the approach of winter had to withdraw. In the following year an army was mobilized in Damascus to join the campaign against ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm. His army was routed and ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm fled to Samsun where he died in the same year.75

Decadence and lack of discipline are shown by the fact that many soldiers refused to present themselves for military service.76 Symptoms of this deterioration began in Damascus after the suppression of Jānbirdī al-Ǧhazālī’s rebellion. A number of janissaries were suspected of arson when a large part of Damascus was burned. Ibn Ṭūlūn records that a group of rabble (ṣafāla) from the janissaries were accommodated in the highly respected Ḥanbalī School of Abū ‘Umar where their behaviour was reprehensible.77 He also states that they would rudely snatch turbans from the heads of the ‘ulamā’.78 He further records that Shihāb al-Dīn, wālz al-qīhāb wa al-ʿulūq (prefect over prostitutes) under the Ottomans, was offered no interference when he openly flouted the Šari‘a. On the occasion of his son’s circumcision wine was drunk in public and women danced unveiled in the streets. Nobody protested because he was protected by the Ottomans.79

78. Ibn Ṭūlūn quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.s. 32b, 79b.
79. In 929/1522 the Ottomans appointed a wālz (prefect) in charge of al-ʿulūq (perverts). He had been one of them himself and for this appointment he was expected to pay five hundred ‘Othmānī every month. He also received a khilā (robe). When, however, he exerted his authority over one of them, the people of Damascus rose against him, whereupon the governor cancelled his appointment. Qīhāb and ʿulūq, both female and male prostitutes might have been a remnant of the zu’ar and al-ḥarāfsh fraternity. It is worth mentioning that prostitutes were known in Damascus under the Mamluks, =
Many examples of offences, due to the lack of discipline, were committed by janissaries and sipahis during the second half of the century. In 966/1558 there were two murders by two sipahis; in 973/1565 a third sipahi took part in the murder of a man in a bath in Zabaddānī. After committing the crime he and his associates confiscated all the man's property. The Sultan decreed that they were to be punished according to the Shari'a.

So lax was discipline and widespread the habit of drinking among the janissaries, especially those with commissions to assist in tax-collection; others would leave the assignment and absent themselves on a spree of, perhaps, three months when they would return and ask for payment of allowances for the period. Some would shirk duty on the pretext of service in the retinues of akābīr (senior officials), and these were forbidden to leave their barraks. If they refused to obey their gediks (tenures) were to be confiscated. A further proof of laxity is shown by the record that soldiers left their own quarters in the citadel which were occupied by sons of previous janissaries who had died, for which they claimed the right of inheritance. The governor was asked to investigate and eject all who usurped this privilege; and order back to barracks all those whose duty was to be resident. In the general chaos, clashes inevitably occurred not only near one of the mosques in Damascus and also observed by al-Suwaydī in the 18th century. Ibn Tulūn, Mutākahat, vol.i, p.21; Ibn Tulūn quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.28a, b; al-Suwaydī, Nāfḥat, fol.95a. Lapidus, Muslim Cities, pp.82-3, 170, 173. Rafeq, A. The Province of Damascus, pp.154, 185-6.

82. M.D.v, No:1128, 4 Sharbān, 973, p.422; M.D.xxii, No:197, 27 Ṣafar, 981, p.96; M.D.xxiii, No:37, 8 Jumāda 2, 981, p.21; No:282, 28 Rajab, 981, p.139.
84. M.D.xxiv, No:347, 4 Dhū’l Qa’dā, 980, p.144.
between the janissaries which were repeated throughout the province. The governor's authority was so diminished that they refused to co-operate with him and frequently sheltered thieves. Their misconduct even allied them with Bedouins to attack outlying villages. One janissary went so far as to destroy part of the city wall to build himself a house and was commanded to repair it.

Subāšis, who were deputed to police the province, misbehaved in such a way that they were banned from entering the Sultan's land (khās). They maltreated the peasants and robbed them, and qādis were authorized to punish the criminals as they deemed necessary. Some za'ims who filled administrative posts not only failed to report for duty but stated that their own private affairs were more important. These officials, by decree of the Sultan, were to be dismissed together with any others who followed their example.

Janissaries found that they were able to trade both in money and in kind. They became traders, craftsmen and moneylenders. They usually lent money in return for wheat, barley and, even more important, silk. It began by lending money to the people of the city and then to the villages and the names of even

---

86. M.D.xii, No:550, 18 Dhu'1 Qa'da, 978, p.279; M.D.xiv, No:116, 18 Dhu1 Hijja, 979, p.90; M.D.xii, No:1220, 17 Dhu1 Hijja, 979, p.644.
Christian borrowers appear on the Shari'iyya court registers. Janissaries did a widespread trade in horses and mules. Their activities grew from small beginnings until they became the owners of mazārī, orchards, arable lands, shops, baths, slaves, valuable articles and houses. Their influence obviously grew to such an extent that they began to interfere in the everyday life of many citizens. They endowed their families from the proceeds and sometimes endowed charities, all of which indicates their influence and the extent of their wealth.

Through their growing wealth and close association with the city's officials, the janissaries acquired a new prestige. Their intimate knowledge of the families who borrowed from and traded with them combined to transmute them into a special group who were the mouthpiece of the Damascene community. One of them, Ḥusayn Pāsha b. 'Abdullah, better known as Shawyazi (d. 1027/1617), rose from the life of an ordinary janissary to become a high official. His interest in learning and apparent desire to help those to whom it was a profession, together with a charitable attitude towards orphans, no doubt added to his prestige and assisted his own advancement. Inefficient management swallowed the revenues from the Nūrī and Qaymārī Hospitals. He was entrusted with the management of


the hospitals and their endowments and was so successful that their finances were restored. For the same reason he was entrusted with the care of the Umayyad Mosque, the finances of which he re-established. His efficiency gave him the office of treasurer (defterdar) of Damascus which also benefitted by his administration, and he was also appointed as the deputy of absent officials and judges. His exceptional character further appears in that he was the anathema of all who were lawless or criminal. He owned large estates and retained powerful influence in the city. 96

Those janissaries deputed to assist tax collection in Aleppo yearly, would first pay the requisite amount themselves. Their collection from the tax payer would be more than twice the correct sum. The system led to the abuse of privilege and they became petty tyrants enriched at the expense of the poorer land-owners and peasants. In 1008/1599, the new governor of Aleppo, Ibrāhīm Pasha, realizing the extent of this abuse, petitioned the Sultan to be allowed to levy a new force of five hundred men in order to rid Aleppo of the Damascene contingent. The plan was approved and many clashes between the two forces followed with the result that many were killed on both sides. Aleppo suffered from destruction and plunder until finally, in 1013/1604, Aleppo was freed from the Damascene contingent. Damascus and its villages became the new target for janissary activity. 97


III. The Pilgrimage Caravan

During Mamlūk times, pilgrims to the Hijāz from outside the Arabian Peninsula, went by caravan from ʿIraq, Egypt, Damascus and each caravan had its own mahmal. In some years, there was a mahmal from Aleppo and another from al-Karak. After the Ottoman conquest of the Mamlūk Sultanate, pilgrims were organized in two caravans: one from Egypt and the second from Damascus; each with its own mahmal. When in 962/1554, the governor of the Yaman sent a mahmal the amīr of Mecca went to receive it as was the custom in earlier times, as also for the Egyptian and the Damascene mahmals.

Damascus was the meeting place for all Muslims from the east. A number of decrees refer to pilgrims arriving from Samarqand, Sufis from Bukhārā, official envoys from Tashqand concerning whom the Sultan issued ḥulūms to judges en route, the governor of Damascus and to the pilgrimage commander ordering them to help pilgrims, give them provisions, water, and not allow them to be disturbed. It is recorded in 980/1572 that similar instructions were issued concerning the journey of the Sultan’s mother.

When the route from Bāghdād to Mecca was closed, pilgrims from Persia and ʿIraq had to go to Damascus to join its caravan and on their return they had to pass through Damascus on their way home. It would seem that strict supervision


100. M. D. ix, Nos:421, 4 Rabī’ 1, 980, p. 204. In 975 similar instructions were given when the midwife of Muhammad Shāh, the son of the Sultan, went to perform the pilgrimage. M. D. vii, No:264, 19 Rabī’ 1, 975, p. 100.
was imposed, and they were escorted by military personnel from the borders to the Holy Places in 'Iraq. In these they were restricted to ten days' stay and only the ruling family could bury their dead there.  

The pilgrimage caravan had an organized supervisory body. At the head there was amīr al-ḥājjī who was responsible for the supply of camels, horses, water, fodder, and provided a military escort to the caravan. Jānbirdī al-Ghazālī successfully transported the caravan for three consecutive years and succeeding Ottoman commanders followed his policy effectively.

Until 979/1571, the Ottomans sent a caravan every year commanded by a sanjaqbey or a senior official either from Damascus itself or from its proximity. In 979/1571, however, most likely because soldiers were withdrawn from the province to fight in the Yaman and Cyprus, local people were entrusted with the appointment and they proved to be equally successful. From this year Gānšūh al-Ghazzāwī, a Bedouin chieftain from 'Ajlūn, successfully executed the function.

---

102. M. D., vol. vi, No:39, 12 Muḥarram 972; this ḥukkum was addressed to the governor of Baghdad; M. D. viii, No:2717, 9 Rajab, 976, p.900.


104. In 930/1523 the sanjaqbey of Saffad led the caravan; in 932/1525 Uways al-Kashif was the commander. His title indicates that he was a Mamlūk. In 957/1551-1552 the governor of Hama Kurt bey b. Khisrū Pasha was entrusted with the office. Two years later the post was given to an Ottoman official, Husayn bey b. Muhammad al-Rūmī who was dismissed and jailed for complaints raised against him. In 965/1557 Yūnus the sanjaqbey of Homs was appointed to be responsible for the caravan, while in the following year Murād bey, the governor of 'Ajlūn, was commissioned to fulfil this task. In 967 Rīdwan bey b. Kara Mustafā, the governor of Gaza, led the pilgrims to Mecca and in 974 Darwish Pasha, the governor of Tripoli, =
until he was dismissed in 996/1587 for a petty offence. The office passed to Ahmad b. Riḍwān b. Kara Mustafā (d. 1015/1606), sanjaq-bey of Gaza, for one year, to be transferred to another Bedouin chieftain, Mansūr b. Furaykh, from al-Biqā‘ who held it for two years. After the dismissal of Mansūr the post went to Farrūkh b. ‘Abdullah (d. 1030/1620), sanjaq-bey of Nablus, and later to his son Muhammad who retained it until his death in 1048/1636.

So successful was Muhammad in checking Bedouin outrages that merely to mention his name inspired fear. Muhammad’s son Ālī was entrusted with this office for a period of one year, and his second son ‘Assāf held it successfully for several periods until his death in 1081/1670. During the seventeenth century it appears to have been given to the Farrūkh family in the Sanjaq of Nablus and occasionally to governors of Ajlūn and Karak, who had become established locally.

Officials were sent from Istanbul to supervise provisions for the journey for both the pilgrims and the animals. In 979/1571 the Sultan enquired from the

---

105. For details, see Chapter VII, pp. 247–252.


governor of Damascus whether it would be more efficient to employ janissaries from Damascus, whose local knowledge of the people and their ways might prove beneficial. The answer is not recorded but recurring official accounts show that the Sultan stressed that adequate bigisā, must be supplied to the pilgrims in addition to other necessary provisions. The animals were previously mentioned, for the records show that in 976/1568 the governor of Egypt was commanded to provide adequate quantities of beans (fūl) to be sent to Judda for the camels. For this purpose five thousand gold pieces were assigned, together with fifty thousand filori for the purchase of necessary provisions. Amīr al-hājj was responsible for the transport of these commodities to Mecca and Medina.

Water was always necessary for the welfare of both the pilgrims and their animals. In many places along the route there were pools or wells, or even streams, but in other halting places there were none. It was commanded that at all places, where there was natural water pilgrims should have free access to it but sometimes greedy officials would extract payment from the

110. M.D.xii, No:1046, 27 Rajab, 973; M.D.xvi, No 300, 18 Rajab, 979.
113. al-Burīnī, Tarajīm, fol.124a, b; M.D.xiv, No:947, 19 Rajab, 978, p.653; Ibn Jum‘a, Wujūd, pp.11-12.
114. al-Burīnī, Tarajīm, fol.124b. In 904/1576, a citadel and a pool were planned in al-Hadiyya Halt. M.D.xxix, No:224, 2nd of Dhu’l Hijja, 984, p.94.
poorer members of the caravan. When the matter was reported, the Sultan was angry and stipulated that access to water must be free to all. A special officer was entrusted with the supply of an adequate number of camels to ensure the comfort of the pilgrims. The official in charge of camel purchase and maintenance was known as mir-i əkhür-i hajj. The first to hold this post was a certain Ibrahīm who possessed a timar yielding 5,202 akches annually. His successor Muḥammad Bahri (d.979/1571) was from the müteferrika of Damascus. Many breeders of camels took the opportunity to exploit the purchase or hire of camels by pilgrims. There were several occasions when the Sultan instructed the governor of Damascus to confiscate the waqf and property of those breeders who tricked the caravan commanders into lending them money which was never returned. It was during 978/1570 that the deftardār of Damascus suggested that the fortress of Buṣra be repaired and its surrounding land used as a breeding ground for the supply of camels for pilgrims. The scheme only lasted for approximately one year owing to the incompetence of Muḥammad Bahri. After

115. M.D.xiv, No:828, end of Jumādā, 978, p.580. Siqāya, (the supply of water) was a separate office. Qānṣūh al-Ghazzawi asked for and was given responsibility for the saqqā'īn (water suppliers). M.D.xviii, No:33, 27 Ramadan, 979, p.19.


118. M.D.iii, No:189, 3 Dhu'l Qa'da, 966, p.75; M.D.v, No:520, 21 Rabī' II, 973, p.208; No:805, 2nd Ramdān, 979, p.205; M.D.vii, No:2680, 2681, 2 Rajab, 976, p.969; M.D.ix, No:1173, 3 Shawwal 977, p.44.

this experiment the previous custom was reverted to, and 300 camels yearly were supplied by Qanṣū al-Ghazzāwī, amīr al-ḥājī. Sixty camels were assigned for special duties. Twenty of these carried biqismāt and twenty transported water. The remaining twenty carried litters for the transport of the sick and disabled. Again greed and avarice spoiled the service as many who could afford their own amenities claimed the privileges under false pretences. This angered the Sultan who ordered the close investigation of all individuals seeking the privilege.  

Qanṣūh al-Ghazzāwī boasted that he could reduce the rent of a camel from 10-12 to 1-2 filori and cut the price of loading from 12 to 5-6 filori. In one case 64 dinārs were paid for the return services of three camels from Damascus to Mecca.

The usual military escort comprised one hundred sipahīs and two hundred janissaries but from 973/1565 an additional number of one za‘īm, ten sipahīs and five janissaries were sent from Gaza. The escort was armed with guns and cannon and provided adequate protection against attacks. The soldiers were provided with camels and provisions from the treasury of Damascus. In

120. M.D.xii., No:867, 8 Rabī‘ II, 976, p.448; M.D.xviii., No:25, 29 Ramaḍān 979, p.28; M.D.xxxv., No:1142, 6 Dhu‘l Ḥiǧja, 981, p.103.
973/1565 an economy was introduced and money was substituted by which each sipahi provided for his own needs. The arrangement seems to have been cancelled for later the sipahis were again supplied with camels. By 979/1571 each sipahi was expected to provide his own camel and provisions as was the case during mobilisation for war.

Later many sipahis refused the call or, which was forbidden, sent deputies. The Sultan ordered the confiscation of the timars of those who disobeyed and their grants to be given to those who rendered obedience in this respect.

Attached to the caravan were a qādi, a mu’adhhdhin, an imām, and a sanjaqdar. The officials known as amīr al-manżil was responsible for encampment at the halts. The commander himself was assisted by a general

122.

130. Ghazzi, Lutf, fol.19b.
131. A certain Muhammad, who was banner bearer, was given a timar which yielded 6,105 akches annually. In 981/1573 it was given to one Farrukh who was granted a ziţāma; T.D.169, p.51; M.D.xxxv, No:471, 10 Shawwāl, 981, p.47.
132. M.D.xii, No:745, 10 Rajab, 964, p.81; M.D.iv, No:2139, 23 Rajab, 960, p.204.
supervisor, known as nāẓir al-ḥājjī who ensured the implementation of all the functions of the various official personnel. 133

Prior to its departure and headed by its banner and mahmal the caravan would pass in procession through Damascus visiting its most important sites, such as the tombs of wālis (saints) and mosques. Camels of the mahmal were decorated and the procession proceeded to the accompaniment of flutes, drums and chanting. The occasion was an auspicious one, and to the procession were added the military and 'ulamā‘ of the city. It began and ended at the governor’s house where a banquet was spread. 134

It generally left Damascus during Shawwāl and the governor, chief judge and dignitaries accompanied it to Qubbat al-ḥājjī (sometimes known as Qubbat Yalbughā al-Yahyāwī). Here the mahmal was officially given into the custody of the caravan commander, who would wait there for three days so that parties who wished to join the main body were able to do so. 135 Some of the people from the city would even accompany the caravan as far south as al-Kiswa before returning to Damascus. 136 At Muzayrib the caravan would halt for seven days for pilgrims from outlying districts. Also at this place, the Bedouin chieftains were given their surras (purses of money) which virtually

133. M.D.xii, No:924, 24 Safar, 979, p.488. The occupant of this office during that year was a za‘īm by the name of Sātīh.
amounted to a bribe against molestation. Here also a bazaar was opened and merchants came from far and near to dispose of their wares. From the camel section alone, 5,000 akches were collected annually in purchase tax and became the perquisite of the governor of Damascus. From thence the caravan passed to Medina and Mecca through a number of halts; where it rested and renewed water supplies. It was due to arrive in Mecca before the end of Dhu 'l Qa' da. 138

The amir of Mecca would receive the caravan and would be given a khil'a. 139 In 'Arafat, the Egyptian mahmal would take precedence. 140 There, often, clashes occurred between the two military escorts of the mahmals. One such incident took place in 967/1559, when the commander of the Damascene caravan claimed seniority over the commander of the Egyptian caravan, and refused him precedence. 141 For the same reason in 978/1570 the military head of the Damascene caravan struck the head of the commander of the Egyptian caravan. 142 Occasionally, the pilgrims suffered inconveniences. In 940/1533 the pack animals were confiscated by the governor of the Yaman. 143 In addition, in 979/1572, the pilgrims suffered offences which earned the reprimand of the Sultan. 144 Great suffering was caused to them in 985/1577, 145

when the Damascene caravan usurped the halt allocated to the Egyptians.

A heavy thunderstorm caused most of the pilgrims from Damascus to be drowned near Mecca. 145

Not only were the caravans despatched with éclat, but the welcome given on their return was even greater. The amīr of muḥaqqaḥ (reception) would meet them, together with a retinue provided with camels, food and water. 146 Nearby villagers would come to meet them with gifts of food. 147 Small retail traders also carried their goods for sale to them. 148 The reception would partly consist of dignitaries such as Gānsūḥ al-Ghazzawī and later his son, Muḥammad, and ʾIbrāhīm b. Talū. 149 Paradoxically, the Druze amīr Fakhr al-Dīn II was commissioned to act in this manner on more than one occasion. 150 Soldiers who displayed gallantry in protecting or serving pilgrims received promotion in many cases or were given timars. 151

The caravan brought prosperity and trade to Damascus both from commodities it brought and the purchases made by pilgrims from the Damascene stores.

145. ʿal-Raṣīlī, Ḥusn al-ibtiḥāj, fols. 56a, b.


147. Ṣhammāʾ, ʿUyun, fol. 11a.


149. Ibn Ayyūb, Nuzhat, fol. 11a.


Inevitably taxes were levied on incoming commodities, and if the caravan came by the Gaza route, taxes were collected at Khan Yunus. If the caravan followed the direct route from Mecca to Damascus, taxes were collected at al-Kiswa. Taxes collected from commodities yielded a great amount of revenue to the treasury.

Outside the city gates, the caravan was met by all the dignitaries that were present at the commencement. In 975/1567, the Sultan commanded the governor of Damascus not to destroy the mahmal but to send it to Istanbul as a holy relic. The Sultan was to be notified of its arrival when a reception for it would be held in great honour.

IV. Buildings and Endowments

Damascus, during the period under consideration, witnessed a time of construction and repair. Schools, mosques, convents, bakeries, baths, bridges, markets and caravansaries were either built or repaired. Every class of society and travellers alike benefitted from this upsurge.

This movement was inaugurated by Sultan Selim who caused a mosque to be erected over the tomb of the renowned Sufi, Ibn 'Arabi to which a takīyya was attached. Not only were numbers of builders and artisans employed but thirty reciters of the Holy Qur'an served in addition to a number of ināms, khatibs and muqaddimis. The takīyya was richly endowed with a number of

152. T.D.263, pp.4, 175; T.D.423, p.6; T.D.474, pp.10, 202. Barkan, Kanunlar, vol.1, p.221. Nahrawālī mentions in 965/1557 that the tax collected in Kiswa on slaves was twenty silver muballaq for each individual, one silver muballaq was paid on each load; Fawā'id, p.199.


villages, the total revenue from which was 213,311 akches annually. To this
was added revenue from watermills, the silk qaysāriyya and shops in Damascus.

When this takiyya was burnt in 962/1554 it was repaired to be better than
before. 155

As did his father before him, Sultan Suleymān in 962/1554 commanded
that a mosque, takiyya and a school to teach law be built on the site of the old
Mamlūk al-Ablaq Palace. On its completion an endowment was set up to feed
the poor and the sufis. Available records show that a great number of people
were employed in various capacities. It was endowed with the revenue from
forty villages, the total revenue from which is not known although an incomplete
defter shows that it amounted to at least 367,753 akches. Its capacity was
emphasized when the Sultan in 984/1576 ordered the building intended for the
garrison to be converted to an additional takiyya attached to the main building.

Food from this building intended for the poor was given to the rich. The Sultan
in 978/1570 and 980/1572 issued decrees ordering the abuse to cease at once.

The building and repairing continued with great zest and many junior Ottoman
officials contributed to the general enthusiasm. 157

155. Ibn Tulūn, Gāla'īd, vol.i, pp.66, 70. al-Fulk, p.23. al-'Almawi,
Mukhtasar, MS. arabe Bib. Nat. 4943, fol.42b. T.D.401, pp.57,
82-4, 92, 121-2; T.D.602, p.161. For the details of the cookery see
Sījit al-Mahkamah al-Shārīyya, Damascus, vol.i, case 219, 5th
Jumādā II, 993, p.350.

156. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.134b-135a, 273a, b; Tadh kirāt, fol.225.
al-'Almawi, Mukhtasar, fols.41b-42a. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.iii,
pp.22, 85, 157, Badrān, Munādamat, p.378. T.D.474, pp.516-8,
563, 565, 621, 625, 659, 661, 665, 702, 703; M.D.xiv, No:1113,
M.D.xxviii, No:459, 25 Rajāb, 984, p.195. Popper, Egypt and Syria,

On the site chosen by the Bosnian governor of Damascus, Lala Mustafa Pasha (971-975/1563-67) built a khan which comprised 170 stores, a mosque, and a bakery together with a number of shops. Nearby he also erected a market of 41 ground floor shops with 29 more above them. Further, in Suq al-Sarrāfīn, he repaired a sabīl and erected 79 more shops and a nearby bath. The same governor caused an amāra to be built in Qunayṭara which included a caravansary, a mosque, a school, and lodges for the poor and travellers; stables, a bath and a kitchen were also attached. Three months only was allowed during which travellers could occupy it at one time and food was served free of charge in the evenings. 158

Approximately 88 people were employed in this amāra in the many capacities of preachers, reciters, teachers and attendants. The cost of their maintenance was 273 dirhams daily. For the purpose of its maintenance, the revenues from all his buildings in Damascus were to be utilized. In addition, it was endowed not only with the revenues from 31 entire villages, but also with part of a further 31, many mazāris, orchards, arable lands, watermills, baths, etc., too many to enumerate. A further privilege was extended in that all endowment was tax-free and considered in the same way as were the endowments of Mecca and Medina, Jerusalem and Hebron. 159

---


159. The waqf was finally registered in 983-4/1575-6; all the names of villages and mazāris are provided in the waqf text, pp.38-110, passim, 211-16. T.D.474, pp.25, 206, 276, 314, 319, 394, 397, 415, 417, 423, 433, 434, 440, 442, 444, 446, 448, 451, 452, 493, 540, 553, 570, 571, 677, 704, 736, 760, 761, 762.
Lālä Mus'afā's deputy in Damascus, Murād Pāša, was made governor of the province in 976/1568. He, too, built a mosque in which he included rooms for, and served food to, the poor. In it people were employed to recite from the Holy Qur'ān. Three years later his successor Darwīš Pāša (d.987/1579) built another outside Bab al-Jābiya. He also built a bath near the Umayyad Mosque, and added a qaysāriyya to which he transferred the silk market. His reasons for doing so were that better facilities were available for weighing the silk and a desire to discourage men and women mingling in the market. In his mosque he employed some fifty five personnel in various capacities. Sixteen students received tuition and their expenses were covered from its endowments.

As successive governors came to power, each vied with his predecessor to create larger mosques with greater endowments. The Grand Vizier Sinān Pāša (d.1004/1595) who commanded his building programme in Sā'īsa and 'Uyun al-Tufjar was appointed governor of Damascus in 995/1586. He transferred his efforts to Qutayfa and Acre and established two further buildings. Each contained a mosque, school, lodges, stables, and kitchens with the proviso that no-one would be allowed to remain longer than three months. He repeated his efforts in Bab al-Jābiya where he built a mosque and also added a school as well as another mosque in the Sipāhis Market. This created employment for 370 people. The revenues for their maintenance was inevitably drawn from the usual innumerable sources. His fervour extended to building of yet another mosque.

market and khan. Nor did the building campaign cease with his governorship, for in 1005/1596 a successor erected a luxurious dome outside Damascus for the departure and reception of the mabmal. Even an official in Istanbul who was not actually employed in Damascus built a further mosque in that city. Other governors repaired other existing public buildings.


CHAPTER IV

The Office of the Chief Judge, the Mufti and
Administration of Religions Offices
1. The Office of the Chief Judge

The chief judge (qādi al-qudat) in Damascus was almost invariably an Ottoman of the Ḥanafī Madhhab. The whole province came under his jurisdiction and his responsibilities were many and varied. In addition to judicial duties, he would assist in tax collection, appraise the quality of woven cloths, investigate allegations of bribery, audit accounts of endowments, and, among other duties, ensure that slaughter of animals was conducted in the slaughter-house to ensure state revenues. Public ethics, the ban on Samaritan clerks in the service of subāṣīts and amins and the provision of food and camels for the pilgrims were among aspects for which he was responsible. Sparse available records do not clarify the limits of his duties nor how he implemented them when they conflicted with the governor or other officials or how he managed to solve conflict in such cases.

Previous to the coming of Sultan Selim to Damascus there were four judges, one from each school of law, of equal prestige. He appointed a Ḥanafī as the chief judge and the others were down-graded to subordinate positions; the Ḥanafī deputies, subsequently, were given precedence over other deputies in courts (sing. mākhama).  


Courts were many and various in the large city of Damascus. They included: Bāb al-ʿEfendi Court (the chief judge court), al-Kubrā, Maydān al-Ḥaṣā, Qanāt al-ʿAwwī, al-Ṣāliḥiyya and al-Qisma al-ʿAskariyya. 

The Kubrā Court was transferred from one madrasa (school) to another, while that of the chief judge (Bāb al-ʿEfendi) was probably held in the former Mamluk Palace of Justice, (Dār al-ʿAdl), but there is no indication whether other courts were actually held in madrasas or had their own separate buildings. After the Ottoman conquest there is a reference to one deputy judge who held the court in his own house, but this was only for a very short time.

The chief judge, sometimes assisted by an interpreter (mutarjim) would function in his own court. Outside, but in the same building, deputies would listen to and adjudicate other cases according to their schools of law. In 959/1551, the chief judge built an annexe to which he transferred his deputies and he himself heard cases in the old building. After this he attended to other administrative duties by appointment only. One native deputy from each of the other madhāhībs was attached to his court, but there was not always a Ḥanafī deputy among them - perhaps because he was himself a Ḥanafī and listened to such cases.


7. Ibn Tulun quoted in Rawḍ, fol.36b.


10. Two people of local origin held this post; see Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.ii, p.67. Ibn Tulun, in Rawḍ, fols.28a, 42a. For Mālikī, deputy judges see Ibn Ayyūb, Rawḍ, fols.208a, b. Ghazzī, Lutf, fols.4a, 8b. For Šāfiʿī deputy judges see Ibn Ayyūb, Rawḍ, fols.206b-207a, 8b, Nuzhat, fol.332a, Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.iii, pp.179-80, 183-5.
The Kubra Court, second only in importance to the Bab al-Efendi Court, comprised a deputy from each school of law. The Hanafi deputy was usually Ottoman but the rest were invariably of local origin or migrants to Damascus from North Africa.  

Available material shows that one of the Hanafi deputies in the Court of Maydan al-Haja was Ottoman. It is easy to deduce from the plentiful references that a native Shafi'i was always appointed as deputy judge, although a Hanbali or Maliki deputy was not always appointed. This may indicate that the local inhabitants were predominantly Shafiis. Available

11. For names of Hanafi deputies see Ibn Tulun quoted by Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols.28a, 30a,b, 31a, 33a, 36a, 39a. For the Shafi'i deputies see Ibn Tulun in Rawd, fols.26a, 280a. Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols.265b, 266a,b. Nuzhat, fol.332a; Ghazzi, Lutf, fols.45b-46a; Muhhibbi Khulasat, vol.iv, pp.143-4.

12. For names and biographies of Hanafi deputies see Ibn Tulun in Rawd, fols.28a, 30a, 31a, 33a, 36a, 39a, 280a; Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols.265b, 266a,b. Nuzhat, fol.332a. Tadhkirat, fol.82a. Ghazzi, Kawakib, vol.iii, pp.122. In 999/590 there was no Hanafi deputy; see Ibn Ayyub, Nuzhat, fol.332a.


15. For names and biographies of Maliki deputies see Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols.52a,b, 266b. Ghazzi, Kawakib, vol.iii, p.13.
biographies show that a Hanafi and a Shafi deputy were generally appointed in the court of Qanāt al-ʿAwnī while the appointment of a Mālikī and Hanbali does not always appear. All deputies with the exception of one Ottoman Hanāfī deputy were of local origin.

The headquarters of the Hanbali Madhhab predominantly lay in Saʿîhiyya quarter of Damascus, where also Shafiʿīs lived, which is probably the explanation why native Hanbali and Shafiʿī deputies were nearly always appointed. The appointment of a Hanāfī deputy seems to have been occasional as in 992/1590. It was then given to an Ottoman in order to restrain a suspected subversion of income by local deputy-judges. The names of Mālikī deputies do not always appear in the records but when they do so they indicate persons of local origin.

16. For names and biographies of Hanāfī deputies see Ibn Tulūn in Rawd, fols.28a, 30a, b, 37a, 38a, 42a. Ibn Ayyūb, Nuzhat, fol.384a. Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.ii, pp.67, 156; Lutf, fol.33a.

17. For names and biographies of Shafiʿī deputies see Ibn Tulūn in Rawd, fols.30a, b, 39a, 51b-52a, b. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.52a, b, 265b, 266a, 280a. Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.iii, pp.126, 179-80, 197, 217. Lutf, fol.5b. Muhībī, Khulasat, vol.i, pp.407-8.

18. For names and biographies of Mālikī deputies, see Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.280b, Ghazzi, Kawākib, vol.iii, p.122. Lutf, fol.86b.


A court, known as al-Qisma al-Askariyya, also functioned in Damascus which dealt with the inheritances of members of military corps or their families. It was staffed by local as well as Ottoman Ḥanafi deputy-judges. In addition to these a court was held in Bāb al-Jābiya in 926/1519, but there is no further reference to it. The Mu‘āyyadīyya Court was also terminated in 945/1538.

The chief judge had deputies in the eight nāhiyās of: al-Marjayn, al-Ghawta, Jubbat al-Asṣāl, Wādi al-‘Ajam, Zabadānī, Ḥammāra, Biqā‘ and Wādi al-Taym. These nāhiyās are referred to in the sources as al-Barr; and their deputy judges are referred to as the judges of al-Barr. Not all those who occupied the post in each nāhiya were natives; some were Ottoman. There are no available records to show that one from each school of law was represented in any nāhiya at the same time. Both Ḥanafi and Shafi‘i were among those appointed. At one time the deputy judge in Hawrān was Ḥanafi and at another a Shafi‘i. Both Ottoman and local judges were appointed at various times.

In towns like Ba‘labakk, Bayrūt, Sidon, Qā‘ā, ‘Ajlūn, Salt, Karak-Shawbak, Nābius, Jerusalem, Ramla, Şafad, Gaza, Lydda and Lajjun, the deputy judges were subordinate to the chief judge and Ottoman as well as native personnel occupied the posts.


A circular from the chief judge issued in 999/1590 clearly specifies the function of a deputy. He must continue to judge cases according to his school of law; examine and sanction contracts of marriages and approve ḥujjās where appropriate; register all cases; dispense equal justice; inform the Ḥanafi deputy judge of all acts and decisions and obtain his signature of approval. The penalty for any contravention of these instructions was forfeiture of position and banishment from the town.30 It is worth mentioning that in the event of dismissal or disgrace of a chief judge, deputies would not be involved.31

Under Mamlūk rule, the shāhid (witness)32 enjoyed a higher status. He was entitled to a separate office and had authority to use his own initiative in adjudicating minor cases. During Ottoman rule the office was integrated into the court proceedings33 and the holder’s duties reduced to clerical status. al-Ghazālī restored the Mamlūk practice,34 but after his rebellion had been quelled it reverted to the Ottoman procedure. Sources refer to shāhid as ṣadl and muwaqqīt; and these terms appear to have been used synonymously. The

appointment was open to the four schools of law and until 999/1590 were given to people of local origin. It is difficult to establish their number in each court but the Shar'iyya Court registers reveal that each case was witnessed by eight to ten witnesses. It is not known whether this applies in all cases as the registers of all courts are not extant.

There was a chief shahid in every court. One of his subordinates drafted a case, a second copied it, while the chief's function, presumably, was to check its technical and legal form. The post obviously needed trained personnel and Ibn Ayyûb (d. ca. 1000/1591) refers to it as šīnakat al-tawriq (craft of chancery.)

In 999/1590 some of the shahids, who were almost entirely of local origin, were dismissed to be replaced by danishmands (those who assisted the judge and collected his revenues) and one was appointed in each court to register cases. In one instance a new chief judge is said to have remarked upon his diminished personal revenue, particularly that which should have accrued from fees from bujjas (deeds). The interpreter replied that it was caused by the judge himself having instilled the fear of dismissal and stating that a complete change of deputies was necessary to the appointment of a new judge. When the chief judge realised this, he dispatched a circular of reassurance to them, together with instructions for future collection of fees. He appointed danishmands in each court, probably in order to augment collection of fees.


36. For names and biographies of shahids see Ghazzî, Kawûkib, vol.ii, pp.80, 177-8; vol.iii, pp.30, 41-2, 53, 66, 77, 82, 100, 122, 125, 126. Lutf, fols.6a, 7a, b, 10b, 11a, 12a, 18b, 23a, 24b, 30a, 31a, 52a, b. Ibn Ayyûb, Rawd, fols.38b, 50b, 51a, 52a, b, 55a, b, 56a, 171b-172a, 173a, 267a, b. Tadhkirât, fols.78b-79a. Sijill al-Mbkhama al-Shartiyya, Damascus, vol.i, case Nos:88, 110, 115, 155, year 992, pp.131-2, 142, 144, 189-90. Schacht, J., An Introduction to Islamic Law, pp.192-4. Ziadeh, N., Urban life, p.107.

37. Danishmands are mentioned as early as 943/1536 accompanying the chief judge and assisting his administrations and collecting the revenues from a number of services (sing. khidma). Their behaviour was notoriously bad and
References to court procedure indicate that many judges were bilingual while many other Ottoman judges employed interpreters who were expert in both Arabic and Turkish languages. Other court personnel, known as muhādirs, were employed to ensure the attendance of the parties.

During 'Abbāsid and Mamluk rule the judges received state salaries; while under the Ottoman rule for every case presented, whether for dispute of any kind, registration of marriages, land, etc, the fees, referred to as yasak, were paid by the persons concerned. In the case of the marriage contract of a girl, a fee of 125 dirhams would be collected. The apportionment would be twenty dirhams for the chief judge's fee; one to the deputy who carried the contract, and four to the witnesses. The remaining sum of one hundred dirhams, referred to as resm-i ʿarūs in the Tapu Defters, formed part of the Sultan's, governor's, or timar-holder's income depending upon its allocation. For the remarriage of a widow or a divorcée the fee was 75 dirhams; 50 of this amount was resm-i ʿarūs and the remaining 25 would be divided in the same proportion. The legalization of a ḥujja cost 14 Sultanīs while a copy of it

42. According to Maqrīzī (d.845/1441) the word yasak was Turkish in origin. It was in use in Syria and Egypt after Chingiz Khan (d.1227) wrote his code of law and named it Yāsā. Under the Ottomans it held many meanings according to the context of its usage. In Damascus it came to mean the term descriptive of all Ottoman practices, whether of administration, justice,
cost eight. In 972/1567 hujjas legalization was reduced to 11 and the copy to six.\(^{43}\) Those whose property had been stolen reimbursed the qādi al-kāshf (inspector or investigator) for his work; the entire quarter's population united to pay the fees in cases of unidentified arson or murder, but the fees on these cases were not usually excessive.\(^{44}\) Finally the employment of a muḥādir cost one dirham.\(^{45}\)


\(^{44}\) Ibn Ayyūb, Nuzhat, fols. 343a, 389a.

There appears to have been no fixed amount of income for the chief judge. The Sāliḥīyya Court references show it as being between 50-00 akches on some days and nothing on others.\textsuperscript{46} al-Kubrā yielded three Sultānīs a week and on one occasion when it rose to five the deputy was dismissed as he was considered to have overcharged. There are no references concerning the estimated income from Maydān al-Hasā Court although the total amount was believed to be considerable. The chief judges from the barr received less than 10 Sultānīs monthly.\textsuperscript{47} Throughout the province payment of these fees caused resentment from both the mass of the population and the ulama'; so deep was this resentment that one judge resigned because such payment had been classed as a form of usury.\textsuperscript{48}

Some of the chief judges in Damascus were notorious for their corrupt practices. Wāli al-Dīn b. al-Farfūr (d.937/1530), the chief Shāfī judge of Damascus under the Mamlūks, changed to the Ḥanafī Madhhab. He was one of the two Arab judges who succeeded to the office during the sixteenth century, and was a subject of criticism. He came from a wealthy family holding vast lands in Ḥilān al-Tuffāḥ and was married to a rich wife. His wealth enabled him to carry out various plans for construction and building and he led a luxurious life.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.178b.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.262a,b. Ibn Tulūn in Rawd, fol.178b.
\textsuperscript{48} Ghazzī, Kawākīb, vol.ii, p.116, vol.iii, p.12. Ibn al-Imād, Shadhārāt, vol.viii, pp.191-2. A reference in T.D.169 (ca.936/1529) says that the following amounts of money were at the disposal of each judge probably as income:-

\begin{align*}
\text{The judge of Damascus} & : 18,000 \text{ akches} \\
\text{The judge of Bayrūt} & : 3,600 \text{ } \\
\text{The judge of Gāra} & : 1,200 \text{ } \\
\text{The judge of Baṣlabakk} & : 4,000 \text{ } \\
\text{The judge of Sidon} & : 1,500 \text{ }
\end{align*}

This is the only reference concerning money at the disposal of judges, T.D.169, p.45.
He was, however, accused of faking money from orphans, confiscating property from partisans of al-Ghazālī; and his greed led him to annex a land near his orchard, to reach which by boat he destroyed a number of small public bridges (sing. gantara). In addition, he was accused of hypocrisy and crooked dealing. In 936/1529 he was dismissed and, while travelling towards Istanbul, was brought back from Aleppo and interrogated for his misdeeds, for fifteen sessions. He sold part of his estate and property to pay for proved allegations. He was held in the citadel until his death in 937/1530 when it was suspected that the governor had poisoned him for reasons of personal hatred. It is more probable, however, that the governor was both envious and jealous. Wali al-Dīn’s influence and power were strong in Damascus and he was favoured by Sultan Selim; also he had been chief judge, under the Ottomans, in Damascus for the third time for as long a period as six years.

Most of the Ottoman judges appointed to serve in Damascus were highly qualified people whose conduct was impeccable, but some of them abused their position. Uthman b. Isrā’īl, (d.944/1537), who was twice a chief judge in Damascus, purloined the books intended for students and his death was not regretted. His successor, Ishaq al-Bursawi (d.944/1537) was poorly qualified.


as a judge and was a suspected homosexual. Similarly, his successor, Abu al-Layth al-Rumi (d. 944/1536), was corrupt; while another, Ahmad Chalabi (d. 957/1550), was extremely arrogant. Yet another, Muhammad b. Ma'bud (d. 993/1583) was avaricious, oppressive and unjust, and Mustafa Efendi (d. 989/1581) accepted bribes.

On the whole, deputy judges appear to have been appointed rather in consideration of their character and qualities than because of family or other influence. The appointment of some of them was considered disastrous. Some were noted for their avarice and bribery; also for defrauding orphans and complete perversion. Some shahids were also notoriously corrupt. They were sometimes known to forge documents; and in at least two instances the Sultan sent orders to investigate their corrupt practices in the courts. A certain Yusuf b. Yusuf b. Karim al-Din (d. 1032/1622) used his position to exploit judges, and al-Ghazzzi described him as the source of corruption in courts. One of the interpreters, 'Ala' al-Din 'Ali b. Yusuf b. Jamal al-Din known as Ibn al-Khashshab (d. ca. 1000/1592) was noted for his greed and as a receiver of bribes; notables and even ulama feared his ruthlessness.

52. Ibn Tulun, Qudat, pp. 318-9.
53. Ibn Tulun, Qudat, pp. 319-20.
54. Ibn Ayyub, Dhayl, p. 326.
58. Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols. 55a, b, 267a, b. Burini, Tarajim, fols. 141a, b. Ghazzii, Lutf, fols. 10b, 52a, b. MD. ix, No: 100, 28 Ramadan, 977, p. 38. MD. xiv, No: 99, 21 Dhul' I Garda, 981, p. 33.
Sultan sent a chavush to investigate the cases of oppression alleged to have committed by deputy judges to the extent that "many villages and inhabited and cultivated places belonging to the province of Damascus are on the verge of falling into ruin." He may have confirmed the truth of these allegations which would explain the dismissal of all Arab deputy judges, but after a short period, however, they were reinstated.

A typical example of corruption in the courts is referred to in the sources as "the story of the Kapiji." In 988/1580 a certain Mahmud b. Yunus b. Shahnin known as al-Awar died leaving 33,000 gold dinars. The ketshuda of the janissaries in Damascus reported to Istanbul that Muhammad b. Muhammad b. al-Khattab al-Hanbali (d.992/1584), the chief shahid in al-Kubra Court and al-Din al-Khashshab, the interpreter, the deputy judge Shams al-Din b. Muhammad al-Rujayhi (d.1002/1593) and others had concocted a deception in order to obtain this money which they had divided among themselves. They affirmed that the deceased had left a daughter to whom one of them would act as a wasi (guardian) and another nazir (supervisor) of the inheritance. A kapiti (port soldier) by the name of Mahmud Turkche Bimez, together with a judge, was sent to Damascus to investigate the case. al-Rujayhi fled and the rest were arrested and tortured. Their property was confiscated and also that of many outstanding innocent ulama; several merchants and deputy judges were also arrested. The value of the total properties thus confiscated exceeded

60. Heyd, U., Ottoman documents, pp.54-5. See also Ghazzi when a deputy judge refused to sanction a forgery case which was approved by the chief judge. Kawakib, vol.iii, pp.204-5.
62. Ghazzi, Kawakib, vol.iii, p.16. The gold dinar referred to in the Tapu Defters as sikke al-fun, appears less frequently and not many transactions are found in which this coin is recorded. In ca.930/1523 its value varied between 50-52 akchas but in 990/1582, most likely as a result of inflation due to the introduction of silver from America, it was increased to 60 akchas on the instruction of the Sultan. TD,430, pp.91, 251, 457. Sijilat al-Malikama, Aleppo, vol.ii, p.99.
200,000 dinars. The outstanding deputy-judge, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Ḥamawī, wrote to the Grand Muftī Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Joyzade (d. 995/1586) in Istanbul explaining the situation and the ruthless manner in which they had been treated. This communication, together with similar complaints, were submitted to the Sultan who ordered the execution of the Kapiji if the allegations could be substantiated. The trial took place and the Kapiji was found guilty and hanged in 990/1582 while the prisoners were freed.

As has already been mentioned, the military section in Damascus enjoyed its own court as far as inheritances were concerned. During the Mamlūk regime it also had its own judges. This does not appear to have been the case under Ottoman rule. Crimes were frequently committed by military personnel, and orders to investigate them were sent from Istanbul. Such orders were usually addressed to the governor except in a few cases. The inference is, therefore, that the governor was given the right to supersede the judge in such investigations.

As under the Mamlūks, the administration of penal law, under the Ottomans, was in the hands of the governor and his subordinates (especially the subāshis) who

---


66. Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. iv, p. 192. There was both a Ḥanafī and a Shāfiʿī judge.


were referred to as ḥukkām al-siyāsā or qaḍāʾ al-siyāsā. They are reputed to have tortured, killed and accepted money in some cases of zina (prostitution), and to have paraded prostitutes in disgrace through the streets. The siyāsā jurisdiction supplemented the Sharī‘a in these cases. In more serious cases the felons were sent to Istanbul for trial. It is not known whether the post of qaḍī al-siyāsā extended to qaḍī al-kashf whose function was to investigate cases of larceny, robbery and murder.

In the light of the evidence which is extant, it appears that the judicial courts were not always able to check the activities of the military personnel. On 935/1528 the chief judge, supported by the ‘ulama’, was able to prevent the governor from building a pool in the forecourt of the Umayyad Mosque. On another occasion in 967/1559, however, the chief judge was indignant when the governor’s men refused to show respect as he passed. This led to a clash between the partisans of both sides and both reported the affair to Istanbul; and the outcome was the transfer of the judge.

The outstanding ability of the judge Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Joyzāde to check ḥukkām al-siyāsā and excesses by military personnel is especially recorded, while another chief judge is credited with Messianic and Mahdist...
qualities because he redressed grievances and relieved military oppression.

There is no doubt that the _subashis_ were notorious for their lawlessness. There is an instance recorded where a shopkeeper was jailed by them, beaten to death and his body hung on a tree. The case was reported to _qādī al-kashf_ stating that the man had committed suicide. His family brought the matter to the attention of the chief judge, who appears to have been completely helpless and could only express his sympathy for the tragedy. When the governor heard that complaint had been made to the chief judge, he sent for the complainants and they received severe physical treatment. A further example shows that a janissary, Kiwan b. 'Abdullah (d. 1033/1623), habitually forged documents, blackmailed reputations by threats and even lashed a retired judge for an unpaid debt. There is no record of any interference or protection from his cruelty.

II. The Office of _mufti_

Although the Ottoman judicial system was founded on Ḥanafi law, other schools of law were not abolished. In addition to the chief judge there was also a recognized Ḥanafi _mufti_ authorized to sign _fatwā_. In the period between the Ottoman conquest and 965/1557 the office of _mufti_ was held in succession by two Damascenes. One of them, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Sultan (d. 950/1543), noted for his independent judgement, was highly esteemed and frequently consulted by officials. In spite of the blindness which overtook him towards the end of

77. Ghazzi, Kawakib, vol. iii, p.28.
78. Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fols.117a, 166a, b. Ghazzi, Lutf, fols.47a, b.
79. al-Khalidi, Tarikh, p.106.
80. Ibn Ayyub, Nuzhat, fols.386b-7a.
Lutf, fols.43b-4a, b. Muhtibbi, Khulāṣat, vol. iii, pp.299-303.
life, his opinion was still sought and his replies were sealed by his stamp to obviate forgery.

With the establishment of the Sulaymaniyah Madrasa in Damascus the supervision was assigned to the Hanafi mufti and thereafter the post was given to an Ottoman. Between 965-984/1557-76 the office was entrusted to four Ottoman muftis in succession, each of whom, in addition to ifta and supervision, taught at the Sulaymaniyah. Two Damascenes succeeded to the appointment between 984-97/1576-88. One of them was Zayn al-Din 'Umar b. Sultan (d.997/1588), a nephew of the first mufti, to be followed by an Ottoman.

Available evidence is not explicit concerning the mufti’s attendance at courts, or whether cases were presented to him for opinion and authentication by the qādi. An opinion may, however, be deduced from Ibn Ayyūb’s (d. ca.1000/1591) criticism of some of the Ottoman muftis who, he said, knew no more than Arabic grammar and titles of books, and relied on local ‘ulamā to answer their questions for them. In one case a local ‘alim (learned scholar) abused his trust and phrased his opinions with deliberate vagueness in order to satisfy both clients and thus enhance his own prestige and fees.

---


87. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.273a, b.
Each muftī had a clerk who would put questions posed to him into writing. For this the clerk would be paid two akches. The muftī himself received five akches. The muftī was also a teacher and Ṿāẓir (supervisor) for which he drew additional income. Two muftīs are recorded as each earning 80 dirhams daily.

In Damascus there was more than one Shiʻā muftī at the same time. Recorded names of those who gave fatwas were those of local origin. There is no evidence to show that confirmation from the chief judge or the Hanafi muftī was asked or given, but in one case the chief judge forbade a Shiʻā muftī to issue fatwas. The Shiʻā muftīs taught in various schools and were paid both for their fatwas and teaching. Badr al-Dīn al-Ghazzi (d.984/1576) was exceptional as he issued fatwas free. In Baṣlabakk as well as in Sidon there was a Shiʻā muftī.

All of them except one were North Africans who had migrated to and settled in Damascus. Two of them worked as deputy-judges; another, for a while, as

88. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawḍ, vols.273a,b.
the supervisor (ناصر) of the Umayyad Mosque and they were also part-time teachers. 92

There was more than one Hanbali muftī at the same time but by comparison there were less than the number of Shāfi'ī muftīs. This is probably because there were few Hanbalīs in Damascus except in the Šāliḥiyâ suburb, which was predominantly inhabited by Hanbalīs from Palestine. Three muftīs were from the Shuwaykīs originating from the village of Shuwaykā near Nablus. The Hanbali muftīs, like other muftīs, taught in schools but one of them was accused of unethical conduct. 93

III. The Administration of Public Buildings and their Āwaif

A. Hospitals:

There were two hospitals in Damascus: al-Nūrī and al-Qaymārī in Šāliḥiyâ. Under the Mamlūks there were three equally recognised grades in the medical profession: surgery, cauterising and general practice, and the appointment as head of each section was made by the governor. 94 It is not clear whether this practice was continued by the Ottomans. More than one person is described in the sources as head of the physicians (رئيّس الأطباء). It is possible that this was an official or honorary title given by the biographer.

In one case, a doctor who went to Istanbul returned with a title which may either...


have merely been claimed or have been awarded him.95

The supervision of the Nūrī Hospital was always entrusted to an
Ottoman; one of whom, originally from Persia, was suspected of Shi'a
inclinations.96 A Damascene has been recorded as holding the post of clerk in
that hospital.97 It not only received in-patients; upon discharge a patient
would receive a medical certificate of freedom from contagion.98

The Qaymari Hospital, like the Nūrī, cared for both in- and out-patients
and provided medicine. The medical staff seem always to have been Damascene.99
The only known local supervisor was Yusuf b. al-Munqār (d.943/1536).100 Most
of the time the supervision of this hospital was linked with the Nūrī Hospital,
especially when the income of both diminished. The joint hospital supervision
was entrusted to the former aghā of the janissaries, Hasan Shawyazī (d.1027/
1617).101

95. For names and biographies of physicians, see Ibn Tūlūn, Mufakhat, vol.ii,

96. For succeeding supervisors, see Ibn Tūlūn, Mufakhat, vol.ii, p.79, and
p.347. al-`Almawī, Mulkhṭasār, MS. BM. Or.3035, fol.48a, Or.6772, fol.
fol.38a.


One example from the Sharīyya Court was such: "Muḥammad b. Nāyīrī
was accused by Muḥammad b. Jamāl of having the disease of elephantiasis
(judham). He possessed a certificate of clearance of contagion in this
respect from the chief physician. Muḥammad b. Jamāl, however, objected
to living near him. The judge examined the certificate and its signature
and declared it authentic, and pronounced the verdict that no-one had the
right to interfere with Muḥammad b. Nāyīrī", Sijill al-Mahkama al-Sharīyya,


B. Convents (sing. takīyya):

All supervisory and clerical posts in al-Salīmiyya Takiyya were held by Ottomans, while all religious offices were held by local people. Similarly, the supervision of the Sulaymaniyya was entrusted to the Ḥanafi muftī who was usually an Ottoman, but in 999/1590, it was held by a Damascene notable Muḥammad b. Manjīk al-Yūsūfī (d. 1032/1622). He was jailed in the citadel for failing to produce arrears due to the takīyya. It is only recorded on one occasion that the katib (clerk) was an Ottoman. Other duties such as those of the preachers and imāms were given to local people. No Ottoman is recorded as having occupied a supervisory post in any of the convents. There were many convents in a derelict state; very few were ever repaired. Instead the Ottomans built many large ones, among which were Salīmiyya and Sulaymaniyya.

C. The Umayyad Mosque:

The Umayyad Mosque had its own supervisor (nāzir), and the office was very important owing to the fact that many people were employed there or were dependent on its waqf. This office was entrusted to both Ottoman and local personnel. Two Ottomans who occupied this post were of Persian origin.
Towards the end of the century it had been entrusted to two people who were originally from the military element. Three Arabs, two from Damascus and one from Morocco, occupied the post at various times. One of the Damascenes who was a sayyid was guilty of mal-administration and dependants complained that their allowances were delayed. The other two proved to be capable and qualified men. The post was remunerative; one supervisor is recorded as being paid forty 'othmani (rupee) a day while another was paid fifty. All other posts such as teachers, preachers, leaders of prayer, readers of the Qur'an—almost all others employed in various capacities, with the exception of the attendance checker—were local people.

D. Awqaf of Mecca and Medina:

The awqaf for Mecca and Medina were supervised separately from the others. Records show that the supervisors were mostly local people; only one was a Damascene of Ottoman origin, and one other was an Ottoman. Two


113. There were 120 readers. Ibn Ayyub, Rawd, fol.34b.


Ottomans are mentioned as holding the post of clerk (kātib) and one Damascene, while the only recorded name of its tax-collector (jābi) was that of a local person. One of the holders, a Damascene named Taqī al-Dīn al-Qārī (d.945/1538), was jailed for arrears of money due, while Āḥmad Chalābī b. Sinān al-Qaramānī (d.1019/1610), who even entertained judges, was recorded as having exploited his position by using money from the waqf for his own purposes.

E. Madrasās (schools)

'Ābd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Nuṣayrī (d.927/1520), in his compiled history, mentions that there were 157 madrasās in Damascus. Upon examination of the available records of the period one finds that many names of schools do not appear. This may indicate that many of them had vanished or were derelict. A small number were revived but it appears that the intention of Ottoman officials was rather to build new mosques and convents and attach schools to them than to repair derelict buildings.

120. Ghazzī, Lūfī, fol.22a.
121. For names of obsolete schools, see al-ʿAlmāwī, Mukhtasār, Taymūriyya, No:1499, pp.21, 28, 29, 48-9, 51. D.K. 3419, Türkvb, p.36. Bib .Nat. arabe 4943, fols.6a, 7b, 11a,b, 12a,b, 13a, 19a,b, 21b-22a. B M. Or.3035, fols. 48a, 55a; Or.6772, fols.38b-44a; Or.3035, fols. 16b-17a, 35a,b. Ghazzī, Kawākbī, vol.ii, pp.10, 177, 189, 241, 260.
122. al-ʿAlmāwī, Mukhtasār, arabe 4943, fols. 16a,b. Or.3035, fol.42b; Or. 6772, fols.33a,b. al-ʿAdwāī in the margin of Mukhtasār, 4943, fol.14b.
Most schools had supervisors (sing. Ṿazīr) who guaranteed collection of the awqaf revenues and paid dependants and employees. From the recorded names of supervisors few of Ottoman origin are to be found. 'Ulamā' from Damascus were employed in the various schools as teachers, preachers, etc. During the sixteenth century at least 73 of them were thus employed. Ibn Ṭūlūn in 926/1519 complained that four madrasās were supervised and dominated by Ottomans. Upon examination of the names of supervisors and teachers, one finds that the number of Ottomans is negligible. The 'ulamā' competed among themselves for appointments and many of them travelled to Istanbul or petitioned for appointment. Some have left an account of their journeys. As early as 936/1529 Badr al-Dīn al-Ghazzī; (d. 984/1576) travelled to Istanbul to lobby officials there to approach the Ḥādītī ‘Askār to confirm him in the posts that his deceased father had held.


127. For names see Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.i, p.175; vol.ii, p.87, vol.iii, pp.127-9, al-Ālmawī, Or.3035, fol.16b; Or.6772, fols.12b-13a. arabe 4943, fols.7a, b. Ibn Ṭūlūn, Ghuraf, Shahīt 'Aft 1924, fol.36a. Taymūriyya, Tarīkh 631, p.79. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.37b.

128. Ghazzī, Badr al-Dīn, Matā'īlī, MS. Köprüllü No:1390, fols.71a, 151a, b-35. B M. Or.3621, fols.3b, 27b, 28a, 31a, b, 32a, b. See also İkrem Kamil, "Ghazzī-Mekki Seyahet namesi", Tarih Semineri Derğisi (Istanbul, 1937), =

There is a long poem by Shaykh Muhibb al-Din al-Hamawi (d.1016/1607) who went to Istanbul in 981/1573 and remained there until 983/1575. He composed many poems in praise of various officials, almost abasing himself in his anxiety to achieve his objective, and was rewarded at least by the judgement of Ma'rur al-Nu'man. Generally the appointment to offices was recommended by the chief judge of Damascus, but the final decision was taken by the Qadi-Aslar of Anatolia. The payment varied between 30 to 80, with a maximum of 100 a day.

IV. Problems Involving the Chief Judge and the ulama

One problem the Ottomans had to face in Damascus was excessive coffee drinking and the ulama were divided among themselves concerning it. It is not known when coffee was first introduced to Damascus but when Ali b. Muhammad al-Shami (d.963/1555) visited Damascus in 947/1540 on his way from Medina to Istanbul, he drank coffee and from that time the practice of drinking it became public. The Hanafi mufti, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Sultan, pp.5-86, where he draws a comparison between their descriptions of their travels. My thanks are due to Professor V. Menage who drew my attention to this article.

133. al-Hamavi, Muhibb al-Din, Bawadi al-dumur al-andamiyya bi wadi al-diwar al-tumiyyya, MS. University Library, Cambridge, No: CIC.125, fols.237a, 240a,b, 241a,b, 243b, 244a, 258a,b, 259b, 263b. Atif Efendi, No:2030, fols.40a-41b, 43b, 44a,b, 45a,b, 47a,b, 48a, 64b-65a,b, 68a,b.
157.

(d.950/1543), considered coffee to be one of the tragedies of the age and gave a fatwa against it. 138 Yūnus b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, al-Ayyāwī (d.976/1568) supported by Muḥammad b. Sultān wrote a treatise against the beverage which was, however, praised by Ibn Sulṭān himself and the chief judge. 139 In 950/1543, 953/1546 and 961/1553 orders were issued from Istanbul to close coffee houses in Damascus as places of disrepute. 140 The repetition of such orders proves that the custom had become widespread and consequently difficult to curb. The practice flourished in spite of fatwās, probably because it was condoned by some of the Damascene ulama. 141 The Maliki muftī, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām (d.975/1567) wrote a muwashshah praising it. 142 Two of his students, Muḥammad b. Māmā (d.987/1579) and Darwish b. Talū (d.1014/1605), both well known and influential poets, defended it. 144 When, however, the former chief judge of Damascus, Shaykh al-İslām


141. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fol.305a. See also Fatawa al-Kamāl al-Qaddi, Zāhi-riyya, No:1054. For names of coffee houses in Şāliḥiyya, see Ibn Kannān, Tariqī, p.36. There was a coffee roasting store in Darwish Pasha Market, complete with four grinders; Sījill al-Mabkama al-Shari‘iyya, vol.i, case No:184, pp.183-4, year 992.


143. Ibn Māmā, Diwan, fols.37b, 133b-134a. For his lamentation of a certain Aṣlān who used to serve coffee, see fols.128b-129a. Ghazzī, Kawākb, vol.iii, pp.50-1.

Muhammad Buslanzade (1006/1597) gave a fatwa permitting it and the distinguished physician Da'ud b. 'Umar al-Anfaki (1008/1599) cited its usefulness from the medical point of view, no doubt the campaign against it relaxed.

Boza (an intoxicating drink) was another problem which angered sufi in Damascus and Ibn Tulun mentions that he wrote a book in its condemnation. In 972/1564 the Sultan commanded the governor and the chief judge to close all boza, coffee houses and public drinking-places in Damascus. Rascals (safala) used them as meeting places from which to commit acts against the Sharia. Mamluk governors had tried to close public drinking places, but without success as is proved by the frequent references to wine (khamr). Wine, produced in surrounding villages, was traded into the city. In 899/1493 a group of sufis endeavoured to prevent this by intercepting it on the roads. The Mamluk governor arrested the sufis and a clash ensued during which some blood was shed. Taxes on wine were collected by the Ottomans, to be abolished in 976/1568 as a religious act.


149. M.D.4i, No:1363, 972, p.620.


Hashish (cannabis) was known, also, in Damascus and was opposed by the ulama. There was a house for hashish in Damascus which paid a heavy tax.

Some of the Damascenes used eggs for gambling purposes; but the method is not known. In 940/1533, the chief judge ordered the eggs to be broken and the vendors to be compensated; yet in spite of prohibition the practice continued. Damascenes held a feast of eggs on the first Thursday of April in every year, which was known as Khamis al-Bayd. It was a public feast and gambling with eggs was probably associated with this feast.

156. Ibn Tulun, Sudat, p.316.
CHAPTER V

The Office of the Defterdar and the Taxation of the Province
1. The Office of the Defterdar and his Function

On Sunday, 2nd Ramadan 922/29th September 1516, which was the day after Sultan Selim arrived at the outskirts of Damascus, his defterdar summoned the Samaritans employed by the Mamluks as mubashirs (tax-collectors) to present their accounts and money due. Title deeds of iqta and moneys from village taxes were demanded simultaneously. Apparently the defterdar took no account of hardship caused to the people, supervisors of waqf, owners of mulk (privately owned land), and those in charge of state (sultanî) land were allowed no discrimination in the burden of taxation.

Perhaps this explains the dismissal of the defterdar in the same year, 922/1516, to be replaced by a certain Husayn Pasha who restored the Mamluk practice and the old procedures of taxation to the mubashirs. This appears to have been a temporary measure because in 923/1517, another defterdar by the name of Nuh al-Rumi was given the appointment. Records show that he, together with the governor and the chief judge, defined the status of the land surrounding Damascus. Supervisors of madrasas, mosques, cemeteries and convents were asked to present documents as proof of ownership of land with which their foundations were endowed. Some resentment was aroused by this action, which was probably calculated to expose misappropriation of lands, finances, or to increase revenue.

So bitter was the resentment that on Wednesday 4th Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 923/18th November 1517, Nūḥ was dismissed, and there is no record of his replacement.\(^4\)

Shortly after, in 924/1518, Damascus and its dependencies were entrusted to Jānbirī al-Ghazālī who was required to produce an annual tribute from taxes.\(^5\)

Three years after al-Ghazālī's rebellion had been quelled (in 927/1521), Nūḥ was again sent to Damascus to survey the terrain and to divide it into state domain, timars, waqf, and privately owned lands.\(^6\)

After the survey, the three provinces of Damascus, Aleppo and Tripoli, which virtually comprised the whole of Syria, were welded into one treasury-administration with its chief defterdār’s headquarters in Aleppo. He was referred to as the ‘Arabiṣṭān defterdārī, Vilayet-i ‘Arab defterdārī, ‘Arab jānībī defterdārī, ḇalab defterdārī, Defterdār-i diyār-i ‘Arab or Defterdār al-mamlakāt al-Shāmīyya wa mā masāhā (the defterdār of the province of Damascus and its dependencies.)\(^7\)

The defterdār was given a khāṣṣ.\(^8\) Two holders of this post were renowned for their justice, efficiency and sympathetic treatment of the people, and one of them was praised by more than one poet.\(^9\)

\(^5\) Ibn Tulūn, Mu‘ākāhāt, vol.ii, p.82.
\(^6\) Ibn Tulūn, quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd., fols.35a,b. The first Tabū Defter probably dates from 930/1523. For dates of the available Defters see bibliography.
In Damascus, the defterdar had a deputy, referred to as ketkhuda-i defterdar, who was granted a ziftâmet. The nephew of Khayirbay of Egypt (d.928/1522), Muhammad (Mahmûd?) b. Cânshû b. Yanâl al-Muhammadi held the post before he was promoted to the rank of sanjaqbay. The ketkhuda was assisted by a number of clerks (sing. lâtîb) and they were also given timars.

This office in Damascus included the defterdar-i tîmâri hâ-i Shân, together with his deputy, each of whom was given a ziftâmet. Their function was the complete charge of timars and their distribution.

In 975/1567 the treasuries of Damascus and Aleppo were separated. The reason is not given for this but as the change occurred one year after the death of Sultan Süleyman, greater efficiency may have been the motive. The defterdar of Damascus, in addition to his responsibility to the province of Damascus, was put in charge of the province of Tripoli excluding the revenues from the port of the city (iskele) and the revenue from silk muqâbâra. In 975/1571 Jabala was withdrawn from the defterdar of Damascus and became the responsibility of the defterdar of Aleppo; the arrangement being considered more

beneficial to the treasury because of the proximity of Jabala to Aleppo. 17

No defterdar was ever of local origin. 'Ali b. Murad (d.980/1572),
the first to occupy the post after Damascus became separated, was previously
the defterdar of the timar in Damascus. He built several houses in Damascus
for personal use, repaired some public buildings, led a luxurious life and en-
joyed the eulogy of poets. 18 Two of the defterdars of Damascus were of
Persian origin 19 and towards the beginning of the seventeenth century the
post was entrusted to the former agha of the janissaries in Damascus, Hasan
Shawyazi (d.1027/1617). 20 After retirement, a number of its employees
were counted among the influential notables in Damascus. 21

The defterdar functioned in the province of Damascus in collaboration
with the governor, chief judge and timar holders and received taxes. 22 Taxes
were collected by the employment of paid amins, 23 and subashis, or by farming.
The amins and subashis employed Samaritan assistants because of their knowledge
of Arabic and siyaqat (accountancy). In 973/1565 the Sultan gave orders to dismiss

17. M.D.x, No:40, 23 Muharram, 979, p.29. Jabala is a coastal town to
the south of Latakka; about 183 kilometers from Aleppo and 367
kilometers from Damascus.

57a, 103b, 104a. al-Imawi, Mukhtar, arabe, 4943, fol.21a.
Darwish al-Talawi, Saniht, D.K. No:17822 Z, fols.25a,b. Asad Efendi,
p.194.


Diwan, 4963, No:1257, fol.44b. Darwish Talawi, Saniht, D.K.
No:17822 Z, fols.42a,b. BM. 7587. Rich, fols.141b, BM. 7583, fols.141b
142a. For 'Ali Efendi (d.1018/1609) who died from fear of the governor of
Damascus, see Ghazzi, Lutf, fols.41a,b.

22. M.D.iii, No:789, 12 Jumada 2 967, p.226. M.D.v, No:532, 27 Rabi'i II,
973, p.211. M.D.vii, No:1278, 14 Shawwal, 975, p.974; No:2201,
11 Rabi'i II, 976, p.804; M.D.xiv, No:1447, 6 Dhu' Al Hijja, 976, p.974;
M.D.xiv, No:127, 20 Muharram, 980, p.58; M.D.xxii, No:511, 14 Rabi'i II,
981, p.261.

all Samaritans because it was alleged that they were forgers and oppressed Muslims. A similar order was repeated two years later when the Sultan stressed that they must be dismissed. In 977/1569 the order was repeated more emphatically. It is worth mentioning that in 923/1517 Christians, Europeans, Jews and Samaritans were forbidden to ride a horse or donkey in Damascus or its suburbs or anywhere where there was "an assembly of people" (majāmiʿ al-nās). In 989/1581, both Jews and Christians were forbidden to wear turbans (ṣamāʾ il) and only allowed special headgear (Pl. qafānis).

Every year soldiers were sent to Aleppo from Damascus to help in tax-collection. This force, which sometimes included ṭāt, was reported to have drunk wine. Later they became a menace in the provinces of Aleppo and Damascus. On their own responsibility they extracted whatever additional payments they could collect. Soldiers appear as tax-farmers in Damascus as indicated by the term derf uhdat (in charge of). Even judges were not averse to personal farming of nazarī. Many of these nazarī were farmed by local chieftains.

27. M. D. ix, No: 127, 3 Shawwal, 977, p. 47.
29. Ibn Ayyūb, Tadhkirat, Ms. Zahiriyya, No: 7814, fol. 82b.
or the tax was collected by the population of a village; and sometimes by Turkomans.

II. Types of Land and Methods of Assessment

During this period land in Damascus fell into three categories. All land which had been entrusted to any Mamluks passed to the Ottoman Sultans and became state domain (sultanī) and part of it was given as timars. There was also privately owned land (mulk) and that which comprised waqf. The last came under two headings: waqf for public purposes (khayrī) and private hereditary waqf (dhurri). All waqf land other than that of Mecca, Madina, Jerusalem, Hebron, the Umayyad Mosque, the buildings of Sultans Selim and Süleyman in Damascus and those of Lala Mustafa, governor of Damascus, were subject to 'ushr tax, 'avārīz-i divāniyya and iklāli-i 'Orfiyya.

Sultanī land, which included granted timars, was entrusted to the local population for cultivation. In return, they surrendered part of the produce. The proportion was assessed either by dimus or muqasama. The former term, of Grecian origin, corresponded to the Mamluk term "fasil" or "mafsul".


34. T.D.263, p.418.

According to al-Nuwayrî (d.732/1332), this method was of Frankish origin dating from Crusaders' times; the share was a fixed amount either in cash or in kind. The Arabic term *muqata'ā* appearing in the Tapu Defters is equivalent to *dimūs*. This applied to arable land and also to land planted with fruit trees. Normally *dimūs* was collected in two portions every year. The first at the time of threshing (*harnān vaktinde*). The other at the time of grape ripening (*pekmez*). Olives were also assessed, when fully ripe, and silk when ready for processing. The date of collection varied according to districts, but in all cases was carefully recorded.

The method of *muqāsama* was also applied to revenues from Sultanī land, and the due share was specified before it was collected from each village or *mazra'a*. Shares varied from one village to another, according to the vertility of the land and its form of irrigation. The Sultan's share was a portion of 1/2, 1/3, 1/4 or 1/5 etc. of the total produce. The amount due is stated in terms of *ghirāra* specified in kind and value. In Sultan Sulaymān's time the usual equivalent price of a *ghirāra* of wheat was static (80 akches) although it varied slightly from one place to another. During the reign of Sultan Selīm II the price was raised to 140 akches.

---


38. *T. D.*, 275, pp. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7; *T. D.*, 263, pp. 239, 240, 244, 245, 259; 243, p. 131, 132, 133; 245, p. 252, 336, 405, passim. The *ghirāra* was the standard measure which in Damascus was "a little more than 250 litres". In addition the *kayl* was used. This in Damascus was 1/12 of the Damascus *ghirāra*. The *malûk* was also used and this equalled $\frac{2}{3} - 2\frac{1}{2}$ *ghirāra*. See Ziadeh, N., *Urban Life*, p. 142. Lewis, B., *Notes and documents*, p. 17.
III. Taxes on Crops, Fruit Trees, Wood and Herbs

There were both šatawī (winter) and ṣayfī (summer) crops. Winter crops were sown in autumn and comprised wheat, barley, chick peas, lentils, meadow vetch, etc. Summer crops, which were sown towards the end of the winter season, included sorghum, millet, sesame, rice, safflower, cotton, hemp etc. The revenue from winter crops are generally specified both in kind and in cash, but those of summer are not always so clearly defined. Often a single covering amount is given which is referred to as māl-i ṣayfī or māluṭ-u ṣayfī.

Ottomans levied taxes on fruit trees by their numbers and these are officially referred to as kharāj. Taxes due on vines varied according to the area. Tradition decreed that the revenue from 100 off-shoots of vine (chabūgha) was 10 akches, but in some places 100 produced only nine akches, while in more fertile places the collection was 20 akches. Olive trees in the province were of two types: Rūmānī (i.e. infidel) and "Islamic". Half of the produce of the Rūmānī olives was claimed as kharāj, while from every two "Islamic" olive trees only

40. T.D. 275, pp.2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11.
43. T.D. 430, p.405.
44. T.D. 430, p.163; in some places every 100 yielded 18 akches, while in others five. T.D. 430, p.164; T.D. 401, p.115. Cf. Abū Yusuf; he states that vines planted nearer a city yielded one dinār on an approximate 1,000; those at a greater distance were charged one dinār for an approximate 2,000. Kitāb al-Kharāj, p.41.
one akche was levied as kharāj. In some places the records show that every three olive trees were taxed merely one akche. Each fully grown walnut tree was taxed two akches, while underdeveloped trees (küchük) merely by one. Concerning mulberry trees, every four trees yielded the value of one akche while on all other fruit trees a tax of one akche was taken for every five trees.

Wood from uncultivated trees such as poplar and willow together with acorns was subject to 'ushr. The tax on pastures (sing. marāṭa, otlak) was referred to either as resm-i otlak, resm-i marāṭa, or hāqq-i marāṭa. The basis of the assessment of this tax is not specified. It seems that the Mamlūk practice, as described by al-Nuwayrī persisted. It was collected according to the number

---

46. T.D.430, p.228.
47. T.D.263, p.3; T.D.474, p.11.
49. T.D.263, p.3; T.D.474, p.11. In some places every three fig trees, in others every hundred, returned nine akches. T.D.430, pp.228, 405.
50. T.D.423, p.7; T.D.263, p.300. An amount of 35,000 akches was collected for the 'ushr on the sale of poplar and willow trees in Damascus, Ghawţa, Warā, Wādī Barādā and Zabadānī. For description of poplar trees in Damascus see Badrī, Nuzhat, p.254.
of cattle grazed on that particular pasture.  

Qali and ashan herbs were valuable assets. All the produce from these herbs, which grow wild in the nāhiyās of Kārik, Jubbat, al-Aṣṣal and Qalamūn, were collected, burned and the ashes carried to Damascus to be sold to the mīrī. These were used by soap-makers, painters (rasāmin), bleachers and dyers. Rent of the land on which these herbs grew was valued at eight akches for each qintār and a similar additional sum was charged for transport to the city.  

In order to guarantee regular supplies the qanūnnāme of Damascus stipulated that a minimum fixed quantity must be produced from six villages in the province which must be brought to Dār al-Tuʿṣma. One third was allocated for sale to


54. T.D.263, pp.6-7. The most used weights in Damascus were the rajl which equalled 1,911.6 grams and the qintār equivalent to 100 rajls. See Popper, Egypt and Syria, vol.ii, p.40; Zaydah, N., Urban Life, pp.141-4; Lewis, B., Notes and documents, pp.16-7.  

55. The village of Dumayr was to supply a minimum of 1,000 qintār and a maximum of 2,000 in the same proportion as land rent and transport rates. The village of Jurūd was charged a minimum of 500 qintār and 1,200 akches returned as land rent; while the village of Ruhayba was to supply 500 qintār and in return to collect 1,000 akches as land rent. The village of Muʿazzamiyya was to provide 500 qintār and to be paid 1,200 akches as land rent. From the village of Qūṭayfa 600 qintār was demanded and it received 1,200 akches as land rent; while the village of Muʾayṣara was to send 1,000 qintār to be reimbursed with 1,200 akches as land rent. T.D.263, pp.6-7, 227. T.D.474, p.16; T.D.423, p.11; T.D.401, p.85. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.224.  

the European (Irānī) merchants, one third for various industries as previously mentioned, and a third was retained for the mirrī. Its sale was banned outside Dar al-Tūma and any quantity sold otherwise was liable to confiscation.57

IV. Taxes on Minerals and Snow

Minerals were another source of Revenue. Salt from the lakes (sing. mamlaha) near Hayjāniyya, Jurd, Bayrūt and Sidon, and the one near the Nahr al-Kalb, was taxed at an annual fixed rate on the basis of the muqājāt system.58 A mine of iron (ahon) together with its three furnaces (sing. ocak) near Bayt Shabāb in the Lebanon yielded a specified annual revenue.59 Sulphur produced by the hot mineral water of al-Ḥimma, part of the Nahiya of Banū Kināna, yielded an annual 3,200 akches.60

Snow from the province of Damascus was considered a state monopoly. The inhabitants of the village of Manāin organized themselves into four teams for its collection and transport. It was stored in Khān al-Thalj which belonged to the state. Its transport was paid for by the beverage sellers who were charged 20 akches.

---


59. According to T.D.430, the amount was 3,756 akches which according to T.D.383 increased to 5,000 akches. See also Gālqāshandī, where he refers to a mountain near Bayrūt containing iron, Subḥ, vol.iv, p.111.

60. T.D.169, p.224.
for each qinjar. In addition they bought the snow from the state storehouse for a sum of 32 akches. A tip of 3 akches was distributed to the head of each of the four teams; and for the clerk acting for the team there was a tip of four akches; both of these sums being paid from government sources. The revenues accruing from the sale of snow were collected on the basis of farming.

V. Taxes on Animals

Animals formed another source of revenue. The owner of two sheep or goats was taxed one akche. The young animals became taxable when they joined the herds. When flocks or herds required shelter in caves or grottoes, taxes were taken in the form of one sheep or goat or its value from every 100 heads. This was referred to as resm-i kishlak or mahsul-i maghara.

Milch buffaloes (sa$il ur jamus) yielded a tax of six akches per head. Fish from the lake of Utayba in the Nahiya of al-Marj or the Nahiya of Jawlān al-Gharbī were also taxable and the tax was referred to as mahṣul-i saydī samak.

All fish or birds so hunted were brought to Dukkan al-Tayr in Damascus to be sold. The taxes were farmed. Even bee hives did not escape taxation, each being

61. T.D.263, p.6; T.D.474, p.15. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.223. Bachrī mentioned that snow of Mannīn remained through the year. It was brought to a special store in Damascus, and from there carried to Cairo, Nuzhat, p.347. See also, al-Gāsimī, Qāmus, vol.1, p.72. For the amount accrued see appendix No.2.


65. T.D.263, pp.6, 237; T.D.474, pp.16, 247. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.223; T.D.423, pp.12, 89. For revenues from Dukkan al-Tayr see appendix No.2. For taxes on fisheries under the Mamlūk, see Rabie, The Financial System, pp.170-2. For this shop in Damascus under the Mamlūks, see Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī, Nuzhat al-rifaq, p.27.
liable for one akche. Chickens, rabbits, camels, donkeys, horses, and mules, appear to have been exempt.

VI. Taxes on Imports and Exports

Imports and exports from Damascus were taxable; spices, materials or other merchandise brought by pilgrims were subject to tax. Every camel-load (sing. himl, quantity unspecified), of material or spices paid the traditional tax of seven and a half gold pieces. This half piece was referred to under Mamlük rule as mubāshirīyya, and also was farmed. If the caravan followed the Gaza route the tax was collected in Khān Yūnus, or at al-Kiswa if it followed the traditional route. Any load disposed of to a European (Iranjī) merchant cost the owner 10% while the buyer was charged an additional 9% as treasury tax. A Muslim buyer was exempt, but a European merchant paid an additional 2% for storage in Damascus; and also 7½ akches when each load was transferred to Bayrūt.

On imports from Europe such as cloth (chūqa), satin (atlas), damask (kamkha), coral (murjān), kali (qalī), copper, an estimated 3% of the value was taxed on the basis of mūqāfātā; articles (khurdawāt) such as glass, thread, linen, paper, etc. at four akches per load, and almonds from Europe 10 akches a chuwāl (bushel).

On exporting raisins of Dirbīl to Europe each box (kutu) was taxed 12 akches.

---

68. T.D.263, p.4; T.D.474, p.12. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.221. For the total amount of revenue see appendix No:2.
70. T.D.263, p.4; T.D.474, p.12. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.221. This tax in the qanunnamā is described as haqq-jaibli (۱) most likely it is haqq-i jaibli.
VII. Taxes Levied in Damascus

A. The Dillāliyya Tax (Auction)\(^72\)

Licensed auctioneers\(^73\) (sing. dālāl) were allowed to collect a tax when commodities changed hands. From this they paid the treasury an amount calculated on the basis of farming. Goods from Mecca, such as ginger (zanjābīl), indigo (nīl) and gum (lāk), were assessed at five akches in every thousand and the tax was collected from both the buyer and the seller. The amount paid by each is not specified and it appears it was left to mutual arrangement. From imports of European materials and articles of adornment, 2\% was deducted.

Imported clothes, kali, copper and other similar merchandise, yielded a tax of 7/10\%. Two thirds of this tax referred to as dillāliyya juwwāniyya was the perquisite of the treasury and one third was the auctioneer’s fee. All these levies were farmed.\(^74\) Yet another auction tax, collected in Sūq al-Buzūriyya was referred to as dillāliyya barrāniyya and comprised every article sold. Five per cent of its value was collected, whether from the buyer or the seller is not specified.\(^75\)

\(^{72}\) For this tax under the Mamluks see Rabie, The Financial System, pp.200-1. For the general history of this tax see Becker, C.H. "Dallāl", i.1.2, vol.II, pp.102-3.

\(^{73}\) M.D.xv, No:36, 18 Muḥarram, 979, p.4.

\(^{74}\) T.D.263, pp.4-5; T.D.474, pp.12-13. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.222. For the revenue from this tax see appendix No: 2.

B. Qabbān Tax (Weighing Tax). 76

This tax was taken on each himl (load). The quantity comprised is not specified but appears to have been assessed by its size. A load of dibs (grape-syrup), lemons, salt, vinegar, colocasia 77 or Nashgharāni oil was taxed at three akčes; rice, cheese, curdled milk (qunburis), 78 chestnuts, at four akčes; cheese produced by Christians was charged at four akčes and the surrender of three blocks (qawālib) of the commodity. Similarly, dates were rated at four akčes, in addition to half a ātal. On a mule load of lemons the vendor paid five akčes, while a mule load of pomegranates, 79 jujube, ʿAjīnī oil, colocasia, was charged at six akčes. Maʿarrī figs 80 yielded six akčes in addition to one ātal, while cucumbers grown outside Damascus were taxed seven akčes. Dates from Iraq returned eight akčes and two ātals of the produce. Truffles (kama) were taxed eight akčes for a complete, and four akčes for a part, load. For each tin (vulba) of yogurt from the southern environs, ½ an akche was collected, while on those from Homs or Tripoli, one akche was collected. Two akches sufficed for tax on a skin (zarf) of carab syrup, 2½ were extracted from fat (yaq), pistachios, hazelnuts, and pine kernels. 81

76. For the origin of the term, see Lewis, B., Notes and documents, pp.20, 41n., 40.

77. For colocasia in Damascus, see Badrī, Nuzhat, pp.352-3.

78. It was exported to Egypt. Badrī, Nuzhat, p.364. Barlabakk was known for its qunburis. Ibn Tulūn, Qalā′āt, vol.ii, p.377.

79. For types of pomegranates in Damascus, see Badrī, Nuzhat, p.214.

80. For types of fig in Damascus, see Badrī, Nuzhat, p.261.

C. 'Awa'id Dār al-Battīkh (Levies in the Fruit Market)

Here again taxes were levied on the basis of load. For each load of apricots, summer apples, peaches, summer pears, early season figs (dayfur), of pomegranates, melons (shummām), early melons or grapes coming from the city itself, two akches were collected. Each load of winter apples or grapes from outlying districts, three akches were charged. Cherries, peaches, fresh pistachios or fresh hazelnuts or dried apricots yielded four akches. The levy on a basket of almonds or one thousand walnuts was one akche. In the same market ½ an akche was levied on each basket (zenbīl) of roses or orange blossoms.83

D. 'Awa'id Dār al-Khūdar (Levies in the Vegetable Market)

These were mainly assessed by the bushel (chuwal - quantity unspecified).

A bushel of onions, aubergines, kidney beans (lūbyaq) or cauliflower represented a one akche tax in addition to one rāṭi extracted as a tuʿma (gift). A bushel of cucumber (tājur) was taxed two akches; while a load of sour pomegranates or sour grapes yielded one akche. Each vendor of carrots or asparagus paid one akche every Friday.85


84. Badrī, Nuzhat, p.63.

85. T.D. 263, pp.5-6; T.D. 474, p.14. Barkan, Kanunlar, p.223. For the value of the muqātā see appendix No.2. Taxes were taken from grapes bought for juice. Ibn Tulun wrote a book entitled: Tahdhīf al-mughaffalin min bayāt al-šāb wa ṣir ilā khamsṭārum, which indicates that some of the grapes were bought for manufacture of wine, Fulk, p.32.
E. ‘Awwâ’īd Sūq al-Khayl (Levies in the Horse Market)

There was a special market in Damascus for horses close to the citadel.86

When a horse was sold, six akches were demanded, three from the vendor and three from the buyer. A tax of 18 akches was required from the sale of a camel, while from buffaloes, eight akches, and from donkeys four akches were demanded, the payment being equally shared by the vendor and the buyer.87 There was a special market for the sale of sheep and 2½ akches were claimed for each from the seller.88

F. Other Taxes

Slaves also were sold in a separate market.89 When a slave was sold, whether male or female, white or black, an amount of thirty akches was demanded from the seller in accordance with established tradition.90

88. T.D. 263, p. 6; T.D. 474, p. 15. Barkan, Kanunlar, p. 223. For this tax under the Mamluks see Rabie, The Financial System, p. 196. In 984/1576 the poet Darwish b. Tul travelled to Istanbul where he composed a poem addressed to the chief judge of the city requesting his good offices to assist him to procure the post of Dār al-Ghanam in Damascus, Sāhilat, D.K. No: 1622 Z, fols. 50a, b. BM. 7583, Rich, fols. 54a, b; in this copy the date is 985/1577. For the number of mosques in this market, see Nu‘aynī, Daiat, vol. II, pp. 338, 341, 420.
No marketing of cereals was allowed other than in Suq al-Ghal'ja. Five akches were collected from the seller on each ghirra.  

The tax of four akches on a qatl of silk was shared equally by the vendor and buyer. In Damascus the tax was farmed.

The area of land irrigated by canals formed the basis of the amount land-owners paid towards maintenance of such waterways in continuance of the old practice. Any resulting surplus was claimed by the treasury. This payment was also farmed.

Every shop-keeper was taxed. The defters show collection from dyes, candles (ṣirāj khāna), reed mats, crucibles, the mint, PTION ASAMAWYAA (refreshing drink made from raisins and snow), presses, grinding mills, smiths, in fact nothing was too insignificant to escape taxation.

Public drinking houses (sing. ILLSAMARA), Bayt al-Hashish and gambling saloons paid taxes. Public offences and crimes, marriages and indeed most personal occasions were taxed, and the revenues are referred to as bad-i hayyi wah resm-i har-un wa jirm wa jinayat. In this connection, if a Muslim died without an

---


95. Concerning amount resulting see appendix No. 2.
heir, his estate was forfeit to the treasury. Unclaimed animals and runaway
slaves became state property. Further there was a general tax for policing the
country referred to as resm-i 'assiyya. 96

Arab, Turkoman, Kurdish tribes and gypsies paid a fixed annual tax,
referred to as 'ādāf. 97 Christians and Jews paid a poll-tax (jizya) of 80
akches per household which went to Bayt al-māl (a separate department in the
treasury). In 977/1569 it was raised to 85 akches for Christians and to 90 for
Jews. 96 It is not clear whether priests and rabbis were subject to this tax in
Damascus because there is no special reference made for them in the defters. It
appears to have been a standardized amount levied on rich and poor alike. There
is no information recorded of any additional tax paid by Christians or Jews as
service-money (marāqīsh) for those who collected the poll-tax. 99

VIII. İhtisāb in Damascus:

Available Mamlūk sources do not qualify in detail the nature of Sultan
Qā'itbāy's code concerning ihtisāb. Scattered references show that the:

96. For these taxes see appendix No:2, Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, vol.viii, p.282.
97. See appendix No:2.
the beginning of the century the poll tax was collected as a lump sum, see
T.D.430, pp.20, 42, 88, 100, 169, 551. See also, Lewis, B., Notes and
office under the Ottomans, see Lewis, B., "Bayt al-māl", E.I.2, vol.i,
pp.1147-8. For general outline of the history of jizya see Cahen, Cl.,
99. Such marāqīsh was paid under the Mamlûks in Egypt, see Rabie, The Financial
muhtasib (market-inspector) obtained a monthly collection from each craft (ṣinā'a) referred to as mushāhara which was abolished in 909/1503. It appears that the exemption was of short duration, because in 918/1512 it was again abolished. It was also mentioned that the muhtasib occasionally used to levy payment on salaries and on the inhabitants of al-ḥārāt. It appears, therefore, that ihtisāb was a tax levied on craftsmen. The qānūnname of Damascus did not stipulate the basis of ihtisāb nor the areas subject to this tax. It merely states that the code (qānūn) of Sultan Giārībāy should be retained. The method of assessment and the amount levied on each is not provided although the total figure is supplied.

When the first Ottoman chief judge assumed his duties in Damascus, in 922/1516, he also assumed that of the muhtasib. Later, when Damascus was entrusted to Janbirī al-Ghazālī he restored the latter as a separate office and farmed it. After his rebellion had been quelled there is no further reference extant concerning the separate continuance of this office. Market inspection appears to have been combined with the office of the chief judge, while the collection of ihtisāb was the province of the defterdār. This, also, may explain the fact that biographical dictionaries do not contain a biography of any muhtasib in Damascus.

---

Damascenos were ordered to slaughter their animals in the places provided for this purpose and according to the records shown in Damascus, 872/1567, a tax of two dirhams per animal was imposed, together with one-quarter dirham for the official who stamped the meat. A temporary abolition of this tax and a subsequent reimposition of it occurred. In 875/1567, an additional slaughter-house was erected by order of the Sultan, which in 878/1570 was reported to him as being used for other purposes, such as dyeing and the sale of wax. The slaughter of animals was privately performed and the treasury suffered in consequence. He ordered the immediate evacuation of both trades, the restoration of the slaughter-house to its original use and the reimposition of the tax.

From records of muqāta‘at, Jews paid a separate tax for this service as a collective sum referred to as nahirat al-Yahūd. This shows that their animals were not sent to the slaughter-house.

Nothing is available in this respect concerning Christians in Damascus which may be explained on the basis either that they were not allowed to slaughter animals or else their animals were sent to the slaughter-house.

---


105. Concerning variations in reading of this word "nahīrat" or "nahirat", see Lewis, B., Notes and documents, pp. 12-13, 37, n. 16. Concerning this tax in Aleppo, see Ibn al-Shihna, al-Durr al-muntakhab, p. 148.
During the period under consideration, the province of Damascus did not constitute one tariff zone. Several octrois were distributed throughout the territory and at these places taxes, referred to as bāj-i qhafara, were collected. These were collected on the basis of a load and the general assessment for the camel load was two akches; a horse or mule load one, while a donkey load was charged half an akche. In most octrois the nature of the merchandise was not specified, but in a few octrois the amount of duty is recorded as varying according to the nature of the merchandise. At a station near Nahr al-Kalb, a camel load of silk from Aleppo or its surroundings paid ten akches. For merchandise transported from Bayrut to Tripoli or to its surroundings a camel load of cloth (chūqa) was taxed 10 akches; for a horse or mule load the tax was four akches. Near Baʿlabak: a camel load of spices was levied at eight akches. In Sarsa, al-Gunayzra, for each camel load the tax was four akches; for horse or mule loads two akches and for a donkey load one akche.

For a slave of whatever sex or colour, 10 akches was paid, but no tax was required on Habash slaves. At the same time, a flock of sheep or goats numbering 100, passing through any octroi to be sold in Damascus, one sheep or its value was demanded as bāj.  


107. For locations see map attached; for amount accrued see appendix No:3. Arabic literature dealing with slave-traffic differentiates between Zanj, Ḥabash, ḑūṣā, and Bajawī, but does not indicate the basis of the difference. The question arises as to whether this was on racial or geographical grounds. Ethiopians, though dark skinned, are of semitic origin. al-Najāṣī, King of Ethiopia, was reputed for his tolerant treatment of those Muslims who migrated to his kingdom during the time of the Prophet, which probably accounts for the more considerate treatment given to Ḥabash slaves. See al-Malikī b. al-Ḥasan b. Buṭān (d.444/1052), Risāla fī Ǧīhād al-raqiqa wa taqīfa al-ṣabīl, (edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Hārūn, Nawadir al-Makhtūṭāt, Collection iv, Cairo, 1952), pp.374-6. See also Muhammad =
A European Christian merchant was assessed at 10 akches, while a Georgian Christian paid one piece of gold at each octroi en route. In Sa'sa Christian merchants were taxed 18 akches, while Jews were taxed at five akches at all stations except Sa'sa, where they were charged six akches. 108

X. Port Customs

Taxes were also levied on imports and exports through the ports of Bayrut, Sidon, Tyre, Acre and Jaffa. This tax is referred to as mūjib-i bab-i mina' (port customs). A review of the code of taxation for these ports shows that Damascus imported velvet cloth, leather, skins, coral, amber, saffron, crystal, wine, paper, copper, sugar, honey, almonds, hazelnuts, and rice. It exported perfumes, wool, silk, raisins, cotton, thread, soda, and kāli. 109

XI. Taxes Abolished

In 955/1540 many taxes were abolished after a land survey was completed. These included the old tax of dawra, 110 originally for supply in kind of provisions for the governor and any of his subordinates on their tour of the country. Later this deteriorated into a money tax with its original reason forgotten. In addition, himāya 111 (which was protection money); resm-i hadid (reaping tax); rajādiyya (to carry the crops to the threshing place); and futūb baydar (permission


110. Money collected for this tax was referred to by Ibn Tūlūn as dirham dawra, I'ilām, p.58.

111. For the origin and history of this tax see Cahen, Cl., "Himāya", É.L.2, vol.iii, p.394.
to commence threshing) were abolished in the countryside, the reason given being that they were a bad innovation (bid'at-i sayy'a). In the city itself taxes collected on tarāṣin (porters) and from the Bath of Hammām al-Ward and on a number of grinding mills and presses were abolished because they had been imposed by the wife of the last Mamlūk governor of Damascus, Sibāy. In 977/1569, the muqāṭa' of khamr, which yielded in excess of 300,000 akches annually was lifted. Christians were, however, allowed to import wine provided they paid the equivalent of 40,000 akches annually and they were not permitted to resell to any Muslim. The abolition of the wine-tax was an act of benevolence commemorating the accession of Sultan Selim II.

Revenues due from the province of Damascus were yearly collected and received in Istanbul by Nairuz (originally the commencement of the Persian year and after adopted by Muslims as the commencement of the fiscal year). Those from silk were collected seasonally. Revenues from the province almost

---

113. For this Bath see Nūṣaymī, al-Dāris, vol.ii, pp.64, 273-4; and see also M. Kayyāl, al-Hammāmat al-Dimashqiyya wa taqāliduhā, (Damascus, 1964), pp.63-65.
doubled in less than half a century as the following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.D. No.</th>
<th>Total/akches</th>
<th>Sultan's share</th>
<th>Governor's allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169 (c. 930/1523)</td>
<td>8,493,284</td>
<td>5,216,208</td>
<td>1,002,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 (955/1548)</td>
<td>13,663,396</td>
<td>10,354,909</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474 (976/1568)</td>
<td>15,804,300</td>
<td>11,024,300</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER VI

Indigenous Power-Groups and their Relationship with the Ottomans
I. Ottoman Relationship with Power-Groups in the Countryside

A. The Ikmids

The first Ottoman reference to this Druze family in 937/1530 names a certain amir Yunus a tax-farmer of three mazra'as (farms) yielding 4,200 akches annually and it is probable that he was the head of the family.

Two campaigns were waged against them; one in 929/1522 and the other in 930/1523 each led by the governor of Damascus Khurram Pasha. He had previously been governor of Tripoli and he might have realized that his predecessor had no authority over the local Druze, particularly after the rebellion of Janbirdi al-Ghazali in 927/1521. He lost no time in asserting his authority and after his first successful campaign he burnt 43 villages, sent four loads of heads to Damascus and returned in triumph bringing with him many of their books which were antagonistic to Sunnis and Nuṣayris.

The Damascenes rejoiced at the victory and many poems were composed in honour of the new ruler.

---


The Druze reacted by killing the Subāshi appointed by the governor to which he retaliated by burning another 30 villages, capturing about 300 women and children and sending three loads of heads to Damascus. In addition, he confiscated most of the Druze's livestock. All this received the support of the 'ulama' of Damascus who considered the measure to be an act of duty. The poet Muhammad b. Māmā al-Rūmī (d. 987/1579) portrays an expedition led by the governor of Damascus against the Druze. Although no date is given, the Druze leader is spoken of as Yūnus which may well be the Yūnus referred to as rich, generous and brave. The expedition was instigated by the judge of Sidon whose complaints reached Istanbul via merchants and notables visiting there. Yūnus was taken prisoner and hanged.

Newly introduced long-range muskets were used by the Druze of Ayn Dārā in 973/1565. They attacked the Sipāḥī who was in charge of tax-collection. A fight ensued and there were many casualties on both sides. The range of the new weapons prevented the Ottomans from close combat and gave the advantage to the Druze. Instructions came from the Sultan that the disturbances must be quelled at all costs.

During 967/1559, fleeing rebels sheltered with the chieftains (sing.).


4. Ibn Māmā, Dīwān, fol. 130a, b.

5. M.D. v. No: 198, 5 Safar, 973, p. 85; No: 217, 12 Safar, 973, p. 54; No: 565, 28 Rabi'al 11, 973, p. 222. Firearms became widespread in Anatolia after the rebellion of Prince Bayezid in 967/1559 who armed his peasant supporters with tüfenks. It is possible that some of these arms reached Syria. In addition, European ships which visited the Syrian coastal ports for trade were reported to have sold arms to local people. More than that, some zar'īma sold arms to the ra'iyya. See Heyd, Ottoman documents,
Six years later, when Sharaf al-Dīn, a muqaddam, fell into the power of the governor, one thousand of his followers rose against the authority. The Sultan commanded that Sharaf al-Dīn should be executed and all his followers completely disarmed. When in 975/1564 the Sultan was again petitioned to confiscate Druze firearms, the governor and the judges of Bayrūt and Sidon were instructed to deposit them in the citadel of Damascus.

The next year the Sultan was informed that firearms were being manufactured in the neighbourhood of Sidon. The bearing of such weapons, except by janissaries or other authorized persons, was strictly forbidden. So rigorous was the treatment of the Druze that they petitioned the Sultan for clemency. The governor was instructed to send a mild reply, gain their confidence, and use it as a strategy to destroy them.

Because the military force of Damascus was employed in the empire's wars, chaos became rife in the countryside. The ancient enmity between Qaysīs and Yamānis revived and rival corps of the remaining Damascene force

---

sought to ally themselves with one or other of these factions. Qaysi
were chiefly Druze, and the Yamani, Sunnis. In 978/1570 three Yamani
were killed during a clash and the Qaysi fortified themselves in the village of
Kafar Silwān. In spite of a punitive force sent against them by which 33
of their number were killed, those remaining were able to cause havoc by
looting surrounding villages. The depleted force of the governor and the dif­
ficult terrain, together with the longer range guns of the Qaysi made it
impossible to dislodge them. The Sultan, therefore, ordered a combined attack
by the governors of Damascus, Homs and Hama. In 982/1574, a joint force
from Damascus and Tripoli succeeded in dispersing them and pursued them to the
mountains where they again defied capture and a reinforcement to the Ottomans
was despatched by sea.

Damascenes were divided into two factions: Qaysi and Yamani. The
inhabitants of Sālṭiya, Bāb al-Jabiya, Shāghūr, Shaykh Rasān, Gubayba, and Makṣid al-Qasab were Qaysi. The inhabitants of
Mazābil, Haydān al-Ḥaṣa and al-Suwayda' al-Mahruqa were Yamani.
The muqaddam of Nablus, Hasan b. Iṣmāʾīl, the Jayusi family in
Palestine, the Harfūshis of Bās labak, the Tayānm in Wādi al-Taym and
the muqaddams of Mārj and Zabādānī were Yamani. Clashes between these
two factions were frequent. See Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufakkahat, vol. i, pp.121,
183, 185, 190-1, 196, 200; vol. ii, p.165. Lapidus, Muslim Cities,
pp.80-81. For the history of the relationship between Qaysi and Yamani
in Palestine in the first half of the 19th century, see MacAlister, Stewart,
"Wars of Yamani and Kais in the Southern Half of Palestine", Palæstine
Exploration Fund (London, 1906), pp.33-52. See also Haddad, S.N.,
"Political Parties in Syria and Palestine (Qaṣi and Yemeni)", Journal of
Palestine Oriental Society, vol. i (Jerusalem, 1921), pp.205-8. See
also Shāykh Naṣif al-Yazīfī (d.1871) who portrays this enmity in his
Ṭīḥāmīyā al-Qasā, Majma' al-bahrāyīn (Bayrut, 1924), p.343. By
the end of the 17th century the Qaṣi-Yamani rift began to die out
in the Lebanese Mountain. Two political factions came into existence
known as Janbulotis and Yazbakis. The people began to divide along these
two lines. For an assessment of the relationship between them see Folk, W.,
The Opening of South Lebanon 1788-1840 (Cambridge, Massachusetts,

Even the augmented force appears to have been inadequate for, in the following year, the governor of Damascus was urged to disarm the Druze and send their muskets to Istanbul. They appear, however, to have continued their defiance and refusal to pay taxes in spite of amins sent to them; and the governor was urged to capture their chiefs and punish them. There are, however, no records extant concerning the implementation of this command.

In 992/1584, the Druze received their most severe blow. Tribute from Egypt en route for Istanbul was robbed in the vicinity of the Bay of 'Akkār. Ibrahim Pasha, the former governor of Egypt, was also on his way to Istanbul. He led the Ottomans against the Sunnite chieftain Yusuf Sayfā (d. 1034/1624) who fled at his approach. Ibrahim Pasha devastated the countryside of 'Akkār and was incited by Mansūr b. Furayḥ to attack the Druze who were accused of the robbery. Ibrahim Pasha, together with local chieftains, killed some 500 Druze elders after closing the roads to the area. Ghurmas b. Ma'īn the Druze leader refused to meet Ibrahim Pasha and met his death in a cave. Ibrahim Pasha's forces devastated many Shuf villages and, more important still, the Druze were disarmed. Burūnī (d. 1024/1615) says that thousands of muskets were confiscated.

Six years later, Fakhr al-Dīn II, son of the deceased Ghurmas, assumed leadership of the Shuf. He took immediate steps to build a standing army from among outlawed Sukbān. By generous gifts he placated officials.


in order to use them to eliminate his enemies and avenge his father. He cunningly induced the governor of Damascus, Murad Pasha, in 1002-3/1593-4, to get rid of the Sunni Furaykh family. He welcomed the suggestion of the governor of Damascus when, in 1007/1598, he was asked to fight the Sunni Chieftain of Akkar, Yusuf Sayfū. Fakhr al-Dīn defeated him near Nahr al-Kalb. This began a series of raids and battles and caused many casualties and the destruction of land and villages belonging to both combatants.

Fakhr al-Dīn pursued his intention of destroying Yusuf Sayfū. An opportunity occurred in 1014/1605 when ‘Ali Jānbulāt rebelled in Aleppo against the Ottomans. ‘Ali belonged to a well known Kurdish family, members of which were entrusted with various administrative posts in the regions of Killis and ‘Azāz. Husayn, ‘Ali’s uncle, was appointed as governor of Aleppo in 1014/1605. In that year, he failed to aid the Grand Vizier Sinan Çagālzāde in his expedition against Persia; and Sinan ordered Husayn’s death. ‘Ali, who at the time was acting on behalf of his uncle in Aleppo, declared a rebellion against the Sultan. The Ottomans, then, were engaged in a war with Austria and for this reason the Sultan acquiesced to Yusuf Sayfū’s request to be commissioned to lead the army of Damascus and quell ‘Ali’s rebellion. In the following year, the army of ‘Ali and the military forces of Damascus supported by forces from Hama and Tripoli met near Hama. In a short encounter ‘Ali’s forces routed the combined forces under Yusuf Sayfū, who was forced to flee. After this victory, ‘Ali asked Fakhr al-Dīn to join him in pursuit

16. For the biography of Murad Pasha, see Lutf, fols. 46b-47a.
of Yusuf Sayfa. At the same time, a leader of one of the two Janissary factions in Damascus, Kīwān b. 'Abdullah (d. 1033/1623), in order to destroy his opponents in Damascus, induced Fakhr al-Dīn to join Ali Janbulat. Fakhr al-Dīn, tempted by this offer, led his forces, together with the forces of the Ḥārūshis of Ba*labakk and the Shihābis of Wādī al-Taym, to join Ali Janbulat in his march against Damascus. In 1015/1605, the Damascene army was defeated and many quarters of Damascus were brutally looted. When Ali heard that Yusuf Sayfa had escaped from Damascus, he accepted 125,000 piastres in return for withdrawal. Ali received this amount of moneny, and his forces and those of his allies were withdrawn. Fakhr al-Dīn as a result of his alliance with Ali Janbulat, was classified as a Jalālī.20

On 23rd October 1596, the battle of Hapova or Keresztes was fought between the Ottomans and Austria. Çağāl Sinān Pāsha, the Grand Vizier, announced that all Sukbān who had not fought were outlawed.21 This affected about 30,333 men who subsequently became a menace in Anatolia and Syria. They joined the rebels, described as Jalālīs, who had already caused havoc in Anatolia. When, in 1606, the treaty of Sitvatorok was ratified between the opponents, the Ottomans were free to deal with the various rebellions. In the following year, the Grand Vizier, Murād Pāsha, was instructed to eliminate the Jalālīs, Ali b. Janbulat and the outlawed Sukbān.22 Fakhr al-Dīn


sent 300,000 piastres together with his nine year old son, ‘Ali, as a gift to Murad Pasha who had previously governed Damascus and was sympathetic towards the Mamluks. Fakhr al-Din declared that he had been compelled to join ‘Ali b. Jambulat, which no doubt counted in his favour when Damascus delegates later that year complained to Murad Pasha concerning both ‘Ali b. Jambulat and Fakhr al-Din. Kiwan was able to use Naqib al-Ashrar, a member of the delegation, to admit that the complaints were incited by the other faction who were the sworn enemies of Fakhr al-Din and Kiwan. The mission failed and the Grand Vizier upheld Kiwan and Fakhr al-Din.24

When Murad Pasha died in 1023/1611, Fakhr al-Din lost a patron, for his successor Nasuh Pasha remembered that in 1012/1603, Fakhr al-Din had been with the Damascene army attacking Aleppo. Nasuh led the Sultan’s armies against Persia and on his return, he received Mustafâ, the Kethkudâ of Fakhr al-Din. He resented not only the relatively small sum of 20,000 piastres but was insulted because a mere official had been sent as messenger and not Fakhr al-Din’s son. When Nasuh arrived in Aleppo he demanded additional cash; and Fakhr al-Din sent fifty thousand piastres to the Sultan, twenty five thousand to Naqib, and gave five thousand to the messenger.25 In Aleppo, Nasuh moreover received Hâfiz Pasha, the governor of Damascus (1618-1623), together with Kanân bîllâh bâshî, one of the leaders of the faction against Kiwan and Fakhr al-Din. In addition he received Farrûlî b. ‘Abdullah (d. 1030/1620) the commander

23. al-Châlidî, Tarikh, pp.5-6.
of the pilgrimage caravan. 27

Together they decided to undermine the authority of Fakhr al-Dīn by removing Ḥamdān b. Qānsūh, a Qaysī local chieftain and a sanjaqbeys of ʿAjlūn and Karak-Shawbak, who was his ally. The two sanjaqs would be entrusted to Farrūkh b. ʿAbdullah to whom money was allocated for his support. Hāfīz Pāsha in addition led a force from Damascus to implement the decision. Ḥamdān, however, realized that he was unable to compete with the strength of the government force, submitted, declaring himself to be the Sultan's slave. 28

He took refuge with Fakhr al-Dīn who clearly realized the gravity of the situation and endeavoured to pacify Ḥamdān and his ally ʿAmr b. Jabr, Shaykh of the Mafārījah tribe, by the information that he had despatched three shiploads of soap to Istanbul hoping that the gift would induce friendship. Kīwān however strongly urged that military assistance should be given to Ḥamdān and forced Fakhr al-Dīn to send a contingent with them to fight the Damascene army. They were the victors at a battle fought at Muzayrīb in 1022/1613, but word reached Istanbul that Damascus was once more at the mercy of Fakhr al-Dīn. 29

When Naṣūḥ Pāsha, the Grand Vizier, learned of conditions in Damascus he sent an auxiliary force to strengthen the army there which marched to battle against Fakhr al-Dīn. Fakhr al-Dīn had provisioned the citadels of Shaqīf and Bānyās with sufficient food, ammunitions and equipment to withstand a five-year siege; but he sent a delegate to Damascus to sue for peace. The terms given were an open invitation to Fakhr al-Dīn to come himself and submit, whereupon, he

decided to fly to safety. He discovered that the highways had been blocked and was forced to remain in Sidon. Kiwan was first to board a ship there and insisted that Fakhr al-Din should follow. At first he hesitated but later succumbed to pressure from Kiwan and joined him in voluntary exile in Tuscany.

Hafiz Pasha led the strong army against the two citadels but was unable to conquer them, although the effort was partially successful. Fakhr al-Din's mother went to Hafiz Pasha with 25,000 piastres and four horses as a gift, but he demanded 300,000 piastres as a price for peace. Although Fakhr al-Din's mother was courteously treated she was kept in custody, and all land entrusted to the Ma' nids including al-Shuf was transferred to the Yamanis.

In the following year Safad, Sidon and Bayrut was made a separate province, probably in order to control the Druze. Fakhr al-Din's Ketkhudā, Mustafā, served under the new governor Hasān Bustānji and gave him details of the district. Under the leadership of Hafiz Pasha the Ottomans launched another campaign against the two citadels and included the forces of local chieftains; some of whom were former allies of the Ma' nids. Although Hafiz Pasha succeeded in destroying part of al-Shuf, he did not reach the citadels. On his way, he received news of the death of Nasūh Pasha who had been succeeded by the Grand Vizier Muhammad Pasha, who was sympathetic to the Ma' nids. Hafiz Pasha, withdrew to Damascus and shortly afterwards he was replaced.

Even with these changes the intention of destroying the Sukban and the

two citadels was not abandoned. Instead, a new strategy was employed. A letter sent to Fakhr al-Dīn invited his return. The Sukbān’s leaders in each citadel were subtly approached and offered reinstatement as sipāhs if they would abandon the citadels to destruction. They concurred but stipulated that the sanjaq of Safad was to be entrusted to amīr Yūnus, Fakhr al-Dīn’s brother, and Bayrūt to amīr ‘Alī, son of Fakhr al-Dīn. These conditions were accepted and the citadels were destroyed. The Mā’īnids had been given no choice but were forced to accept the position. 34

With the return of Fakhr al-Dīn to Acre in 1027/1617, the rivalry between the two military factions under Kīwān and that under Kurd Hamza was revitalized; Kurd Hamza had succeeded Kanān būlākbashi in opposing Fakhr al-Dīn. The governor of Tripoli pledged support to Fakhr al-Dīn if he would attack Yūsuf Sayfā. Yūsuf Sayfā appealed to Kurd Hamza and to the governors of Damascus and Aleppo for assistance. Fakhr al-Dīn was issued with an ultimatum when their armies reached al-Qusayr; he raised the siege and accepted reconciliation with Yūsuf Sayfā. 35

Hamdān b. Qānṣūh and his ally ‘Amr, who had meanwhile been reinstated in Ḍālīn, were again dismissed by the strategy of Kurd Hamza. Again they appealed for help from Fakhr al-Dīn and in 1028/1618, by bribery on his part, in addition to his influence in Istanbul, their status was restored. 36

In 1030/1620, new alliances were made and enmities forgotten. Fakhr al-Dīn, Kīwān and Kurd Hamza formed a triple alliance of mutual assistance. Shortly after, Fakhr al-Dīn was sent by the governor of Damascus to collect taxes from Yusuf Sayfā in Tripoli, an official commission which coincided with his avowed intention to destroy his enemy. Yusuf Sayfā’s influence at court enabled

36. al-Khālidī, Tārīkh, pp.94-7, 98-104.
him to obtain a force sufficiently strong to implement Fakhr al-Dīn's withdrawal and he reluctantly left Tripoli. 37

Fakhr al-Dīn seems to have realized that his difficulties with the Ottomans were augmented by his alliance with the Ghazzawīs for in 1031/1621 he disassociated himself from Ahmad b. Ḥamdūn b. Qānṣūh and Fakhr al-Dīn managed to have the Sanjaq of Ajlūn entrusted to his two year old son, Husayn. 38 Now confident of his loyalty, the Ottomans again despatched him to Tripoli to assist in tax-collection. His loyalty was proved for when approached by its governor to raise a rebellion against the Sultan he replied that the wishes of the Sultan were his law. 39 The triple alliance was short-lived. Yunus Harfūsh, a former ally of Fakhr al-Dīn and governor of Baṣlabakk, caused the split. He approached Kurd Hamza with a conspiracy against Fakhr al-Dīn who retaliated by destroying the property of Yunus in the village of Qubb Ilyās in al-Biqāʿ. Military officials summoned by Muṣṭafā Pāsha, the governor of Damascus met to discuss the situation and old enmities re-emerged. Kiwān and a small minority were alone in favour of Fakhr al-Dīn. They left Muṣṭafā Pāsha, strongly influenced by Kurd Hamza and Yunus Harfūsh who persuaded Muṣṭafā Pāsha to lead an army against Fakhr al-Dīn and Kiwān. To the regular Damascene soldiers were added those of Yusuf Sayfā, Yunus Harfūsh and Ahmad Tarābūy. In 1033/1623, Fakhr al-Dīn defeated them at Anjarr and Muṣṭafā Pāsha was taken prisoner while Kurd Hamza and Yunus Harfūsh fled to Aleppo. Courtesy and consideration were extended to Muṣṭafā Pāsha who admitted that, influenced by Kurd Hamza and Yunus Harfūsh, he had led the fight against his captor. Together they proceeded to Baṣlabakk, the stronghold of Yunus Harfūsh.

and sacked, then demolished its well-fortified citadel. They, also, decided that Kīwān should be installed as leader of the military force of Damascus.

Meanwhile, a delegation of 'ulama' from Damascus arrived to beg the release of Muṣṭafā Pāsha.

Events, however, proved favourable to Muṣṭafā Pāsha for when Fakhr al-Dīn refused to execute some of the arrested military officers, Kīwān decided to return to Damascus after openly insulting Fakhr al-Dīn. In a sudden fit of anger, Fakhr al-Dīn drew his dagger and slew Kīwān. When Muṣṭafā heard of the incident he expressed the hope that a similar fate would befall Kurd Ḥāmza who was at that time in Aleppo. Meanwhile the Damascenes executed and confiscated the property of Kurd Ḥāmza's followers.40 Muṣṭafā Pāsha upon his return to Damascus was able to exert his authority with greater effect. He summoned a meeting of the learned Damascenes and high military officials to formulate rules for the behaviour of janissaries. A published edict (ḥujja) commanded that henceforth there should be no practice of usury by any soldier and they should be compelled to observe the law.41

After these liquidations which later included Kékhdū Mustafa, Fakhr al-Dīn faced the problem of controlling the Sukbān. Never an easy task, it mounted when he raided Ahmad Tarabay in Lājūn; they flouted his commands which no doubt accounts for his failure. Forces were sent by his old enemies Yusuf Sayfa and the governor of Damascus which rescued him from probable

---


In 1036/1626, the Grand Vizier Khalil Pasha raised an army against Fakhr al-Din who was accused of building citadels manned by Sukban.

Fakhr al-Din offered to hand them over to the Grand Vizier together with a large sum of money which appeased him. Fakhr al-Din continued to build citadels. Some thirty in all, scattered over Syria, were under his command and in 1042/1632 the Sultan sent another expedition against him. This time he was taken to Istanbul and there executed; a great victory over a Druze leader which rejoiced the hearts of the Damascenes.

B. The Harfush Family in Baalbek

The Harfush, a Shi'a family of obscure origin, claimed descent from the Arab tribe of Khuzayma. In 903/1497 a certain Ibn Harfush (?) is recorded as naib (governor) of Baalbek. Ibn Harfush, described as a tribal chief, allied himself with Nasir al-Din al-Hanash when he was fleeing from Janbirdi al-Ghazali. Both of them were beheaded by Janbirdi who sent their heads to Sultan Selim. Later Janbirdi, then himself a rebel, realized the influence of both these families and bestowed al-Biqaa upon the son of Nasir while he gave...

\[42\] Khalidi, Tarikh, pp.160, 175-6, 186-9, 192-3.


Homs to a certain Ibn Ḥarfūsh whose first name was probably Musa. When the rebellion failed the families fell from Ottoman favour and Ba‘labakk was given to Muhammad b. Baydamar. The family, however, is mentioned in a quarrel between the traditional factions of Yamanīs and Qaysīs and appears to have occurred frequently in connection with local disputes.

In 975/1567 Musa b. Ḥarfūsh, head of the family, possessed a zi‘āmet. He was asked to lead archers against the Yaman and was offered a sanjaq for such service. No records are extant concerning acceptance, but in the following year he was among those local chieftains who received hülûms from the Sultan to refuse exemption money (badal) from qualified archers commanded to service in the Yaman. His son Husayn also held a zi‘āmet and his second son ‘Alī became governor of Ba‘labakk. When a tribute-convoy from Egypt was sacked in the vicinity of the Bay of ‘Akkar in 992/1584, ‘Alī was amongst those local chieftains taken to Istanbul. Abū ‘Alī b. Qunbar, better known as al-Aqrā‘, who was employed by the Ḥarfūshīs, succeeded ‘Alī as governor of Ba‘labakk.

48. Ibn Tulun, quoted by Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols. 112a, b. In 907/1501, the governor of Damascus hanged Ibn Baydamar, the nā‘ib of Ba‘labakk, for which Ibn Tulun gives no reason; this indicates that the Baydamar family was a rival to the Ḥarfūsh. Mufakhat, vol. i, p. 251.
51. Heyd, Ottoman documents, p. 70, n. 3.
52. T. D. 474, p. 509.
\textsuperscript{202.} 'Ali was detained in Istanbul considerably longer than was expected and his family began to resent al-Aqra's control.

Intrigues were begun against him supported by some two thousand Druze. al-Aqra\textsuperscript{c} on his part was backed by the Arab tribes, Turkomans and Qorqas the son of Mansur b. Furaykh. The factions clashed on Wednesday, 21st Rajab 994/8th July 1586 when the Druze were routed. Burini states that their casualties numbered 1,080 and further affirms that 1,000 heads were sent to Damascus. After 'Ali b. Harfush's return to Ba\'labakk in 997/1588, he killed al-Aqra\textsuperscript{c} but he was forced to seek refuge with the Druze in 'Ayn Dara. The son of the dead 'Ali b. al-Aqra\textsuperscript{c} was installed as governor and 'Ali Harfush received an amnesty from the governor of Damascus.\textsuperscript{54} He was well received in Damascus but he was arrested and put to death on the 12th Muharram 999/10th November 1590, which caused sorrow to the population of the city who had appreciated his generosity and kindness.\textsuperscript{55}

His son Musa, who had Sunni inclinations, later succeeded his father in Ba\'labakk. He was on good terms with the governor of Damascus and in 1007/1598 the governor incited him to wage war against the Sayf\textsuperscript{a}. Backed by amir Husayn b. Muhammad known as Ibn A\'waj al-Raqaba\textsuperscript{56} (d.1019/1610) amir of Ijma, together with Fakhr al-Din, they defeated Yusuf Sayf\textsuperscript{a} near Ghazir and 'Ali b. Sayf\textsuperscript{a} was killed.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{54.} Burini, Tarajim, fols.148a,b. Ghazz\textsuperscript{i}, Lutf, fol.24b.
\textsuperscript{55.} Ibn Ayyub, Nuzhat, fol.7a, Ghazz\textsuperscript{i}, Kaw\textsuperscript{a}kil, vol.iii, p.194; Lutf, fol.39b. Ghazz\textsuperscript{i} mentions that he was killed in 1001/1592 or 1002/1593. Muhibbi, Khul\textsuperscript{a}sat, vol.iv, p.432. Mas'\textsuperscript{a}r, Fakhr al-Din, p.61.
\textsuperscript{56.} Muhibbi, Khul\textsuperscript{a}sat, vol.ii, pp.45-51.
\textsuperscript{57.} Ghazz\textsuperscript{i}, Lutf, fol.48a.
When ‘Alī Jānbulāt, together with Fakhr al-Dīn, marched against Damascus in 1015/1606, in pursuit of Yusuf Sayfā, Musā volunteered to intercede; and when his mission failed he returned to Damascus. The rebels preferred to recognize his cousin Yūnus as the governor of Ba‘labakk but when ‘Alī Jānbulāt and Fakhr al-Dīn withdrew, Musā tried to regain his position but failed. At his death in Damascus in the same year, Yūnus became the undisputed leader of the Harfūsh family.50

Yūnus utilized every possible means of self-aggrandisement. Although he was appointed by ‘Alī Jānbulāt and Fakhr al-Dīn he pursued his own policy regardless of Fakhr al-Dīn whom Yūnūs appeased until his interests could be better served by alliance with the governor of Damascus. In 1023/1614, he first joined Fakhr al-Dīn and abandoned him for Hāfiz Pāsha.59 When Fakhr al-Dīn left for Tuscany, Yūnus advised the Sukbān to destroy the two citadels of Bānyās and Shaqīf,60 thus weakening the Ma‘nids and strengthening his own position. To this end he sent his son, who was married to the daughter of Fakhr al-Dīn to build a residence in the village of Mushghara with the intention of undermining the loyalty of the people towards Fakhr al-Dīn. Fakhr al-Dīn’s son, ‘Alī, was helpless against the Harfūsh machinations61 which Yūnus continued when Fakhr al-Dīn returned and roused Kurd Ḥamza and Muṣṭafā Pāsha against Fakhr al-Dīn and Kiwan which led to the skirmish at ‘Anjarr.62 The defeated Yūnus fled

59. al-Khālidī, Tartik, pp.5, 11-12, 22.
60. al-Khālidī, Tartik, p.50.
61. al-Khālidī, Tartik, pp.66-7, 70
to Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān where the governor of Aleppo arrested and jailed him in Salamya. In 1035/1625 Baʿlabakk was given to Fāḍir al-Dīn who, by means of bribery, destroyed Yūnus in the following year. The destruction caused by successive rival factions reduced Baʿlabakk and its surroundings to a state of dereliction. In 1048/1638 when Yāḥya al-Maḥāsini (d.1053/1643) passed the area en route for Tripoli, he recorded the devastation in a poem comparing it with the famous lament for Andalusia composed by Abū al-Baqāʾ al-Randī 64.

C. The ʿAssāf Family in Kisrawān

Reliable information concerning this Turkoman family during the first half of the sixteenth century is meagre. According to Duwayhī, ʿAssāf, the head of the family at the time, upon whom Kisrawān and Jubayl were conferred by Śūṭān Śēlīm, chose Ghazīr as his place of residence. He died in 924/1518, leaving his three sons Ḥāṣan, Ḥusayn and Qāʾīṭbāy and was succeeded by Ḥāṣan. Qāʾīṭbāy, his half-brother, disputed the succession and he succeeded in assassinating his two brothers when they visited Bayrūt. Most probably supported by Jāʿbirī al-Ghazziī, he succeeded in Kisrawān and, childless
himself, spared his brother Hasan's son Mansur who, according to Duwayhi, succeeded Gha'ith after his death in 930/1523.\(^{65}\)

Tapu Defters show that between 930-955/1523-1548, Kisrawan was entrusted to an amir named Musa bey but nothing further is mentioned about him in available literature. The title amir (amir = bey) may indicate that Musa was a member of the Assaf family and assumed its leadership while Mansur was a child.\(^{66}\)

Mansur appears to have assumed leadership after 955/1548 but information concerning him is scanty, most of it being provided by Duwayhi, and its authenticity is doubtful. In a decree dated 982/1574 he was described as one of the Druze mugaddams who claimed that they had no muskets.\(^{67}\) After many complaints concerning his conduct, Mansur was dismissed in 987/1579 in favour of his son Muhammad.\(^{68}\)

Muhammad was among those accused of the robbery of the Egyptian tribute in 992/1584 and was taken to Istanbul; but was released and appointed tax-farmer of the province of Tripoli although not of the city. He clashed with Yusuf Sayfa who refused to pay the taxes. When he endeavoured to collect them by force, a bullet killed him and he left no successor. The people of Tripoli rejoiced at his death, which gave them relief from his unscrupulous


\(^{67}\) M.D.xxvi, No.488, 10 Jumâda I, 982, p.180.

\(^{68}\) Duwayhi, Tariikh al-azmina, p.281.
taxation. Yusuf Sayfā married Muhammad's wife and inherited the family fortune. Thus circumstances brought Yusuf Sayfā into closer contact with his enemy Fakhr al-Dīn.

D. The Arslān Family in al-Gharb and Jurd

Questionable tradition infers that Jamāl al-Dīn Ahmad b. Khalīl b. Muṣṭafīj, the head of the Arslān family, was among the party welcoming Sultan Selīm on his arrival at Damascus, and received from him the government of the areas of Gharb and Jurd. When al-Ghazālī led his expedition against Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Ḥanash, Jamāl is said to have supported him. For his services he received the government of al-Shūf by which the Yamānī faction in that quarter was strengthened. Jamāl al-Dīn who is said to have owned a water-mill near the village of Dayr Qublayn, abdicated in favour of his son Muhammad at an unspecified date. Muhammad is reported as having taken part in the campaign against Cyprus in 1570. He returned with a recommendation from Lālā Muṣṭafā Pāsha, commander of the campaign, to Murād Pāsha, the governor of Damascus. His prestige was heightened when, in 1579, Yusuf Sayfā was appointed governor of Tripoli as they were both members of the Yamānī faction.


70. Duwayhī, Tarīkh al-azmina, p.236.


He, too, was among those amirs who were arrested, sent to Istanbul and afterwards released. On his return, he built himself a palace in Shuwayfat and also repaired his quarter in Aramun. 73

On his death in 1605, Muhammad was succeeded by his son Mudhji, who joined Hafiz Pasha against Fakhr al-Din in 1023/1614. The usual sacking and looting took place in al-Shuf and Fakhr al-Din's son, 'Ali, revenged himself by defeating the Yamani alliance of Arslans and Sayfis at the battle of Ayn al-Nama in 1025/1616. In this battle Mudhji lost Jurd and Gharb which were sacked and plundered and their residence was destroyed. The family fled to the Sayfis of Tripoli for refuge, where Mudhji died in 1617. He left three sons: Yusuf, Izz al-Din and Yahya. Yusuf allied himself with the Marids, Yahya with the Sayfis and Izz al-Din had no interest in politics. With the death of Yahya in 1632, the Arslans ceased to be of any significance in local politics. 74

E. The Shihab Family in Wadi al-Taym

In the Sultan Khass of Wadi al-Taym lived the Sunnite family of Shihab. Most information about this family is derived from later Lebanese sources and is probably inaccurate. According to these sources, Mansur, the head of the family, continued to be the recognised chieftain of Wadi al-Taym until his death in 1535, when he was succeeded by his son Mulhim who held the chieftainship until his death in 972/1564. He was succeeded by his son Mansur, who, on his death in 1557, left two sons, 'Ali and Ahmad. 75

The Mühimme Defteri refers to a certain ibn Shihāb who in 981/1573, with Mansūr b. Furaykh and other chieftains, attacked and sacked many villages in northern Palestine. In 982/1574 Qāsim b. Shihāb was one of the muqaddams who denied being in possession of muskets after they had been collected. Qāsim may have been the same Mansūr mentioned above, because it was a custom among Muslims to possess compound names.

The Shihābīs most of the time allied themselves with the Ma'ānids. In 1015/1606 Ahmad with his men were in the army of Fakhr al-Dīn which laid siege to Damascus, but in 1022/1613 he joined Hāfiz Pāsha while his brother 'Alī remained faithful to the Ma'ānids. The successive governors of Damascus helped Ahmad against his brother 'Alī who was forced to retreat. When Fakhr al-Dīn returned, he reconciled the two brothers by dividing Wādi al-Taym between them. After that, the Shihābīs allied themselves with the Ma'ānids and later succeeded them in 1697 as leaders of the Druze.

II. Relationship between the Ottomans and the Sufis in the Province During the Sixteenth Century

A. The Jabawī Order (tariqa). Husayn al-Jabawī, the head of the order, was among those prominent people who decided to surrender Damascus to Sulṭān Selīm. A waqfiyya

76. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.84-5.
80. For the chain of Shaykhs of this order see Muḥibbi, Khulāsat, vol.1, pp.33-5. Zaḥān, Muḥammad, ʿɪqād al-jawhar al-thamīn fi al-dhikr wa ṭarīq al-ibād wa ṭalāqīn, M.S. fo:is.66a,b. I would like to thank Shaykh Muḥammad b. Tawīl al-Tanṭī who lent me his copy of this manuscript. The grandfather, Saʿd al-Dīn, originally a robber, lived =
shows that Sultan Selim visited Shaykh Husayn in his house, built a zawiya (convent) for him in the Qubaybat Quarter, and endowed it with pieces of land and watermills for its maintenance and that of the Shaykh's family.

Shaykh Husayn (d. 926/1519) was held in great veneration by the officials and his son Ahmad who succeeded him wielded even greater influence by reason of his reputed ability to cure the sick. When he died the chief judge led the prayers and people visited his tomb to ask for blessing. His brother Muḥammad Saʿd al-Dīn (d. 987/1579) succeeded him as head of the order and completed their zawiya.

Muḥammad Saʿd al-Dīn in turn was succeeded by his son Muḥammad (d. 1020/1611) who owned many lands, orchards, baths, shops, and mazraʿās. He built himself a huge house, reconstructed the zawiya and entertained many people, including officials, daily. His wealth and extravagance are demonstrated when at the birth of a child to his son ʿĪsā, the notables of Damascus came to congratulate him. He celebrated the occasion by sending zalābiyya (a kind of thin, sweet fritter or waffle) to all officials and notables.
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Muslims and Christians alike. The patriarch (unidentified) in Damascus, for his part, sent a gift of money to the Shaykh. Drummers, singers, dancers, and jugglers entertained his guests for seven days. The evenings brought entertainment by shadow players and magicians; all these were paid and well treated by him.  

Shaykh Muhammad enjoyed great prestige among the people of Damascus but his influence with army personnel was very limited. He had no success as a mediator and sometimes remained passive. When in 1005/1596 taxes were increased, sympathy for the population was expressed by the chief judge. The Shaykh remained a passive onlooker who did not even voice their grievances to the Sultan and only blessed the chief judge, who, at least, took steps to rectify it.  

In 1012/1603 the Damascene army marched on Aleppo. The Sultan forbade this and the governor deputed the Shaykh to reason with them. The decree stated that if the soldiers persisted in their disobedience they would be outlawed. They ignored both threats and exhortation and continued on their way.  

Similarly, when ‘Ali Jānbūlāt besieged Damascus in 1015/1606 in order to capture Yusuf Sayfā, Shaykh Muhammad was deputed to remonstrate with ‘Ali and inform him that Yusuf Sayfā had fled, he took the passive line which he tried to force on the people. He himself managed to get from ‘Ali a

85. Būrīnī, Diwan, MS, Köprü, No: 1257, fol. 39a, b.
guard for his own house. Later, he was in the delegation to the Grand Vizier Murād Pasha which went to complain about 'Alī's behaviour.

All of them were, however, ignored by Murād Pasha.

B. The Şamadīs.

Sultan Selīm who endowed the Jabāvis appears to have neglected the Şamadīs. It was doubtless for this reason that Shaykh Muḥammad b. Khalil b. 'Alī al-Şamādī (d.948/1541) went to Istanbul to put his case to the Sultan. It was considered favourably and their zawiya was endowed with the village of Katibat al-Mār near Barlabakk but later this was changed to 80 ghirāb of wheat from the village of Kanākir in Hawrān. When in 932/1525, the governor of Damascus disputed the endowment, Shaykh Muḥammad again set out for Istanbul. This time he carried a written complaint from the 'ulama' of Damascus concerning excessive taxes and many of them were present at his departure.

When the governor learned of the intended complaint, he sent a messenger to bring Shaykh Muḥammad from Barlabakk to Damascus. All those who had complained were rebuked or punished, but the endowment was finally conferred in 934/1527. Muḥammad's influence was great. He was considered as a wali by both local people and officials whom he entertained each year when he celebrated the birthday of the Prophet.

89. The founder of this order was Shaykh Sālim. He was a student of the famous Sufi Shaykh, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Kītānī (d.561/1166). Their zawiya was in the village of Samad in Hawrān. One of his descendents, Shaykh Salih (d.825/1421) was described by Ibn Hajar as a rich and influential person whose word was never disputed among the people of the barr (countryside). Ibn Hajar, Inbā', MS, BM, No.23, 330, fol.114a. For background and teaching of Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir, see Braune, W., 'Abd al-Kādir al-Djilānī', E.1,2, vol.1, pp.69-70.
His son Muhammad continued in his father’s tradition and when in 969/1561 he visited Istanbul he was well received by the Sultan and was assigned five pārās per day for his expenses. Another member of his family, Yunus, was given a timar which yielded 1,600 akches annually. Muhammad was highly esteemed by the *ulama* of Damascus and the Bakris, the Sufi family of Cairo. The Şamādis became subject to criticism in 985/1577 when the family officially claimed descend from the Prophet, and from then respect for them partly diminished. Muhammad’s son, Muslim, succeeded him and enjoyed similar prestige. Together with many followers, he went to Jerusalem where he appropriated a drum of the Jabāwis, claiming that only Şamādis used drums. A clash between them and the Jabāwis was narrowly averted by officials and *ulama*. In 1016/1607 his son and successor, İsa (d. 1021/1612) was among those who went to Aleppo to complain to the Grand Vizier, Murad Paşa, about ‘Ali Janbulat, and Fâldh al-Dīn. On a second occasion he was sent to the Grand Vizier by the governor of Damascus and succeeded in reducing the tax of nuzul. İsa was succeeded by his brother İbrahim who also enjoyed an influential position among Damascenes and officials and was well received when he visited Istanbul.


93. Ghazzî, Lüf, fols.42a,b. Muhibbi, Khulagat, vol.iii, p.244. Concerning the nuzul tax collected in time of war in kind and cash, see Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society, vol.i, part ii, pp.30-2.

Part of the family remained in Samad while others worked as supervisors (mutawallīs) of the waqf for Hebron in the village of al-Rabad in the Sanjaq of Ajlūn.

C. Other orders

The Qadriyya Order numbered few in Damascus and little information is extant concerning its head, Sulaymān (d. 945/1538). It is known that he adopted Islam and was the student of the Moroccan Sufi ʿAlī b. Maʿmūn. Sulaymān's son ʿAlīmad (d. 1005/1596) was influential among people and officials alike. He repaired the derelict Kilichiyya School in Damascus aided by volunteers from the villages. Officials frequently visited him, seeking his advice. For corruption in 990/1582, the governor of Damascus caused his naqīb to be strangled. In 1008/1599, Nāṣir b. ʿAbdān one of his men was corrupt (muṣfīd) and he was crucified.

A new order sprang into being by reason of its founder Shaykh Uways al-Qaramānī (d. 951/1544). He foretold the imminent appearance of the Mahdī and many people believed and followed him, with the result that he was arrested and jailed in Aleppo. His best known student, Dāʾūd al-Mārāshī, was...


fled to Antioch and joined his master upon his release, and together they lived in Damascus. Another of his students took up residence in the Shi‘a city of Ba‘labakk. His beliefs continued to be promulgated after his death, and Da‘ūd was arrested and strangled in 954/1547. The imminence of the Mahdi was preached chiefly in the areas where Shi‘a were strongest. The Ottomans realized the threat and steadily crushed it.

Usually the sufis of Damascus were respected by the officials especially by ʿĪsā Bāk al-Fanārī, (d.950/1543), the governor of Damascus who was reputed for his firm beliefs and his kindness to Shaykh ‘Ulwan b. ‘Atiya (d.936/1526) in Hama, Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn ʿUmar al-ʿUqaybī (d.951/1544), Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Khaṭīb b. Gāyṣar al-Gubaybāṭī al-Ḥanbalī (d.975/1565) and to all others of that belief. He visited many of their convents and received initiation from some and was blessed by all. 106


III. Relationship of Ottoman Officials with Naqīb al-Ashraf

Available literature does not show that the Naqīb al-Ashraf in Damascus exerted any special influence in the city. Successive naqībs were employed as supervisors (sing. nāzīr) in madrasās or mosques and these posts were coveted by many. The first naqīb, after the Ottoman conquest, was Sayyid Tāj al-Dīn al-Ṣalṭī (d.982/1574). Although his learning was very limited, he was employed as a supervisor of the Gaymariyya madrasa and later the Umayyad Mosque to become the general supervisor of madrasās and mosques. His son Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad (d.971/1563) was entrusted with supervision of the Tankiz Mosque. Persons eligible for allowances from institutions under the two men were not happy with the administration and were occasionally unable to draw their benefits. Both father and son were suspected of dishonesty.

A rival of the Ṣalṭīs, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ṣafadī, known as Ibn al-Hamrawī (d.976/1568) managed several times to secure the posts for himself. He was more popular than the Ṣalṭīs. Benefits were duly conferred and, at his own expense he widened roads and opened a gate through the market to enable worshippers to gain access to the Umayyad Mosque at all times. He earned the praise of contemporary poets by his hospitality, and his mediation was generally acceptable to officials.


108. There is no distinguished member of this family recorded in the sources. The janissary, Ibrāhīm b. Jāfar al-Rūmī (d.998/1589), son-in-law to the family, appears to have inherited its fortune. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Muṣā al-Ṣalṭī (d.998/1589), another member of the family, supervised al-Naṣiriyā School and the Tankiz Mosque. He was notorious for his luxury and wine drinking. He also defrauded the endowments of the school and mosque. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.16a,b-17a, 26a,b. Ghazzī, Kawākib, vol.iii, pp.49-50, 87, 179-80, 205.

Other Ashrāfi exercised less influence than the Šaltīs. When in 931/1524 Muḥammad b. Ḥamza al-Ḥusayni (d. 933/1526) went among other delegates to meet the Grand Vizier Ibrāhīm Pāša and complain about certain taxes, they were refused audience. When he left, Ibrāhīm assigned thirty *Otnān* (akchenes) to Shaykh Ḥamza who was known for his subservience towards officials. His son, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī (d. 989/1581) was a judge and succeeded Tāj al-Dīn al-Šaltī as naqīb and nothing is recorded concerning his conduct while in office.

His successor, Zayn al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Ḥamza (d. 1009/1600), was an unlearned, over-zealous but pious man who, on one occasion, incurred the displeasure of both judge and governor by a mistaken claim that a lavatory was about to be erected near the tomb of Zayn al-ʿAbīdīn. It was rumoured that it had received the approval of the chief judge. He went angrily to the governor stating that the scheme would pollute the tomb. The matter was investigated and proved untrue. Husayn was rebuked both by the governor and the judge. His brother and successor, Muḥammad (d. 1017/1608) was an insignificant and twisted personality. He was very much disliked. On the one occasion when he was sent among other ūlamāʾ to the Grand Vizier Murād Pāša to complain about ʿAlī Jānbulāt and Fakhr al-Dīn, he was used by Kiwan to give false testimony and his death was regretted by no one.

Mohammad b. Mohammad b. Kamal al-Din b. Ajlan (d.1025/1616) who succeeded, combined the three offices of naqib, Shaykh mashayikh al-hiraf (head of crafts) and head of the Rifa'iyya Order. His impact on the administration of these offices was not recorded nor was any complaint made against him. All of this indicates a good but insignificant personality. 114

None of these successive naqibs made any special impact on their surroundings, probably because Ashraf were few in number, merely 92 in all, and some of their behaviour was reprehensible. 115 Nothing is left to show that the people of the hiraf were in any way organised into professional guilds or in any other way which would have given them solidity. 116 The Rifa'iyya order was introduced from Egypt and recruited a few supporters. 117

IV. Relationship of Ottoman Officials with the Notables of Damascus

The Manjik and Talu families continued their influence in Damascus during the 14th and 17th centuries.

Manjik acquired its name from Sayf al-Din Manjik (d. 776/1374)


a Mamluk governor of Damascus. 118 His grandson Nāṣir al-Dīn was considered favourably by more than one Mamluk Sultan and became sufficiently rich to buy land, build two mosques outside Damascus and endow them. In addition, he repaired the Abu ʿUmar Madrasa in al-Ṣāliḥiyā and constructed a pool for the use of pilgrims in Tabūk. 119 Their huge wealth created family endowments and assured their distinction among the notables of Damascus. ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Manjīk (d.940/1533) supervised the endowments as head of the family and was personally considered one of the most notable personages of the city. 120 His son Ibrāhīm (d.991/1583) was described as simple, but because of the family's prestige he was offered the governorship of Homs, Ḥama or ʿAṣfād, which he declined. He was, however, highly eulogised by officials, judges and poets for his great generosity. 121 His successor and nephew ʿAbd al-Laṭīf was also reputed for generosity and his brother Manjīk was given a āzām which added to his already luxurious life. 122

ʿAbd al-Laṭīf was followed in turn by his nephew Muḥammad b. Manjīk who, in addition to the supervision of the family endowments, also supervised those of Mecca, Medina and those of Sultan Selim's takīyyā. He was further given the governorship of Karak-Shawbak and later of Tadmur, then Ruḥā and Raqa. 123


He was celebrated for his capable and honest approach and for his protection of the poorer peasants against exploitation by Subashish.

His luxurious palace in Damascus witnessed the reception of many officials and notables. Later, he built another equally, if not even more, luxurious palace outside the city which was presented to the governor of Damascus, Kuchuk Ahmad Pasha. His son Ahmad was a chāush in al-Bāb al-ʿAlī (the Sultan's palace) while ʿUmar his second son was given a zīāmet. 123

The family allied itself and held its state under the Mamluks, but later transferred their allegiance to the Ottomans from whom they received continued favour. Intercession for any Damascene cause derived its force from favours thus granted.

Like the Manjik, the ʿTālū family were not originally Damascene, and claimed descent from the Artuqids. 124 Under the Mamluks some of its members achieved prominence. Taqī al-Dīn b. ʿTālū was the dawadar of the Shafi'i judge in Damascus in 913/1507 to become in 915/1509 the deputy supervisor of the Umayyad mosque. 125 His brother ʿAlī al-Dīn, married to the cousin of the historian Ibn ʿTulun, was in 922/1516 naqīb al-jaysh (adjutant of the army). 126 He was sufficiently important to be mentioned as one who took part in receiving Sultan Qānṣuh al-Ghawrī on his way to Aleppo in 922/1516.


126. For description and function of this office, see Qalqashandi, Subh, vol. iv, pp. 21-2, 186. Popper, Egypt and Syria, vol. i, pp. 105-6.
When Sultan Selim entered Damascus, he received a gift but he remained loyal to the Mamluks. From Egypt he wrote a letter to Shaykh *Abd al-Nabi al-Maghribi rebuking him for his support of the Ottomans and reminding him that he was not native to Damascus. He also falsely informed him that Sultan Selim had been arrested which, when learned in Damascus, caused much confusion. 127

It appears that he was among the many Mamluk employees who were pardoned by Sultan Selim and was installed as a deputy supervisor of the Umayyad Mosque. In 926/1519 he went on a pilgrimage. He might have suspected the intentions of al-Ghazali, and for this reason he remained in Mecca in order to disassociate himself from al-Ghazali who refused to allow him to collect his allowance while he was deputy supervisor. 128

Tapu Defters show that many members of this family held timars. Among them Ibrahim, his son Hasan, Uthman, Muhammad and *Ali, all of whom received only small timars. 129

Ibrahim b. Talu (d.1024/1615) attained a distinguished position. He began his career in the service of the governor of Damascus, Ahmad Pasha al-Khalidi (ca.965/1557), 130 and when this governor was transferred, Ibrahim accompanied him. He became chaush in al-Bab al-‘Alî. When the campaign against Cyprus was launched he supervised the supply of provisions from

---

130. Concerning his biography see Burinî, Tarîjim, vol.i, pp.188-90.
from Damascus and led its army. Probably for this service he was the first local person later to be appointed head of the military force in Damascus. In 997/1588 he was given the Sanjaq of Nablus where he served for two years. In 999/1590 he became amīr al-mulāqah and demonstrated his ability to provide security for pilgrims. His last official appointment, in 1016/1607 was as governor of Tadmur. 131

CHAPTER VII

The Arab, Turkoman and Kurdish Tribes in the Province of Damascus during the Sixteenth Century
The distribution of Arab tribes in the Province and their annual ġadār

In their biographical dictionaries, Syrian writers of the sixteenth century furnished plenty of information about life in the cities. On the other hand, little attention seems to have been paid to life in the countryside or to tribal life. In line with their biographical tradition, historians of the time provide scanty information about some Arab chieftains. The absence of genealogical treatises deserves particular attention, when one bears in mind that the Arab tribes were active at this time, and often influenced the policy of the Ottomans towards the Province of Damascus.

Ottoman defters, which are rich in details of the history of the Turkomans in Syria, unfortunately provide only fragmentary information about Arab tribes. A number of defters are not available to scholars either because they are missing, or because they have not yet been identified and catalogued; and consequently there are many gaps in available data. In this section the distribution of Arab tribes in the Province will be dealt with from South to North in rotation, according to their localities.

There were five tribes (sing. ta'īfa) in the Sanjaq of Gaza. Banū ʿAtiyya was the largest and comprised 14 branches; paid an annual ġadār (tax) to the Sultan's Kháss amounting to 15,000 akčes. This tribe was not confined to that sanjaq only, but other branches were distributed over the strip parallel

to the Red Sea coast as far as Niğhârat Suhâ'idi. Banû 'Aţâ', whose name is usually associated with that of Banû 'Atiyâ', especially during uprisings, was scarcely less important. It had nine branches and paid an annual 'adat to the Sultan's Khâss of 12,500 akches. One of its branches occupied part of the Naḥiyat of Ġåra to the north of Damascus. The precise number of its households is not known but it appears to have been large and paid an 'adat of 7,000 akches annually. Some of the members of this tribe in the Sanjaq of Gaza seem to have been engaged in agriculture. A record shows that it owned land in five villages in addition to a mazra'a, (farm). A timar with the revenue of 26,080 akches annually is also registered as being shared between this tribe and the tribe of Sawâlmah. Sawâlmah comprised nine branches and paid 12,500 akches per annum as 'adat. Perhaps some branches of this tribe had migrated northwards as towards the beginning of the seventeenth century a certain tribe by the name of Sawâlmah is mentioned as occupying an area near Ramlah in Palestine. Jarm, with its 12 branches, was the fourth tribe. Its annual payment as an 'adat to the Sultan's Khâss was 10,000 akches.

3. For names of branches see T.D.1015, p.20.
5. Banû 'Aţâ's share in the revenue was 5,610 akches annually which might indicate that the land owned by them was not large. T.D.1015, pp.68, 75, 73, 83, 97, 108.
7. For names of branches see T.D.1015, p.20.
9. For names of branches see T.D.1015, p.19. According to al-Hamâdi, the Muhimindâr (d.770/1301) as quoted by Qalqashandî (d.821/1418), Jarm was one of the clans of the big tribe of Tayy. This clan lived in the region of Hawrân, some had migrated into Egypt. Qalqashandî, =
The fifth tribe in the Sanjaq of Gaza was that of Hutaym which had two branches. Their total payment to the Sultan's khaṣṣ was 8,000 akches. 10 106 households of this tribe lived in Marj around Damascus and their annual ḍādat was 8,500 akches. 11

It appears that most of the population of the Sanjaq of Karak-Shawbak were nomads. Some branches of Banū ʿAtīyya, mainly the branch of Kaʿābnah, were living parallel to the Red Sea coast. Further inland, in the south, the land was inhabited by the tribe of Ḥuwayṭāt, while Banū Lām al-MAFārijah, which was composed of four branches, had their holdings in the north. 12 Neither a mention of the number of their households nor any reference to payment of ḍādat to the Ottomans is made concerning either tribe.

Ottoman defters do not mention which tribes were living in the Balqa' but al-Khaydī al-Šafadī (d.1034/1624) states that there were two

——


13. According to Qutb al-Dīn al-Nahrwālī (d.990/1582), Huwayṭāt was a branch of the Banū ʿUqba, which was the main Arab tribe in the Mamlakah of al-Karak under the Mamluks. Its chief was recognized by the Mamluk Sultans. On writing to him the title Samī was used. Qalqashandī, Nihayat, p.364. Subh, vol.vii, p.188. Nahrwālī, al-fawāʾid, pp.271-4. Banu Lām was divided into 4 main clans each of which comprised a number of branches. For names and divisions of branches see al-Jazīrī, Durar, p.514. See also Schleifer, J., "al-Huwayṭāt", E.1.1, vol.ii, p.349; Rentz, G., "al-Huwayṭāt", E.1.2, vol.iii, pp.642-4.
Tribe by the name of Jahawishah and Da'jah who lived there. Under the Mamluks this area was inhabited by the tribes of Banū Mahdī and Banū Sakhr. The only allusion to them is that four mazra'a (farms) in al-Ghawr near Baysān were entrusted to them to cultivate. In addition, a mazra'a in al-Ghawr was cultivated by a certain tribe by the name of Karīm. The tribe of Banū Manzūr occupied land to the east of al-Ghawr at the Nashiyat of Banū Jahma. There were 145 households, each paying 23 akches annually as an iḥādat. In addition to the bād-i havā the total amount of money levied from it was 5,835 akches. Three mazra'a which yielded 3,736 akches yearly to the treasury were given to this tribe to cultivate. The tribe of Banū Sa'id was distributed in the two neighbouring Nashiyas of Banū Ašūr and Banū Kināna. It had 226 households and its iḥādat was 16,260 akches and it was part of the income of the governor of Damascus. Altogether, in addition to resm-i karūs (marriage fees) and bād-i havā it paid annually 50,000 akches. Near to Banū Sa'id, in the Nashiyat of Banū 'Ātkah, the tribe of


15. Mamlūk sources mention that Banū Sakhr were composed of six branches. For names see al-'Umarī, Masālik, Hīs. Topkapı Saray, No:2797, vol.iii, part i, fol.24a. al-Qalqashandī, Nashiyat, pp.132, 141, 147, 303, 442, 447. Subh, vol.iv, p.243. Banū Mahdī was a branch of Judām. It lived in the region of al-Balqā', under the Mamlūks, and was divided into 25 branches. See Qalqashandī, Qālaʾid, p.66.

16. The two mazra'a entrusted to them in al-Ghawr were Ḥakmiyyat and Ḥamām. They yielded annually 4,500 akches to the treasury but in 944 these two mazra'a were left uncultivated which indicates that this part of Banū Mahdī reverted to its old nomadic life. The mazra'a of Iṣṭafā and Jubūl al-Suflī yielding annually 11,000 akches were in the custody of Banū Sakhr. T.D.192, pp.35-6. See also Buhl, F.R. (Sourdel, D.), "al-Ghawr", E.T.2, vol.ii, pp.1024-5.


18. T.D.192, pp.47-52, the registered amount of money due for collection was 5,835 akches, but if every household paid 23 akches, plus 2,600 bād-i havā, the total amount would be 5,935 akches.

Rabī' of 31 households was established. Each household paid twenty akches yearly as an adat. Together with 400 akches collected from it as bād-i havā, it paid 1,020 akches every year. A tribe by the name of Hāmid lived in the Nahiyat of Jaydūr in Ḥawrān. It was given a timar which yielded annually 2,000 akches. Lajāh, in Southern Ḥawrān, referred to as Jabal, was one of the main centres for the gathering of Arab tribes. Defters refer to tribes living there as 'Urbān-i Jabal; also the name of Fuqara'i-i-‘Urbān-i Jabal is frequently used to refer to some of these tribes. There were twenty-one jamā'at, and their total number in 958/1551 was 1122 households. According to the 977/1569 survey their number dramatically dropped to 858 households plus 137 bachelors. This decrease is in agreement with the pattern noticed when the demography of the Liwā’ was dealt with. These jamā'at were dominated by Banū Nu‘aym one branch of which lived in al-Biqā‘ and another in the Nahiyat of al-Hājali. The rādat, bād-i-havā and resm-i ‘arūs paid by Banū Nu‘aym of Jabal and Al Diyāb (Dhiyāb?) are given in the defters as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>amount/akches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>936/1529</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958/1551</td>
<td>18,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977/1569</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. For the census of 'Arab-i Jabal in 958/1551 and 977/1567 see T.D.275, pp.84-105; T.D.491, pp.403/21. Tapu Defters do not differentiate between the terms jātifa and jamā'at, both of which can be translated "groups". By comparison of tribal numbers, however, it is evident that those referred to as 'jātifa' are small in number while those of 'jamā'at' are large. For Lajāh see Yaqūt who spells it al-Liājah, Mu‘jam, vol.iv, p.350.
24. T.D.275, p.89.
By comparing the amount paid in 958/1551 and 977/1569, one sees that in 977/1569 they paid a little less than two-thirds. This coincides with the decrease in the number of the households. A similarity is noticeable in the decrease of money paid by the rest of the tribes in that area. In 958/1551 adat reached 70,000 akches, but in 977/1569 it dropped to 5,000.26 It is worth mentioning that a branch of 'Urban'-Jabal by the name of Al-'A'tiq numbering 21 households was at that time living in the Nahiyat of Banū Nashba.

The nature of taxes paid by it indicates that this tribe was engaged in agriculture.27

Twelve Arab ifās lived in the Nahiyat of Marj Banū 'Amir (Esdraelon). Their households numbered 104 in 944/1537,28 and their adat was 30,000 akches annually.29 Other small tribes in Marj Banū 'Amir such as Banū Aslam, Banū Ghalliz and Banū Qatarnā, Banū Zugbayb and Ta'ākna (Da'ākra?) were living as cultivators.30 In this area, two jamā'at known as Munjid Walad

27. They paid 12 ghīrāra of wheat, 10 ghīrāra of barley, 150 akches for mal-i sayf, 100 akches as fees for goats and bees, and 85 akches for resm-i 'arūs and bād-i havā. The total amount was 3,935 akches.
30. Banū Aslam, who were composed of nine households, were mentioned as living in the village of Ta'neq which was originally a mazra'a but became a village. They paid in kind 22.5 ghīrāra of wheat valuing 2,700 akches, 11 ghīrāra of barley equal to 792 akches. In addition their masā'diyā (tax on cows?) was 360 akches and their bād-i havā was 90 akches. Banū Ghalliz and Banū Qatarnā who comprised 12 households lived in the village of 'Amara which had been a mazra'a but became a village. They gave as the treasury share of the produce 23 ghīrāra of wheat equal in value to 3,120 akches, and 7 ghīrāra of barley valuing 490 akches. Their masā'diyā and goats fees were 280 akches and 175 akches respectively. The total amount was 4,175. The 110 extra akches
Zayn Sharaf and Mujir Sharaf retained their nomadic life. Each had to provide annually young camels equal to 800 akches as haqq-i mara'a (pasture tax). It is understood from a note in one of the defters that this was collected in accordance with the old custom and it had not been altered. Further to the north-east, Banu Harritha to whom the leading family of Tarabay belonged, lived near Jacob's Daughter's Bridge. Their households totalled 51 paying annually 3,555 akches as an 'adat. Three other tribes, Kalbayn, Shurafā and Shūmar lived near Banu Harritha. Their total number was 56 households and their total annual 'adat was 4,830 akches. The following tribes lived in Nahiyat of Hula:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. of households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>No. of households</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banū Shaybān</td>
<td>930/1523 33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Nu'aym</td>
<td>950/154334</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Ghani</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Nimr</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū 'Ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū 'Arab</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

might have been in return for the bād-i havā. Banū Zughayb were 19 households who lived in the village of Quayl. Three mazra'ās were in their custody. They paid one fourth of the produce of these three mazra'ās to the treasury. In addition to ma'ādīyyah and bād-i havā the total amount they paid annually was 8,380 akches. Arab Tarakana farmed the Mazra'a of 'Ayn Jarzah for which they paid the treasury 500 akches. T.D.192, pp.9, 11-2, 18-9, 58-9, 64.

There is a noticeable rise in the number of households of Banū Shaybān and Banū Nu‘aym. It is, also, to be noted that the names of Banū Gfani, Banū Nimr and Banū Yūsuf do not appear in the first survey. This may mean that they either migrated into this place after the first survey was made, or that the first survey was not thorough. In the second survey the names of Banū ‘Alī and Banū ‘Arab do not appear. They may have migrated to another place since all of them were described as migratory. It was their habit to spend winter in Ḥula and summer in al-Biqa‘. In 930/1523 all of them were paying 2,000 akchēs as himāya (protection tax). In addition to this sum, ‘Alī ‘Alī had to pay 2,000 akchēs annually but the reason is not given. If any tribe among them was sufficiently enterprising and cultivated land, it had to pay additional taxes. Their total payment as an ādat according to T. D. 401 was 15,000 akchēs. In 930/1523 there were 16 additional tribes to those already mentioned who lived in the Nahiyat of Ḥula but their names do not appear in other surveys. They paid a total ādat of 5,536 akchēs, which indicates that they were a comparatively small jamāʿat.

al-Biqa‘, around which Arab tribal activities centred, is as fertile as Ḥula. According to the survey of 958/1551 there were 25 jamāʿat with an aggregate of 730 households. The largest amongst them was a tribe by the name of Banū ‘Ass (?). The number of its households in 958/1551 was 171. In 977/1569 the number had lessened to 112 households. Neither the origin nor even the exact pronunciation of its name is known, nor is it mentioned in the local Arabic sources. The second largest amongst them was Banū Nu‘aym.

37. T. D. 401, p. 710.
38. For names and money paid by them, see T. D. 430, p. 403.
comprising 76 households, while others varied between 4 and 63. According to the survey of 977/1569 the total number of Arab households in al-Biqā‘ was 590.\textsuperscript{39} In this survey the names of Āl Āli, Āl Fadl and Banū Nu‘aym al-Qabbala do not appear. It had the names of two jamā’at: Hājj b. Sayf and Kassāb numbering 21 and 19 households respectively, which are not shown in the survey of 958/1551. According to this survey all these jamā’at were paying an ādat of 40,000 akches annually,\textsuperscript{40} while in 977/1569 their total payment was 23,000 akches.\textsuperscript{41} It is to be noted that the decline in the number of households is matched by a decrease in the revenue collected from this tribe.

The Hanash Family, which had dominated the tribes of al-Biqā‘ till 976/1568, and which also was granted authority and the right of tax farming by the Ottomans, is not mentioned in the Ṭapu Defters but one finds this information in the Muḥimm Defteri.

Āl Āli, described by Arab genealogists as a large tribe living in Marj and Ghawṭa around Damascus,\textsuperscript{42} had a branch comprising 9 households which lived in al-Biqā‘. Defters do not mention their number in the vicinity of Damascus but state the amount of their payment in 932/1525 as 9,042 akches,\textsuperscript{43} and in 934/1527 it fell to 3,100 akches.\textsuperscript{44} Āl Āli had timars in Gaza.

\textsuperscript{39} For names and census see T.D.275, pp.105-118; T.D.491, pp.421-33.
\textsuperscript{40} T.D.275, p.118.
\textsuperscript{41} T.D.491, p.433.
\textsuperscript{42} Āl Āli were a branch of Āl Fadl, their land was the Marj and Ghawṭa around Damascus. al-‘Umārī, Masālik, fols.28a, 46a. al-Ta’rif, p.72. al-Qaliqashandi, Ṣubh, vol.IV, p.210; Qalā‘id, p.81.
\textsuperscript{43} T.D.275, p.118.
\textsuperscript{44} They were paying 1,239 akches as resm-i ‘arūs, and 7,803 akches as ma‘ādiyya. T.D.998, p.286.
\textsuperscript{45} They were providing thirty camels and ten horses equal to 11,000 akches; their ma‘ādiyya was 2,000 akches. No reference has been made to the fees of ghafara. T.D.160, p.26.
Hawrān, Nāḥiyat Banū Kilāb, Qārā and Tadmur which indicates that they were a large tribe with branches in all these places. Most probably they engaged in agriculture and became semi-established villagers. This may explain the decline in payments.

Recurring references are made to a tribe by the name of ʿUtayba. It comprised 11 households living near the lake of ʿUtayba in Marj to the east of Damascus and were chiefly fishermen. The proceeds from their hunting and fishing had to be sent to Dukkān al-Ṭayr in Damascus; and they were prohibited from selling any of their catches anywhere else. They were commanded to produce 300 fish daily during the season and no excuse was accepted for failure. In addition, 1,000 akčes as ṣayd-i ṣamak (fishery tax) was required from them annually. 47

II. Amir al-ʿArab

The institution of the Arab Emirate in Bilād al-Shām which was officially recognized by al-Malik al-ʿĀdil of the Ayyūbids (596/1196–616/1218) and maintained by the Mamluk Sultans, 48 was preserved by the Ottomans during the sixteenth century. The grant of an iqṭāʿ to an amir of

46. ʿAlī ʿAlī had one fourth of the village of Mutbīn in the Nāḥiyat of Banū Kilāb as their timar. It yielded 1,350 akčes annually. It is most likely it was the same timar referred to in T. D. 998 which was mentioned in Hawrān without specifying the location. Their second timar was in the village of Nabk in the Nāḥiyat of Qārā. They had 3 1/5 qarts of the village which yielded 2,293 akčes annually. Their timar in Gaza gave a return of 26,080 akčes, and their timar in Marj and Qawṭa returned 9,670 akčes. T. D. 430, pp. 13, 350; T. D. 998, pp. 286, 289, 291.


48. al-ʿUmārī, Masālik, MS, vol. ii, part i, fol. 29a. Galqashandī,
'Arab-i Shām, customary under the Ayyūbids and the Mamlūks, was continued by the Ottomans as a timar. This yielded an annual sum of 7,193 akches. The amīr had to supply the Ottomans with 1,050 young camels every year; the value of each was 200 akches. In addition he had to provide them with 30 young horses each valued at 1,000 akches. The total value of these animals, which amounted to 240,000 akches, formed part of the revenues of the Sultan from the province of Damascus.

Available sources do not explain the prerogatives or the function of the post of the amīr neither do they shed any light upon his status in the administration of Syria. The qānūnname of Damascus does not refer to the Arab tribes nor to the function of the amīr. It is not clear whether the approval of the Sultan was needed for the recognition of the amīr by the Arab tribes and the officials in general.

According to Arabic sources the office was hereditary in the house of ʿAl Ḥayār of ʿAl Faql at Salamya. Mudlij b. Zāhir b. Asār b. Ijil al-Ḥayārī was amīr al-ʿArab in Bilād al-Shām under the last Mamlūks and he continued to hold this office under the Ottomans until his death in 945/1538. Mudlij, who


50. He had one fourth of the revenue of the village of Nāmir in the Nāḥiyat of Banū Mālik in Hawrān. According to T.D.430, it yielded 2,200 akches which later increased to 2,843 akches. This timar was exempted from ʿushr. He had another timar in the village of Masāwir in the Nāḥiyat of Banū Muqālid in Hawrān; it yielded 4,350 akches annually. T.D.430, p 543; T.D.401, pp.682, 686.


was reputed for his physical strength and his cruelty, came into conflict with the governor of Damascus ʻIsa Pasha Bak al-Fanārī (934/1523-937/1530). The causes of this conflict are not known. When ʻIsa tried to arrest Mudlij and kill him, he failed. When Mudlij died he was buried in the village of Asāwir; and his tomb was revered and visited by Bedouins who considered him to have been a man of sanctity. He exerted great influence and fear during his life. As previously mentioned, Mudlij and his tribe were commissioned by Sultan Selīm after the battle of Marj Dābiq to escort Mamlūks officials from Aleppo to Damascus whom he robbed on the journey. The amīr was a law to himself and no one disputed his decisions as the following anecdote shows. While Shaykh ʻAlī b. ʻAttya b. ʻUlwān al-Ḥamawī (d.936/1529) a renowned Sufi, was in seclusion (mustakiṭ) during the last third of Ramadān, Mudlij sent him three camels as a gift. Shaykh ʻUlwān was not able to refuse but, later, he gave orders to sell them and to distribute their price amongst the poor of the quarters in Ḥama; but nothing was to be given to the sufis there. Shaykh Shammaʻ (d.936/1529) commends his action by saying: “It was a wise policy where both the affairs of this mundane World and the Next were taken into consideration.”

After his death Mudlij was succeeded by his son Ẓahir; and there is no

---

53. Radī al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī, Durr, MS. Taśmyriyya, 2105., fol.181a. Nūrosmāniyya, No:3293, fols.212b-213a. I.U.A.Y. No:3190, fols.218a,b. al-Ghazzī, Kawākit, vol.II, p.250. Shaykh Badr al-Dīn al-Ghazzī, (d.984/1576) relates that while he and his companions were travelling to Istanbul in 936/1529 they passed by the people of Mudlij near Ḥama; one of his companions saw a woman cutting green wheat. He told that it was against Shārīa to do that. The woman replied, “Long live Mudlij, may God protect him, he allows us to do this and more”, al-Majallī, al-badriyyah fi al-manāzil al-Rūmīyya. MS. Kōprüld, No:1390, fol.21b. BM. Or.3621, fols.11a,b.

record of how long he retained his position before he was killed by one of his relatives called ʿAlmaḏ al-ʿUraḍī (d. 1026/1615) relates that Ẓāhir was near the camp of ʿAlmaḏ who invited him to a meal. As food was being served, ʿAlmaḏ took Ẓāhir by surprise and struck off his head with a sword he had concealed in his sleeve. ʿAlmaḏ then confiscated his property and assumed the chieftainship. Ẓāhir's son, Mudlij, sought refuge with his two uncles; Dandan and Fayyāḏ. Together they tried to avenge Ẓāhir but failed, as ʿAlmaḏ had the backing of most of the Arab tribes and was financially in a much better position than the avengers. It is said that during the last years of his life, ʿAlmaḏ associated with men of piety and began to repent. One day he met Dandan in the desert and offered him his life. Dandan refused and forgave him; and ʿAlmaḏ offered his daughter in marriage to Dandan. When ʿAlmaḏ died he was succeeded by his son Shādīd who is described as tyrannical and brutal. He was obsessed with committing unlawful acts and met his death in a tent near Aleppo while playing chess. Mudlij, the son of Ẓāhir, was among those present, and repeated ʿAlmaḏ's own tactics and stabbed him with a dagger he had hidden (1018/1609). Mudlij did not inherit the ʾimārah but his uncle Fayyāḏ assumed the position and retained it until his death in 1029/1618. His eldest son, Sayf, was not fit for the ʾimārah and Husayn his second son was too young. Nevertheless, the latter was recognized by the Arabs for a short

55. ʿAlmaḏ al-ʿUraḍī, ʿUmar, Maʿādin, MS. BM. Or:3618, fols.37a,b-33a.
56. The family kept its fortune in boxes in one tent which was well guarded day and night. Whoevver owned it was the amīr of all Arabs. Būrīṇī, Tarajīm, vol.ii, pp.239-40. Muḥibbi, Khulasat, vol.ii, p.222.
57. ʿAlmaḏ, fols.79a,b. al-ʿKhālidī, Tarīkh, p.80.
period, but when his cousin, Mudlij, disputed the succession and Mudlij became amīr they were outwardly reconciled. Each, however, secretly conspired against the other. Ḥusayn sought refuge with the Druze amīr of al-Shūr, Fakhr al-Ḍīn II who was approached by Mudlij to behead Ḥusayn. To cement the pact Mudlij offered his daughter in marriage to Fakhr al-Ḍīn’s son ‘Alī, and also the payment of 10,000 piastres together with ten horses. Fakhr al-Ḍīn refused this tempting proposal claiming that it was against his ethics and when Husayn left Fakhr al-Ḍīn in 1033/1623 he went to Aleppo. From there, he began to prey on Mudlij’s cattle. For the second time, Mudlij begged help from Fakhr al-Ḍīn but Fakhr al-Ḍīn, who had visited Mudlij’s camp, told him that it was out of the question to attack Husayn as it was winter and provisions would be in short supply.

One night, disguised as a woman, Husayn entered Mudlij’s tent but Mudlij’s wife who was Husayn’s step-mother, recognizing him, warned him and he fled.

Not long after Husayn fell into the hands of Murād Pasha, the governor of Aleppo (1033-5/1623-5). Murād wrote to Mudlij telling him that he would behead Husayn for 25,000 piastres which Mudlij paid immediately and Husayn was suffocated in 1033/1623. Murād, next, attacked the camp of Husayn, but Husayn’s followers repulsed him and stripped his soldiers of their clothes. This victory, however, did not prevent Mudlij from maintaining his position as amīr al-ʿArab.

III. Administrative and Tax-Farming Posts Entrusted to Bedouin Chieftains in the Province

After the occupation of Syria by Sulṭān Selīm in 922/1516, two Arab chieftains, Nāṣīr al-Ḍīn b. al-Ḥanash and Ṭarabāy b. Garāja allied themselves

59. For the genealogical tree of Al Ḥayār known as Al Abū Rīsha, see appendix No. 4.
with Selim. Nasir retained the administration of al-Biqā', Bayrūt and Sidon which he had held under the Mamluks. His sympathy extended, however, to sheltering some fugitive Mamluks and for this reason he lost the Sultan’s favour, and narrowly escaped arrest. Selim’s deputy, Jānbirdī al-Ghaṣalī, captured and executed him in 924/1518, and Ottoman officials were appointed to his office. When al-Ghaṣalī started his rebellion against the Ottomans in 926/1520, he dismissed Sinān the Ottoman governor of al-Biqā' and its dependencies and appointed the muqaddam (local chieftain) Ahmad, son of the murdered Nāṣir al-Dīn, in his place. By his acceptance of this appointment, Ahmad reinstated himself and his family in al-Biqā', but available sources give no information of Ottoman reaction towards him after Jānbirdī’s collapse. Nevertheless, the family continued to enjoy an influential position in the area, although the fate of Ahmad remains obscure.

Muḥammad, a brother of Ahmad, is described in a waqfiyya dated 950/1543 as the amīr of al-Biqā', Karak-Nūḥ and their dependencies. According to this waqfiyya, he endowed the cemetery of the tomb alleged to be that of the prophet Noah, with two watermills, three orchards, nine pieces of land and the halves of two other orchards, for its maintenance. It is evident, from this, that he owned land and was obviously wealthy.


61. A MS copy of this waqfiyya is preserved in the Mudiriyat al-Awqāf in Damascus dated 905/1499, but this should probably be 950/1543 since it mentions "the late Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Hanash" and it is known that he was killed in 924/1518. Among the signatories were Husayn Harfūsh, who had a zi'āmat in 977/1565, and his cousins, 'Awwād bey and 'Aṭī bey, the sons of Muḥammad b. ‘Assāf al-Ḥanash, Sijillāt Awqāf Dimashq, vol.ii, pp.196-200. T.D.474, p.509. The genealogy of the Hanash family was as follows:—
Muhammad was among the Arab chieftains who in 976/1568 were delegated to receive the Safavid minister Naṣūm bey (d. 976/1568) who was passing through Damascus on his way to Mecca as a pilgrim. Armed tribesmen and some Ottoman soldiers of Damascus formed a double line along the road between Damascus and the village of Ḥarasfa, about eight kilometres to the north of Damascus. He was also amongst the Arab chieftains to whom a hülkūm (order) was sent by the Sultan on the 14th of Rabī‘ I 976/6th September, 1568, commanding them on threat of punishment not to accept exemption money (badal) from qualified archers drafted to serve under Mustafa Pasha, the governor of Damascus, when he was sent to fight rebels in the Yaman. Muhammad was, also, a tax-farmer

62. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols. 126a, b. Naṣūm bey served the Safavid administration under Shāh Ṭahmāsp I (930–84/1542–76) as military commander, amīr al-dīvān and wazīr. In 976/1568 he made a pilgrimage in order to rouse pro-Safavid Sufis against the Ottomans. The people of the Mahallat al-Kharab area in Damascus were overjoyed on his arrival. It was said that he felt Damascus and its surroundings worthy of being the Shāh’s seat.

On learning this, the Sultan issued a hülkūm for his execution.


for Karak-Nūḥ and for al-Shūf. In 976/1568 he owed the treasury of Damascus 13,334 gold pieces (sikke altun). With an escort of three or four of his men, he went to Damascus with 4,000 gold pieces in part payment of his debt. But while he was there a rebellion (isyān) broke out in the city and he was killed. His escort disappeared together with the money. The defterdar of Damascus reported the matter to the Sultan who commanded the governor, the qādi, and the defterdar to carry out an immediate investigation, and to act according to the Shari‘a. They were to use any means to collect the mal-i mīrī and the property of the escort was to be confiscated until the money was forthcoming. 64

At the time of Nāṣir’s dismissal, he had written to Sultan Selim referring to the land he had cultivated and of which he was probably the owner. 65

Tapu Defters prepared under Sultan Süleyman or Selim II do not mention either the name of the Hanash Family or any land which may have been their property.

Nor were they included in the timar system as was the Qawwas Family, in Shaqshab, whose head, Yūnus, allied himself with al-Ghazālī in his rebellion. 66

64. M.D. xiv, No:1487, 17th Safar 977, p.1000.
65. Topkapı Saray Arşivi, No:10734.
66. Yūnus b. Gāwwās at the head of his tribesmen was one of the main supporters of Jāmbirdi al-Ghazālī in his rebellion. He was beheaded later in 927/1521 by Iyās Pasha. In spite of that, members of his family benefitted from the timar system. Ahmad b. Gāwwās in 935/1528 had a timar yielding 2,502 akches annually. Muhammad had a zī‘amet, the available recorded yield being 1,666 akches yearly, which later increased to 17,703 akches. Mudlij the son of Yūnus started with a timar yielding 4,662 akches which in 952/1545 had increased to 5,999 akches. In 961/1553 he was promoted for his gallantry in action against the Hutaym tribes and his income increased to 9,920 akches. Ibn Ṭulun, al-Ṭam, p.237. T.D.,169, pp.50, 194, 202. T.D.423, p.110. M.M., No:17642, p.30.
With the death of Muhammad in 976/1568 political prestige of
the Hanash family came to an end. From then onwards, a hitherto humble
Bedouin family by the name of Furaykh began to assume influence. Mansur,
its head, began life as a farm labourer (sing. ra'jdd). He became known as
a scourge of lawlessness and as a man of great courage. In 981/1573
together with a certain Ibn Shihab and three thousand of their joint followers,
attacked and plundered several villages in the region of Acre. Fifty or sixty
of its inhabitants were killed, and although the Sultan commanded the
arrest and punishment of all rebels no further action appears to have
been taken against him. The Ottomans became aware of his qualities as an
administrator and he was given the government of al-Biqâ'. Mansur hated
the Druze and the Shi'a and suggested that it was the Druze who were respon-
sible for the robbery of the Egyptian tribute in the vicinity of the Bay of 'Akkâr
in 992/1584. Ibrahim Pasha, the former Ottoman viceroy in Egypt, on his way
back to Istanbul, attacked the Druze amir, Qarqmas b. Man and devastated
many villages in the Shuf. Shortly after the destruction of the Druze amir, the
governments of Nablus, Safad and Ajlun were given to Mansur in addition
to that of al-Biqâ'. He took this opportunity to employ forced labour (sulhra) to

67 In the seventeenth century references were made to members of a
family by the name of Hanash in Homs and they were mentioned as
Bayt al-Hanash; if they belonged to the Hanash of al-Biqâ' this
indicates that part or all the family had migrated to Homs. Muḥātkarāt
ahad abnā' madinat Homs, 1100-1135, MS. at the Library of the
American University of Beirut, MS. No 956-9, T.181, pp.315,
353, 406, 407. I would like to thank Dr. A. Rafeq of the University
of Damascus, who drew my attention to this manuscript and
provided me with this information.


69 Heyd, U., Ottoman documents, pp.84-5, pp. For Acre see Buhl, F.,

build himself two palaces, one at Gubb Ilyās in al-Biqā‘ and, for the other in Damascus, white marble was brought from the coast together with red stone from al-Biqā‘.

In 998/1589 and 999/1590 he rose to even greater prominence when he was appointed as amīr al-hājlī. 71 Gorqmās, his son, was entrusted with the charge of al-Biqā‘. 72 He was also to have met his father en route from Mecca on the 19th of Jāfar 999/17 December, 1590. Gorqmās, however, was arrested and, on Saturday 16th of Rabī‘ I the same year, 12th January 1591, was released as suddenly. It would seem that the governor tried to extract money from him and succeeded in obtaining 11,000 Sultanis upon which he was appointed Subāshī of Sidon and Bayrūt. On the dismissal of Sinān Pāsha, the Grand Vizier in Istanbul, who was the patron of the Furaykhīs, his son Muḥammad the governor of Damascus was also dismissed. Gānṣūḥ al-Ghazzāwī, the previous amīr of ‘Ajlūn, who had been displaced by Mansūr b. Furaykh, wrote to the Sultān pleading his own cause; Mansūr’s behaviour, he said, had given cause for complaint. Perhaps, because of the complaint on the 25th of Muḥarram 1000/7th December 1591, a hākim arrived in Damascus which ordered the arrest of Gorqmās and his father who was returning from Mecca at the head of the pilgrims. About one hundred janissaries were sent to al-Biqā‘ to arrest Gorqmās, and he was brought in chains to Damascus. On the 27th of Muḥarram/9th December, the governor’s stewards (sing. katkhūdā) were sent to Ṣafad to confiscate his property. Orders were issued to arrest Mansūr but it was said that Mansūr escaped by bribery. Contrary to the wishes of the Druze amīr, Fakhr al-Dīn II, who desired their death, neither Mansūr nor Gorqmās was harmed. Gorqmās was released and his father was allowed to go free.

72. al-Burūnī, Tahālim, fols.48a,b.
Fakhr al-Dīn’s opportunity came in the year 1001/1592 when
the new governor of Damascus, Murād Pāsha, landed in Sidon on his
way to Damascus. He was well received by Fakhr al-Dīn, who poisoned
his mind against Mansūr and his son. On the arrival of Murād Pāsha in
Damascus he declared an amnesty for Mansūr. To gain his confidence, Murād
Pāsha invited himself to lunch in Mansūr’s house. Later, Murād apologized
for circumstances which rendered him unable to attend and asked Mansūr
to bring the food to the government house. Mansūr acceded to his request
and was summarily arrested. Murād wrote to Istanbul asking for instructions
and a hilmām was sent to execute him. This was implemented on Tuesday,
13th of Rabī‘ II 1002/6 January 1594. The governor instructed Fakhr al-Dīn
to arrest Qorqās who was, at that time, in the village of Bawārīsh in al-Biqa‘.
Qorqās with about one hundred musketeers fled to Yusuf Pāsha Sayfā asking for
asylum. This was refused and his followers gradually dispersed. In 1003/1594
Qorqās fell into the hands of the Shi‘ite amīr Mūsā b. Harūsh who, impelled
by Fakhr al-Dīn, killed him. With the removal of the Sunnite family of
Furaykh, al-Biqa‘ and its dependencies as well as Sidon and Bayrūt, passed into
the hands of Fakhr al-Dīn II. One immediate result was that the governor of
Damascus came into direct contact with a Druze amīr who controlled not only the
Shūf but the coastal area stretching from Bayrūt to Tyre, a development which
led ultimately to the defeat of Fakhr al-Dīn and his execution in Istanbul in
1045/1635.

Sulṭān Selīm confirmed Ṭarabāy b. Qarāja in the position

73. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.49-50. Ibn Ayyūb, Rawd, fols.213b-
he had previously held under the Mamluks as amir al-darbayn (amir of the two roads: Damascus—Uyun al-Tujjar-Cairo and Damascus—Uyun al-Tujjar-Jerusalem) of Marj Banū 'Amir. Relations between the victorious Sultan and Tarabāy were cordial to the extent that the Sultan wrote a personal communication, informing him of the victory at Raydāniyya and commanding him to arrest any fugitive Mamluks and to establish firm control of the territory under his authority. Tarabāy reciprocated with congratulations on the Sultan's victory and assured him that he was in firm control of all routes. In addition he emphasized his care of the people and his determination to improve the land. Tarabāy was among those who bade Sultan Selim farewell when he left Damascus; in this connection he was described as the nāʿib (governor) of Safad.

According to the preamble of a Tapu Defter dated 945/1538, Tarabāy was a tax-farmer of villages in Marj Banū 'Arna, Nabiyyat Banū Kinā, Banū Jahmah and in Nabiyyat Qāqūn in the Sanjaq of Nablus. The area under his jurisdiction comprised 1,232 households, 10 bachelors and an imām. He collected as much as 1,042,608 akches annually. This amount, undoubtedly, indicates his importance.

75. Ibn Tulūn, Mushakhat, vol.ii, p.82. For the general history of this family see von Oppenheim, Max Fröherr, Die Beduinen, Band II (Leipzig, 1943), pp.51-5.
76. For the names of these villages and their revenue and for the census of the population see T.D.192, pp.1-77.
Tarabay survived at least until 957/1553 when he is mentioned in a Maliya Defter as the holder of iqta'. His family, together with Banū Tūba, Banū ʿHasan and Banū ʿSakhr, were in a state of rebellion in 959/1551 but despite this, it appears that they retained control of Lajjun.

In 966/1559 ʿAli b. Tarabay was among those Arab chieftains who received a hülkâm from Sultan Süleyman commanding the arrest of Prince Bāyezīd who was trying to escape to the Arab lands. In a hülkâm dated 972/1564 a certain Kamāl is described as the bey of Lajjun which probably indicates that the Ottomans endeavoured to get rid of the family of Tarabay. It would appear that the family was reinstated because in 975/1571 ʿAssāf b. Tarabay received a hülkâm from Sultan Selim II written in Arabic praising him for his care in guarding the roads which passed through Lajjun between Damascus and Cairo. A few months later, ʿAssāf requested the grant of the Sanjaq of Nablus in return for guarding its roads and the collection of revenues including the arrears of the previous ten years. He also offered to establish law and order in this Sanjaq and promised to build a tower (burj) at Khān ʿHamār on the highway to Cairo between Qāqūn and Jaljūlya, a resort of brigands. ʿAssāf’s request was not granted.

---

77. For his iqta' and revenues see T.D.401, pp.611, 614, 630, 637. M.M. No:15543, pp.48-9. See also T.D.192, p.10, for a watermill he owned and which yielded 2,700 akches to the treasury.

78. K.888, Sultan Ahmet III Library, fols.32a-b. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.95-6. Āl-ʿUthmānī mentions that Lajjun constituted part of the ʿamal of Marj Banū ʿAmir in the province of Ṣafād. It was inhabited by Yāmānī tribes. Tārīkh, p.483. See also Qalqashandi, Subh, vol.IV, pp.154-5. Yāqūt also describes it, Muṣjam, vol.IV, p.351. See also Le Strange, C., Palestine under the Moslems (London, 1890), pp.39, 41, 492.


82. Heyd, Ottoman documents, pp.106-110.
perhaps because he failed to join the Ottoman campaign against Persia as commanded. In 991/1583 he was dismissed from Lajjun. At that time rebellions were widespread and it was feared that he might have joined them. The new Sanjaq bey of Lajjun and timar holders were granted military exemption in order to restore law and order. 'Assaf was exiled to Rhodes but he appealed to the Sultan for pardon and pledged himself to make Lajjun prosperous if it were given to him. The Sultan issued a hukum to the governor of Damascus in 997/1589 instructing him to allow 'Assaf to settle in the town of Lajjun together with his people. From Qaaqun to Qunaytira would be 'Assaf's responsibility and the governor was to report his achievement to the Sultan. If he were successful 'Assaf would be given a sanjaq. 'Assaf went to Damascus a year later, in the hope of receiving the promised sanjaq but he was arrested and killed there by the governor's order.

'Assaf was succeeded by his nephew Tarabay the son of Ali; and Tarabay governed in Lajjun until his death in 1013/1601. He was followed by his son Ahmad who retained the government of Lajjun until his death in 1057/1647. During his long reign he came into conflict with Fakhr al-Din II. In 1021/1612 he gave asylum to the amir's bitter enemy, the Kurdish Sunnite chieftain Yusuf Pasha Sayfa and refused to kill him in accordance with the desire of Fakhr al-Din. In the following year Ahmad and Yusuf, together with
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the governor of Damascus joined against Fakhr al-Din. Relations improved slightly after Fakhr al-Din's return from Tuscany in 1027/1617, when Ahmad sent a number of horses to him by his Ketkhuda (steward). In the following year Fakhr al-Din cultivated a piece of land near the estate of Ahmad and gave half its produce to Ahmad. Relations began to deteriorate when in 1032/1622, Fakhr al-Din plundered Ahmad's villages as part of his own expansion. A battle was fought at a point of the River 'Awjā, north of Jaffa. Ahmad repulsed Fakhr al-Din and regained the booty taken from his villages. Again in 1033/1623, Ahmad defeated the army of Fakhr al-Din near the 'Awjā River and peace was concluded between them.

At his death Ahmad was succeeded by his eldest son Zayn who ruled until he died in 1071/1660. Zayn's brother Muhammad was next in succession and ruled until his death in 1082/1671. During the next six years, three of Muhammad's nephews ruled for short periods. By 1088/1677 the family had virtually ceased to be a ruling power when an Ottoman official Ahmad Pasha al-Tarazi was appointed to govern Lajjun. The family remained there, as records show that Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi (d.1143/1731), the great Sufi of Damascus, visited Jinin on his journey to Jerusalem and met the surviving amirs of the Tarabāy family. Concerning them, he says "They are

---

90. al-Khalidi, Tarikh, pp.22, 25.
91. al-Khalidi, Tarikh, pp.69, 86.
92. al-Khalidi, Tarikh, pp.140-1, 186-9, 197-8.
Administrative posts were given to members of the Ghazzawi family in the Sanjaq of 'Ajlun by the Ottomans. Sources mention the name of Muhammad b. Sāid al-Ghazzawi, who rebelled more than once against the Mamluks and against whom Sultan Selim sent a punitive expedition in 922/1516. The outcome of this expedition appears to have ended with co-operation between him and the Ottomans. In 923/1517 while Sultan Selim was preparing to despatch the caravan of pilgrims to Mecca, Muhammad informed him that there was chaos on the road to Mecca owing to disagreement among the tribes, and that the pool of al-Ukhaydir was low during that year. This report compelled the Sultan to cancel the caravans to Mecca. His relations with Jānbirdī al-Ghazāli during his vice-royalty were most likely not cordial, since al-Ghazāli had caused a son and a grandson of Muhammad to be hanged in Damascus. It seems therefore improbable that he supported al-Ghazāli in his rebellion.

Available sources do not refer to the status given to Muhammad by the Ottomans nor do they mention the date of his death. After his death, the head of the family was Qānṣūh b. Masādah b. Muslim al-Ghazzawi. He wrote a letter to the Sultan from which he first appears as being in the service of the pilgrims' caravan. His first appointment in 959/1551 was when he was made governor of Karak-Shawbak. The Sultan issued two hukūms commanding the governor of Damascus to help Qānṣūh to reconstruct and revive the land. The governor was also told to co-operate with him and assist him in keeping

in check the Bedouin tribes, especially Hutm and al-Umr as they habitually made hit and run attacks on the inhabitants of the sanjaq, and to retreat to neighbouring sanjaqs such as Jerusalem and Nablus. Neighbouring officials were warned not to allow the Bedouins to take refuge in their sanjaqs, and, if they did so, they were to be arrested and handed back to be tried in accordance with the Sharī'a. If necessary, sanjaqbeys were to mobilize their military forces to help Qānṣūh in his work. Available sources do not record either the success or the failure of Qānṣūh or how long he was a sanjaqboy of Karak-Shawbak. After that he served for four years as the sanjaqboy of ‘Ajlūn. It is probable that he was there between 972/1564 and 976/1568 because in 976/1568 the Sulfān wrote to the governor of Damascus informing him that he had heard that Qānṣūh was oppressing the people and that he was to arrest Qānṣūh and interrogate him. If guilty, he must be made to give restitution to the people. Qānṣūh was asked to answer for several offences. He was reputed to have appropriated 15,000 gold pieces which had been allocated for the reconstruction and repair of the pool of Qatrāna on the pilgrim route to Mecca. Moreover, while he was sanjaqboy of ‘Ajlūn, he promised the treasury of Damascus 20,000 filori which he did not pay. The governor was instructed to arrest Qānṣūh by strategy if necessary. Qānṣūh was offered 1,000 akchas which he was to collect in person, thus exposing himself to easy arrest, where he could be forced to redeem his
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broken promises. He was also accused of inciting rebellion amongst
the tribes. However, every attempt to arrest him either by strategy
or force failed.

It appears that the Sultan decided to exploit Qansuh's influence
among the Bedouins by appointing him as amir al-haji in 977/1569. In
this connection, when he informed the Sultan that the citadel near the pool
of Ziyya en route to Mecca was in bad condition, the Sultan instructed the
governor of Damascus to send builders to repair it. The next year,
Qansuh was not appointed amir al-haji because Salamah b. Nu'aym and
Naṣrullah, the two Shaykhs of the Mafarrijah tribes, were in conflict with him.
The governor of Damascus appointed Uqab, a relative of Salamah, to the post.
Muḥammad Bahri, amir akhur of the pilgrims' caravan, submitted a report to the
Sultan in 978/1570 about this matter and he pointed out that Qansuh belonged
to the kizilli (Red = Qaysis) faction. Salamah belonged to the Akili (White =
Yamanis) and emphasized that there were thirty-five stations en route to Mecca.
Moreover, only three of them were kizilli while the rest were Akili. He
therefore recommended that it was preferable for the amir al-haji to be an
Akili but the Sultan appointed Radwan, the sanjaqbe of Gaza, as amir
al-haji and reappointed Qansuh as sanjaqbe of Karak-Shawbak. Qansuh's

duties were to control the Bedouins, maintain law and order and protect
the pilgrims. Qānṣūh and his son Muḥammad, the ayyāb of ‘Ajlūn, were
commanded, also, to receive the pilgrims on their return journey. 108
Salāmah was given the māshyakha in Hawrān as a compensation; and the
Sultan urged the governor of Damascus to reconcile him with Qānṣūh
in order to avoid disorder. 109

In a letter to the Sultan, Qānṣūh described the situation in the
Sanjaq of Karak-Shawbak. He said that he was given this sanjaq to restore law
and order. No crops were to be found as the inhabitants were in a state of
rebellion. Some of them had cultivated small patches on top of the mountains.
Owing to the lack of provisions and of stable population, no official could
remain there. It was difficult for him to subdue the inhabitants as they were
a roving population. He also explained the causes of his conflict with Salāmah
b. Nuṣaym and his relative Naṣrullah. He said that each had asked for too
much for the use of the camels they supplied to the pilgrims’ caravan.
Qānṣūh added that during his service with the pilgrims’ caravan for thirty-five
years he had been able to gain the confidence of the tribes; and thus could
reduce the hiring price from 10–12 to 1–2 filoris. Similarly, money for loads
had been reduced from 12 to 5–6 filoris. During his preparation for the
caravan in 978/1570, he received news that he had been dismissed. The tribes
dispersed immediately and as a result, high prices were again charged, the cost
of loads reaching 15 filoris. As for the money he owed while he was sanjaqāb
of ‘Ajlūn for four years, he claimed that he would pay it to the treasury of
Damascus; he had barely saved one hundred to two hundred filoris a year.

He promised if the two sanjaqs of ‘Ajlūn and Karak-Shawbak were united
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under him; and if his son Muhammad were granted a zirāmet instead of a timar, he would not only pay the treasury of Damascus 10,000 gold pieces annually but he would, also, ensure the pilgrims' safe conduct at all the stations.

The Sultan wrote to the governor of Damascus enquiring whether Qansuh had paid the five thousand filori he had promised when he was given the Sanjaq of 'Ajlūn. He also enquired if Qansuh had paid any money, as he claimed, to the treasury of Damascus, and if so what amount. The Sultan also commanded the governor to collect all money due from him. The investigation proved that while he was Sanjaqboy of 'Ajlūn he paid the treasury of Damascus 5,000 gold pieces from his private purse. In addition, as amir al-ḥajj, he had paid from his money 9,000 gold pieces for renting 3,000 camels.

Qansuh's request was partly met when he was reaffirmed in the Sanjaq of Karak-Shawbak from the 24th Ramadan 979/9th February 1572. In the same year, he was also appointed amir al-ḥajj with full authority. More than that, when he requested the appointment of his son Muhammad as receiver of the caravan on its return, his request was granted. In order to arrange for the supply of camels, he kept from the revenues of Karak-Shawbak 160,000 akches. In the first two years he paid for the camels but in the third year he claimed that there was no revenue from Karak-Shawbak; and the Sultan commanded the treasury of Damascus to pay it for him. In 984/1576, upon
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Qānṣūh's request, the governor of Damascus and the governors of Ṣafad, Jerusalem and Lajjun in Palestine were commanded by the Sulṭān to help him to subdue the rebellious Bedouins of al-‘Aṣārījah and to assist him to ensure the security of the pilgrims. 115

Qānṣūh served as amīr al-ḥājj until 994/1585. In this year Ibrahīm Pāsha, the former viceroy of Egypt, was on his way back to Istanbul. When he arrived in Damascus, Arab chieftains visited him with the exception of Qānṣūh who refused to go to Damascus. When Ibrahīm Pāsha arrived in Istanbul he roused the Sulṭān's anger against Qānṣūh and the Sulṭān issued a hūkūm for his arrest. At the time Qānṣūh was in charge of the pilgrims' caravan. When he returned he was arrested and jailed in the citadel. Shortly after, he was sent to Istanbul. When he was brought before the Sulṭān, the latter, touched by his dignity, ordered his release and confirmed him as amīr al-ḥājj. In 996/1587 the governor of Damascus, Sinān Pāsha, a follower of Ibrahīm Pāsha, sent a certain Abu Sayfāyn to the Sanjaq of Ajlūn with the instructions to arrest Qānṣūh. Fighting broke out and Abu Sayfāyn with about 50 janissaries were killed. Sinān Pāsha himself hastened to avenge Abu Sayfāyn. When Qānṣūh learned this he fled with his men into the wilderness. In this year Sinān was made Grand Vizier and his son Muḥammad succeeded him as the governor of Damascus. Until Sinān and his son Muḥammad were dismissed from their respective offices in 999/1590, Qānṣūh was out of favour. On hearing of the dismissal of Sinān, he, together with his son Ahmad, set out for Istanbul. There he received a gift and was well treated by the Sulṭān. On the 10th Muharram 1000/28th October 1591 Qānṣūh died at Üsküdar (Scutari) and his funeral was attended by many people. The Sulṭān appointed his son Ahmad as sanjaqboy of Ajlūn. 115.
During his period of office as amīr al-ḥājj, Qānṣūh was described as being kind and helpful and the Bedouins obeyed him. In Damascus he built a mosque and gave money to the Umayyad ijmāʿ. He was married to the daughter of a Damascene merchant, Zayn al-Īn, who was known as Aʿwaj al-Raqaba. Qānṣūh built himself a residence in Damascus. It is significant that his requests to Istanbul were never refused. 116

Ahmad succeeded his father in the Sanjaqs of ʿAjlūn and Karak-Shawbak. He did not oppress people but, like his father, he was overcareful with money. His death was sudden and there were rumours that he was poisoned by the governor of Damascus; but al-Būrīnī regards this simply as a mere allegation. 117 He was succeeded by his son Hāmdān, who was dismissed from his office by the governor of Damascus, Ḥāfitz Pāsha, in 1021/1612. ʿAmr the Shaykh of Mafārijah, was also dismissed from the mashyakha, which was given to Rashīd, the head of the Sardiyya tribe, a branch of Mafārijah. Hāmdān and ʿAmr sought refuge with Fayyād al-Ḥayārī in the Sanjaq of Hama. From there he went to Fakhr al-Ṭīn; and on their way to him they were engaged in a fight with the tribes loyal to Rashīd. In a later engagement the combined forces of Fakhr al-Ṭīn, Hāmdān and ʿAmr defeated the forces of the governor together with his allies near al-Muzayriḥ on Friday the first of Rabīʿ I 1022/21 April 1613. As a result of this victory Hāmdān reinvested himself with the Sanjaq of ʿAjlūn. 118 Ḥāfitz Pāsha mobilized his forces and those loyal to him against Fakhr al-Ṭīn and his supporters. Fakhr al-Ṭīn, who realized
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the futility of fighting the strong army under Hāfiz, was forced by circumstances to leave for Tuscany. Without his help Ḥamdān was defeated and sought refuge among the al-Ṭayyid tribes in Gaza. He asked pardon from Hāfiz Pasha which was granted. In 11025/1616 he was reappointed to the Sanjaq of ‘Ajlūn. When he assumed authority he ordered his brother Sayf, who had co-operated with Rashīd and Hāfiz Pasha against him, to be beheaded. His second brother Bāshir, who was in agreement with Sayf, sought refuge with Shaykh Rashīd in al-Balqa’. Both of them attacked Ḥamdān during the night and he was accidentally injured by a soldier guarding his tent and died shortly after in 1025/1616. He was succeeded by his son Ahmad who was at first backed by Fakhr al-Dīn, who had returned to al-Shūf. In 1032/1622 Fakhr al-Dīn discarded him and managed to acquire a hākīm securing the sanjaq of ‘Ajlūn for his infant son Ḥusayn.

IV Disturbances and Uprisings of the Bedouin Arabs

The Arab tribes in the vicinity of Damascus caused the governors a perpetual irritation. During the transitional period, when the whole province
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122. Rashīd the head of the Sardiyya tribe, a branch of Mafārijah, helped in 1018/1609 in receiving the pilgrims. He contended the Mashyakha against ʿAmr b. Jabr, the recognized Shaykh of Mafārijah. In a fight in 1018, ʿAmr was able to defeat Rashīd who sent two of his nephews, Ahmad and Shuwayyi, to Shadīd, ʿamīr of Al Hayr in Ḥama, and to Kanān, a senior janissary in Damascus to seek their support. Both nephews died of plague during that year. In the ensuing fight, Rashīd was victorious. He enjoyed the support of Shaykh Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Fahīlī Shaykh Al Mīrā. Burinī, Tarājim, vol. ii, pp.224-5. Khalīdi, Tarīkh, pp.8-11.
123. al-Khalīdi, Tarīkh, pp.48-9.
124. al-Khalīdi, Tarīkh, p.118.
was entrusted to Jānbirdī al-Ghazālī, he was able to draw them to his side.

Some of them assisted him in his rebellion, but when the Ottoman forces advanced they deserted him. Their aggression against villages in al-
Ghawja and al-Majr and against caravans were ceaseless. For example, in 931/1524 Āl Ālī attacked al-Majr. A battle took place between them and the people of the villages. Lutfi Pasha, the governor of Damascus at that time, hastened to fight Āl Ālī and he arrested two of their Shaykhs: Shuwaykh and his cousin Abu Ḥamrā and both of them were executed in Damascus. Three years later, Āl Ālī attacked an Aleppo caravan near al-Qastal, about eleven kilometres to the south of Nabk, and twenty men from the caravan were killed. They may have attacked the caravan because in that year there was little rain and the whole country suffered from drought.

Hükmums issued from Istanbul to the governor of Damascus imply that there was lively trading between the Bedouins in the vicinity of the city and its merchants. In order to curb the activities of the Bedouins in 959/1551 the Sultan commanded the governor to enforce an economic boycott against the Bedouins and the deportation of any merchant who had dealings with them. These orders are to be found in a letter sent in reply to a report submitted to the Sultan by the governor of Damascus. In this report the governor pointed out that "Very many of the people of the province are in partnership with the Bedouins in regard to wool (?) and sheep... And there are also some fief holders
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whose relations with the Bedouins have never been broken off. Whenever there is a matter of an action against the Bedouins planned at Damascus they cause knowledge of it to reach the Bedouins. Thereupon the Bedouins strike tents and move off to a place a four or five days' journey away." It appears from this that the policy adopted by the Ottomans to curb the activities of the Bedouins was not entirely successful. In 972/1564 most of the tribes in the vicinity of Damascus were in a state of rebellion. An armed force from Damascus was sent against them. Among the tribes attacked were Banū Nuʿaym who lost 60 of their own men. In addition, the property of the tribe was plundered, and some of its members were arrested. The Banū Nuʿaym protested their innocence to the Sultan and denied any connection with the rebels. The Sultan issued a hıkâtûm commanding the three judges of Damascus, Tripoli and Hama to investigate the case. If they were innocent, prisoners were to be freed and their property was to be returned to them in accordance with the Shariʿa. Unfortunately, the result of the investigation is not available.

There is little information available concerning the activities of Āl Faḍl. It was reported in 992/1584 that 15 men from the branch of Abū Rūsha of Āl Faḍl together with 12 men from Baylabakk admitted in court that they had molested travelers, looted Muslims and attacked caravans on their way to Damascus. On one occasion they had robbed 43 loaded camels and 43 loaded mules, and killed some of the men escorting the caravan. The Bedouins of Abū Rūsha in 1017/1609 allied themselves with the outlawed Sukbān.

who had fled to Syria. Armed with rifles, 400 sukban and Abu Risha people using lances and swords attacked and occupied the two citadels of al-Caṣṭal and Qufayfa. Kūchūk Sinān Pāsha, the governor of Damascus, supported by the Naṣārījah tribe under the command of 'Amr b. Jabr attacked and defeated them near al-Gatrāni. Three hundred of the Sukban were killed and fifty were captured. They were brought to Damascus carrying poles on which they were impaled on the 6th Dhul Hijja of the same year/13 March 1609. 131

In the region of Ḥawrān, timars and promotions were awarded to people who showed gallantry in fighting the rebellious Banū Hutaym and Banū Saʿīd in the years 960/1552 and 961/1553. 132 A new strategy adopted by the Ottomans was to pretend kindness to Bedouins until they fell into captivity and then punish them as uncivilized (wahshi) people. 133 The Ottomans, also, continued to practice a harsh policy against tribes when they rebelled. When Banū Ṣakhr, in 959/1551, rebelled and occupied four villages in the neighbourhood of Jabal (Lajah) and dispersed their inhabitants, the governor was commanded to use any means to bring to an end the activities of these evil-doers (ahl-i faṣād). His task, however, was rendered extremely difficult by the 600 people who guarded the routes, as part of the road patrol (darak) system, as they sympathised with Banū Ṣakhr and condoned their escape to the neighbouring Sanjaqs of Safad, Nablus and Jerusalem. In addition some of this tribe were allying themselves with the rebellious Ṭarabāyās. 134
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When in 967/1556 Bedouin insurrections in 'Ajlūn increased and spread to the neighbouring Sanjaqs of Damascus, Safad, Nablus, Jerusalem and Karak-Shawbak, the Sultan gave orders to establish a fortress in 'Ajlūn manned with soldiers to keep rebels in check. In 975/1567 the governor of Damascus was ordered by the Sultan that all large arrows with "flat, wide, iron heads" together with bows and daggers used by the Bedouins were to be collected from markets and to be distributed among the various citadels on the route to Mecca. By this means the Bedouins would lose their source of weapon supplies and thus be held in check. The Sultan also commanded the establishment of a fortress in Buṣrā (Bostra) in Southern Hawran for the same purpose.

Part of the constructive policy of the Sultan appears to have centred around the safety of caravans and travellers. In order to maintain a regular and fast postal service the Sultan ordered that post-horses should be stationed along the road from Kān Kūy (Saʿsa‘) to al-ʿArish. There were ten such stations and forty-five families exempted from the tekālīf-i ʿārīyya (Sultanic impositions) were to be settled in each station in order to look after the horses. In 985/1578 a village was established at the spot most vulnerable to Bedouin attacks, where two hundred such households were to be
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settled there also with tax exemption. Markets were also established in Sa'sa' and Khan al-Tujjar with the purpose of improving the economic conditions of the Muslims and to increase the revenues. It seems that the Sultan with this hope gave his consent to the Grand Vizier Sinan Pasha in 998/1589 to build three caravansarays in Qufayfa, Sa'sa' and 'Uyun al-Tujjar where food could be served free to travellers. The Sultan's enthusiasm was further manifested by the instructions he issued to the deffterdar of Damascus to bear the expenses of construction which would be reimbursed by the Grand Vizier in Istanbul.

The pilgrims' caravans from Damascus were vulnerable to attacks by the Mafarrijah tribe which al-Ghazālī succeeded in subduing. Moreover, in 926/1519, when Salāmah b. Fawwāz, better known as Jughaymān, their chieftain, met the pilgrims near al-Zarqa' he talked to their commander and no harm was done. In the same year, however, Jughaymān with about 10,000 of his followers attacked the Egyptian pilgrim caravan near al-Azlam but the commander, together with his few escorting units, repulsed the attack. From that year on, military squadrons were assigned to accompany the Egyptian caravan. In addition, Jughaymān was assigned one thousand dinārs a year for life, an amount which his heirs continued to receive. His brother-in-law 'Āmir b. 'Āmir b. Dā'ud, amīr of Banū 'Uqba acted as a guarantor to Jughaymān.
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In 931/1524 the commander of the Damascene caravan failed to pay Jughayman his dues, he attacked the caravan but was repulsed by the commander’s guns. After this, the governor of Damascus resumed the plan of a military escort to meet the pilgrims near al-Azlam and al-Ulā on route to Damascus. In 937/1530 Mullhim, one of the heads of Mafarrijah, made a fierce attack on the pilgrims. He intercepted them in Dhat Ḥajj and when he failed to capture them he withdrew to Tabūk where he filled its pool with cut palm trees thus preventing pilgrims from using the water. From Tabūk he went to al-Ukhaydir and poured ground colocynth (hanzal) into the pool, and to Muʿazzam pool which he choked with the corpses of beasts. Fierce fighting broke out between him and the pilgrims who gained the ascendancy over him but, in spite of their victory, suffered great losses. Many pilgrims had died of thirst and the rest were forced to take the Gaza-Damascus route. A citadel at al-Ukhaydir was built in the following year by order of Sultan Suleyman to counteract the threat. It was manned by twenty janissaries from Damascus. Taxes were collected there on goods and part of it was spent to cover the expenses accrued.

The insurgence of the tribes was not felt only by the pilgrims but was also directed against villages. In his ḥulūl to the governor of Damascus 959/1551 Sultan Suleyman described the destruction in the Nahiyat of Salt. He wrote that in a letter he had received from the governor of Ajlūn and the qādī of Karak, Salt was in a state of ruin. Since Bilāl bey (?) had ceased
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to govern, no one now listened to officials coming from Karak. Tribes
attacked fields and plundered wheat and barley from the villages. In
'Ajlūn itself there was no control and even the amount of 150,000 akhes
registered in the Khaqān-i Defter and due for collection could not be entirely
collected because some villages were in a state of rebellion. The governor
of 'Ajlūn and the qādi of Karak asked for the permanent stationing of 300
janissaries in order to bring the situation under control. The Sulṭān authorized
the governor of Damascus to take whatever measures were necessary, even to put
offenders to death if he could not maintain order otherwise. He consulted
the governor as to whether he could offer a solution and enquired how many
janissaries he could afford to send there. He commanded him to send
immediately those he was able to spare and enlist the help of all neighbouring
Sanjaqbeys for the officials in 'Ajlūn. The Sulṭān also asked the governor
if it would be more useful to unite the Sanjaqs of 'Ajlūn and Karak-Shawbak
under one governor and to suggest a place of residence for him. Unfortunately,
the recommendations of the governor are not available but the Sultan deemed
it necessary to appoint Qānsūh al-Ghazzāwī in Karak-Shawbak. The governor
of Damascus was commanded to help Qānsūh in his mission to curb the activities
of the Bedouins and to rejuvenate that Sanjaq. In the opinion of the Sultan
people in Karak-Shawbak were oppressed and for this reason they had dispersed.
Qānsūh was instructed to protect the Sanjaq and not to violate the Shari‘a. The
Sulṭān also required him to send a list of names of all offenders.

In spite of all precautions, Bedouins continued to raid. In
963/1555 'Amr the Shaykh of Banū 'Aṭṭiya rebelled and attacked pilgrims

149. K.888, fol.82a, 4th Rabī‘ 1, 959, fol.109a, 16 Rabī‘ 1, 959. For
Salt see Le Strange, G., Palestine under the Moslems, pp.529-30.

150. K.888, fol.196a, 6 Jumādā 1, 959, fol.223a. No date is fixed
but it was either 19th Jumādā or 20th Jumādā, 959.
because he was not paid his dues by the Ottomans. Two years later Nu'aym b. Salāmāh b. Fawwāz, the Shaykh of Miṣārifah, also rebelled.

Many attempts were made to arrest him and he not only escaped but killed many Ottoman soldiers sent from Damascus. During that year he blocked narrow passes beyond al-Ukhaydur on the way to Damascus. Amīr al-bajj tried to clear the road of stones but was unable to do so because pilgrims feared a sudden attack by Nu'aym. In 967/1559 Sūlān Sūleymān built citadels in 'Ajlūn, Qatranah, Ma'ān, Dhat Hajj and in Ta'būk in a further attempt to control these tribes. During that year, timars and promotions (sing. taraqqī) were granted to soldiers who distinguished themselves by fighting the Bedouins, but no measures could stop them. In 972/1564 they attacked Ḥasan the sanjaq bey of Karak-Shawbāk and killed him and his friends and plundered their money and property. The Sultan could only issue orders to arrest the chieftains and endeavour to extract the money and punish them, and it is not known whether he succeeded or not. In any case the whole sanjaq continued in turmoil until 978/1570 when Qānsūh al-Ghazzāwī was appointed as its governor. The gravity of the situation is reflected in a letter from Qānsūh to the Sultan, as has already been dealt with in this chapter. Probably the situation became more grave after Qānsūh was dismissed in 996/1584 and became a rebel, together with his followers.

151. Nahrawālī, Fawā'id, pp.273-4. Nihāyāt, No:171, 20 Rabī' I, 963, p.20. According to this hikayāt a timar was granted to a janissary of Damascus for gallantry against Bedouins who attacked pilgrims.
156. M.D.xiv, No:1152, 3 Ramadān, 978, p.794.
The Egyptian caravan of pilgrims travelling to Mecca via Gaza and the southern park of Karak-Shawbak was frequently exposed to the attacks of tribesmen living there. In 932/1525 Banū 'Aṭṭiya attacked pilgrims' camels which were carrying water near Thaghrat Hāmid. Since then the amīr al-hajj of Egypt started to employ horsemen to guard that rocky part of the road. Pilgrims would suffer a surprise attack from this tribe near 'Aqaba. Armed with swords, they would swim in the Bay of 'Aqaba and attack the unsuspecting caravans. The amīr al-hajj Muḥammad b. 'Abdullah al-Rūmī took reprisals by following them and using a saw to kill those who fell into his hands.

When in 941/1534 a camel was missing in Dhat Nakhl, Yusuf al-Ḥamzawi, amīr al-hajj, sent a small force against Banū 'Aṭṭiya. Nineteen of its members were killed and the camel was restored. Five years later Banū 'Aṭṭiya attacked the pilgrims and robbed them. Jānim b. Cānsūh (d.954/1547), amīr al-hajj in that year, summoned their chiefs and offered them amnesty and an annual payment of 2,000 pieces of nisf fiddhah, in addition to twenty pieces of jūkhab (cloth) for their assistance. This arrangement lasted until 952/1545 when the remuneration was reduced to half. In the following year, they attacked some of the pilgrims. Ḥusayn Abāza, amīr al-hajj, surprised them, burnt their tents and even some children in their cradles. Three of their chiefs were beheaded and about seventy women and children were jailed in 'Aqaba.

It was the custom of Banū 'Aṭṭiya to attack camels rented by other

tribes to the pilgrims. For this reason, particularly as Banū ʿAtiyya and Banū 'Atā were in rebellion in 959/1551, camels from other tribes were not available. 162 Nahrawālī (d.990/1582) mentions that in 963/1555 they were also in rebellion because the Ottomans were paying their money to Banū Lām al-Mafārijah. 163 Banū 'Atā rebelled in 959/1551 and 967/1559 and timars were granted to all courageous fighters against them. 164 To check the activities of those tribes, the Sultan ordered a fortress to be built at al-'Arīsh, "an uninhabited place in the wilderness, where Bedouins constantly attack pilgrim and merchant caravans on their way from Aleppo, Damascus, and Gaza". The Sultan also commanded that some people were to be settled there and explore its agricultural possibilities. 165 Banū 'Atā and Banū 'Atiyya continued to be in permanent rebellion as late as 1001/1592. They sold whatever they robbed from pilgrims to buyers in Hebron. 166

The historian al-Jazīrī (d.976/1568 ?) remarked that Bedouins generally attacked returning pilgrims for the merchandise they had brought from Mecca. 167 He noticed also that tribal attacks occurred when ʿawā'id (allowances) had not been paid. 168 The roofo was portioned according to tribal vicinity and each tribe was paid an allowance to protect pilgrims in that area.

162. al-Jazīrī, Durar, p.418.
164. K.888, fol.61a, 20 Ǧafer, 959; l.:D.iV, No:975, 982, 12th Shawwal, 967, p.96.
166. Heyd, Ottoman documents, p.85.
Some tribes would refrain from attack until the caravan had passed through their vicinity and would plunder it away from their particular area. 169

He pointed out, also, that some poorer Bedouins would follow the pilgrim caravan not for looting or robbery but to take left over camels even the dead ones to use their flesh as immediate food or dried and salted meat (qadid). 170

V. Turkoman Tribes in the Province 171

During the sixteenth century there were about 25 Turkoman tribes living in the region of Ḥawrān. During the reign of Sulṭān Sulṭānān there were 1,410 households and 36 bachelors in addition to 29 imāms. In 977/1569 the number rose to 1,651 households and 133 bachelors but no mention of imāms is made. 172 The total amount of money that these tribes paid annually was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>akches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>936/1529</td>
<td>194,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952/1545</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977/1569</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sanjaq of Ḥama was densely populated by Turkoman tribes.

Eight tribes in that Sanjaq had branches in the province of Damascus. They comprised 240 households and 46 bachelors. The dwelling-places of these

172. For Turkoman jama'at and census see T.D.401, pp.700-8. T.D.491, pp.4-34.
174. T.D.423, p.96. This includes goat fees and bād-i havā.
175. T.D.491, p.34.
branches were not defined, but most likely they lived in the northern part of the province. Their annual payment was 22,411 akches.\textsuperscript{176}

Other Turkoman tribes lived at the coast near 'Athlīth. Their 32 households and four bachelors were cultivators and contributed an annual sum of 23,080 akches. They had a watermill for which they paid 1,600 akches annually.\textsuperscript{177} A Turkoman tribe by the name of Jamāsīn lived near Acre. Its households numbered 39 and paid a total of 5,890 akches.\textsuperscript{178}

The region of Ḥawrān was not fully inhabited. Names of 66 villages were listed in one of the Ṭapu Defters, but neither the number of the population nor the amount of revenues were given.\textsuperscript{179} This indicates that they were very scantily populated. Between 956/1549-959/1551 about 101 timars were granted to the members of the newly created Turkoman Ṣipāhī regiment. Each of them was allotted 2,000 akches per annum. Each timar holder was required to co-operate with Turkomans there to cultivate and reclaim land granted to him. The number of mazra'ās (farms) granted as mentioned in available sources was about 260 mazra'ās and one village. Their total annual revenue was 267,000 akches. After the timar-holders had been paid, 65,000 akches remained for the Sultānī Khāṣṣ.\textsuperscript{180} It appears that, in addition to reclamation, part of

\textsuperscript{175} For names of these branches and amounts of tax paid see T.D.1052, pp.273, 276, 279, 281, 285, 288-91, 293, 295.

\textsuperscript{177} T.D.192, pp.7-8. The total amount given was 22,720 akches but upon checking the supplied figures the total amount showed 23,080, in addition to watermill fees. Under the Mamlūks, 'Athlīth constituted an ḍanāl in the province of Ṣafād. It was reputed for its fertility and famed for its fruit. See al-ʿUthmānī, Tarīkh, p.483. Qalqashandī, Subh, vol.iv, p.152. Hartmann, R., "'Athlīth", E.I.2, vol.i, p.737.

\textsuperscript{178} 5,500 of it was buffalo fees, 390 was bād-i hāvā. T.D.192, p.8. A branch of this group by the name of Ḥusayn was as mentioned in 963 as comprising 18 households who paid 400 akches as buffalo and goat fees. T.D.300, p.176.

\textsuperscript{179} T.D.401, pp.388-9, 697.

the timar-holders' duty was to guard the routes. According to the qānūnname of Damascus of 977/1569 Turkomans who lived in the province of Damascus for a length of time were considered as part of the ḥarīyya (Sultan's subjects). Their bād-i havā was to be collected together with other taxes. They were categorized as settlers and not as nomads and the amīns (official tax-collectors) were to behave accordingly. It is not known whether the Turkomans employed in cultivation were from the 25 tribes previously mentioned or whether they were brought from other regions.

Little information is available about the activities of the Turkoman tribes in the province during the sixteenth century. Towards the end of the century in 991/1583 a tribe by the name of Āk Bayraḳlī was mentioned to have attacked the Ḥarīfī family in both Bāṣlabāk and al-Jurd. The governor of Damascus was commanded to prevent, by every possible means, any recurrence of this. The Sallūriyya Turkomans were twice, however, plundered by Fakhr al-Dīn. Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī refers to Turkomans living in Karaf al-Suq to the west of Damascus and in Zawq al-Baṣliyya, and said they treated him well. He was also courteously treated by Turkomans after he left Saʿsaʿ on his way to Jerusalem.

183. Ahmet Refik, Anadoluda Türk Asiretleri (966-1200), (İstanbul, 1930), p. 49. In Bāṣlabāk there were Turkomans known as the Turkomans of Bāṣlabāk, al-Khalīdī, Tarikh, p. 146.
184. al-Khalīdī, Tarikh, pp. 157, 159.
VI. The Kurdish Tribes in the Province

In addition to the Arabs and Turkomans, there was a Kurdish population in the region of Hawrān. The seven Kurdish jamaʿāt clustered in Baṭīha. 186 About the middle of the 10th/16th century they comprised 117 households and by 977/1569 the number had risen to 129 households, in addition to one bachelor. They paid an annual sum of 1,200 akhes as ʿadat. 187

186. al-ʿUthmānī mentions Baṭīha which lies to the east of the Lake Tiberias as part of Tiberias wilayat which was part of the province of Safad. al-ʿUthmānī, Taʿrīḥ, p.450; the editor of the text read it Baṭīkha. Ǧalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol.iv, p.151.

CONCLUSION

When Sultan Selīm conquered the Mamlūk Sultanate he made no initial attempt to replace the structure of Mamlūk rule. Some Mamlūks realised the permanent nature of the conquest and these, headed by Khāyirbāy of Egypt, gave allegiance to the Ottomans. Others, headed by al-Ghazâlī in Damascus, deemed it temporary and planned its overthrow. Although al-Ghazâlī had gained the support and confidence of a large part of the population, the death of the middle-aged Sultan Selīm was premature for his plans. However, he seized the opportunity and proclaimed himself Sultan of the two holy places, Mecca and Medina. Ottoman reaction was violent and a formidable expedition was launched to suppress the rebellion, which resulted in complete annihilation of the faction. It suppressed also the shabāb of the city of Damascus and its environs who had supported al-Ghazâlī and liquidated the Mamlūk regime to a far greater extent than in Egypt.

With the introduction of direct Ottoman rule a survey of the land was made and taxes were carefully registered. Ottoman taxation was meticulous in detail. Until, however, Syrian Mamlūk historical sources have been thoroughly examined it is difficult to state precisely to what extent the system had been inherited by the Ottomans. During the first half of the sixteenth century revenues more than doubled and the population increased in almost all parts of the country. However, in the second half of the century, the registers indicate an almost equally pervasive decline in the population. An understanding of the nature of the administrative structure and its relation to the local people offers a tentative explanation of this phenomenon.
The Ottoman presence in Syria was predominantly military; this even applies to the offices of the defterdar and to some aspects of that of the chief judge. The province was dotted with many fortresses manned by regular soldiers. This is further shown by the division of part of the land among military personnel who were responsible for the maintenance of law and order. In addition, they supplied military escort for the despatch of the pilgrimage caravan and mobilised auxiliaries to augment the Sultan's army when required. They also assisted in tax collection. Some local chieftains and notables were integrated into the timar system for similar purposes, but merely in marginal areas.

Appointments in any school, mosque, convent, hospital or for the supervision of the awqaf needed Ottoman sanction. Because of the foundation of many additional charities, 'ulama and ordinary men of religion became more and more absorbed into and dependent upon this structure.

Equally, a survey of the economic life of the province shows that it was built around the military structure. A considerable portion of the revenues was allocated to military personnel, which may explain why they were able to penetrate every stratum of society. They were recorded as money-lenders, land-owners, traders and usurers. Many led luxurious lives and lived in sumptuous dwellings and enjoyed also the eulogies of poets. They were authorised to control the expenditure for the pilgrims' caravan which, no doubt, added to their power and prestige.

Factions inevitably sprang up when military discipline became lax. Neither the places of origin nor the background of their leaders are known and it is, therefore, difficult to state the bases of this factional formation. The leaders vied with each other for support among the local people who were
traditionally divided into two factions, Qaysī and Yamānī. This division ran across all tribal and sectarian loyalties and asserted itself dramatically whenever central administration weakened. This was the case at the beginning of the second half of the sixteenth century and each faction tried to utilise the division in the military forces. Furthermore, local chieftains began to build military units from outlawed sukban, thereby becoming self-supporting, though with no intention of rebellion against the Sultan.

The struggle was apparently for supremacy in the province. The ensuing fighting was destructive to the three provinces of Aleppo, Tripoli and Damascus. This encouraged Bedouin raids on villages and even on the pilgrimage caravan. Such is the probable explanation of the noticeable decrease of population during the second part of the century, and the impoverishment of those remaining, by the increase of taxes.

By 1606 the Sultan had signed a peace treaty with Austria. This enabled him to concentrate on restoring law and order and to eliminate the many local despots who had emerged as a result of the weakness of internal military administration. By 1635 all factions in the province of Damascus had disappeared and only 'ulamā' who had remained peaceful survived, and Ottoman authority was again asserted.
Appendix I

During the preparation of this thesis it was found necessary to compile the complete available demographical data for the Liwāʾ of Damascus during the first three-quarters of the 16th century. Places and names of the majority of villages have also been identified and located. Due to lack of space the findings cannot be included here. Examples have, however, been appended for four nahiyās, as below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nahiyat Ghawṭa</th>
<th>Names of villages</th>
<th>T.D.401 (pp.52-83)</th>
<th>T.D.263 (pp.181-218)</th>
<th>T.D.474 (pp.494-518)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 150</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mizza</td>
<td>B. 35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kafar Batnā</td>
<td>B. 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sh.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 140</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gābūn Fawqānī wa Taḥtānī</td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>T.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T.15 B.T.2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jarmaḥa</td>
<td>B. 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iftīs</td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 156</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kafar Sūsīyya</td>
<td>B. 7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>T.D. 401</td>
<td>T.D. 263</td>
<td>T.D. 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Irbil</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bayt Rantis</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Aqraba</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jisrayn</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hammuriyya</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C. abr al-Sitt</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tilthaya(?)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rabbaniyya(?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Saqba</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bayt Sawa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Babila</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Babila)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kafar Mudira</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hazza</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>T.D.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hadīthat al-Jārsh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Manīhā</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Zamalkā</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zabdayn</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yalda</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bīlat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barza</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Masjīd al-Gādām</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jawbar</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Muḥammadiyya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ayn Tharmā</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Harasīd al-Zaytūn</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
<td>T.D.263</td>
<td>T.D.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>H. 1,568</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 149</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y. 20</td>
<td>15 B.T.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. 59 B.J.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nahiyyat Kisrawān

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T.D.430 (pp.226-44)</th>
<th>T.D.383 (pp.353b-88)</th>
<th>T.D.401 (pp.385-401)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ifqir</td>
<td>H. 20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faytarun</td>
<td>H. 23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 'Ajaltun</td>
<td>X. 23</td>
<td>X. 19</td>
<td>X. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.X. 3</td>
<td>B.X. 1</td>
<td>B.X. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bikarkiyya (bikarki)</td>
<td>X. 15</td>
<td>X. 20</td>
<td>X. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.X. 5</td>
<td>B.X. 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dalbata</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- X.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 'Aramun</td>
<td>H. 4</td>
<td>X. 6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. - B.X.2</td>
<td>2 X.9</td>
<td>- X.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. - B.X.</td>
<td>- B.X.1</td>
<td>- B.X.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Harajil</td>
<td>H. 62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Iqbal</td>
<td>H. 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 'Aman al-</td>
<td>H. 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahitā wa al-Fawqā</td>
<td>B. 1 X.29</td>
<td>2 X.36</td>
<td>- X.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. - B.X.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B.X.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of villages</td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 'Ayn Jamal</td>
<td>B. 2 X.8</td>
<td>2 X.36</td>
<td>X.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  B.X.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.X.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ighzir (GHazir)</td>
<td>H. 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.16</td>
<td>- X.21</td>
<td>- X.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  -</td>
<td>B.X.3</td>
<td>- B.X.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Majdal Banî Habis</td>
<td>H. 34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Baq'atâ</td>
<td>H. 38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dar'ûn</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- X.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  - B.X.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- B.X.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Baša</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- X.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  -</td>
<td></td>
<td>- B.X.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ghûštâ</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.11</td>
<td>- X.12</td>
<td>- X.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  -</td>
<td>B.X.1</td>
<td>- B.X.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mi'râb</td>
<td>H. 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Abû al-Ḥamrâ</td>
<td>H. 9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 'Ashqût</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.43</td>
<td>- X.43</td>
<td>- X.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  -</td>
<td>B.X.7</td>
<td>- B.X.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Banâbil</td>
<td>H. 17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dayr al-Bâshâ(?)</td>
<td>H. 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Abû Kuffiyya</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.  - X.28</td>
<td>- X.41</td>
<td>- X.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.  -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- B.X.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of villages</td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Muhaydha</td>
<td>H. 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. -</td>
<td>- X.11</td>
<td>- X.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Bayt Shabah</td>
<td>H. 27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. -</td>
<td>- X.32</td>
<td>- X.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- B.X.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. `Ammarriyya(?)</td>
<td>H. 22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Fairayya</td>
<td>H. 45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Jadida</td>
<td>H. 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. - X.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- X.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- B.X.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Darmaiyya</td>
<td>H. 38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tahtiy wa</td>
<td>B. 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- X.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fawqa</td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- B.X.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Bahr Saf</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- X.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- X.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ashnaa Naftir</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Hammaya</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Misbah</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Majdallta</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Zarun</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of villages</td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Zawq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghurbitya(?)</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Harisa (Harisa)</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. - X.17</td>
<td>- X.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>- B.X.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. 391</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 37</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X. 198</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.X. 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nahiyyat Jizzín

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T.D.430 (pp.383-6)</th>
<th>T.D.383 (pp.447-58)</th>
<th>T.D.401 (pp.523-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jizzín</td>
<td>H. 55</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rum</td>
<td>H. 29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bittáín</td>
<td>H. 14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jadidá</td>
<td>H. 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Busra</td>
<td>H. 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mashmusha</td>
<td>H. 20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A'erba(?)</td>
<td>H. 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of villages</td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>T.D.383</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maymas</td>
<td>H.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.164</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nahiyat Banū Malik al-Ashrāf</th>
<th>T.D.430 (pp.543-5)</th>
<th>T.D.401 (pp.684-88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nāmir</td>
<td>H.16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Khirbat Banī Rabbāḥ</td>
<td>H.15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. al-Ḥarāk</td>
<td>H.11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dhunayba</td>
<td>H.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ḍarfa</td>
<td>H.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daʿil</td>
<td>H.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mazraʿat al-Ḥarāk al-Gharbī</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Samakin</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>1 Sh.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of villages</td>
<td>T.D.430</td>
<td>T.D.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Katb Nāmir</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 'Alma</td>
<td>H. -</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. -</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sh.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

A. Taxes levied in Damascus and some in its liwa' (represented in akches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of muqatt'a</th>
<th>T.D.169 (pp.1-2)</th>
<th>T.D.401 (pp.52-3)</th>
<th>T.D.423 (pp.5-6)</th>
<th>T.D.263 (p.175)</th>
<th>T.D.474 (pp.202, 206)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gabbán wa Dár al-Khudár wa Dár al-Bāṭīlkh wa 'inab al-Fāṣīr</td>
<td>73,850 plus 360,000</td>
<td>262,787</td>
<td>262,787</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bazár asab wa dawáb</td>
<td>14,160</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Khammāra</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>306,666</td>
<td>306,666</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bazár ghanam</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>213,312</td>
<td>213,312</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iḥtisāb</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rusūm tadhkīrahā-i fimārītha der Shām</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bazár asārā</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>27,624</td>
<td>27,624</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bāshkhāna</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>38,666</td>
<td>38,666</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gümüşük</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>222,222</td>
<td>222,222</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dilāliyya barrāniyya</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dilāliyya juwāniyya</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bazár ghalla</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Khan al-Thalj</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>63,332</td>
<td>63,332</td>
<td>63,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Mashadiyyat al-anhar</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bayt al-hashish wa al-qimār</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>35,333</td>
<td>35,333</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mizān al-ḥarīr</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dukkan al-Ṭayr</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ikhtisāb al-Ṣālihiyya</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dār al-ḍarb</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Bayt al-māl wa māl ghā‘ib</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Masbak</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Basāṭīn Khandaq wa aḥkār bayūt</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Boya Khamān</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Hammām al-Ghazālī</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Bāst al-dāmān taht al-Qatra</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Dukkan jubun maghīlī</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Dawalīb harīr</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Shaykh al-Ḥamamān</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ashrān wa qalī</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>666,666</td>
<td>666,666</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Bāj ghafrāra</td>
<td>131,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Jizyat Naṣārā wa Yahūd wa Sunarā</td>
<td>232,659</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 'Ādat rusūm Turkomān</td>
<td>171,964</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 'Ādat qawd amir 'Arab Ṣām</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Rusūm aqnām wa māla dar Liwā Ṣām</td>
<td>302,152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Maḥṣūl ghabatān</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Širāj Khāna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Ḥabbādān</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Bāj gāfitāt ḥaḍj Sharīf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Maḥṣūl 'assīyya-i Ṣām wa Samayyā</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Bād-i ḥāfa wa jum wa ḥanāyat wa 'arūsānā-i nafs-i Ṣām</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Bād-i ḥāfa-i nawāhī Ṣām</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Maḥṣūl Suvayyāfiyyā</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Maḥṣūl māḏāṣir</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Mahṣūl tawāḥīn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Mahṣūl barawāt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Mahṣūl  qaṣamāwiyya</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Nahfrat al- Yahūd</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Taxes levied in Bāt labakk and some of its surroundings (akches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of muqāta‘a</th>
<th>T.D.430 (pp.35-6)</th>
<th>T.D.383 (pp.35-6)</th>
<th>T.D.401 (p.178)</th>
<th>T.D.423 (pp.35-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Iḥtisāb</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>21,760</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>21,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bazār asab</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maykhāna</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nahfrat qassabān</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ½ Mahṣūl Maslakh</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bazār ghalā</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dibāgh khāna</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Boya khāna</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>6,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Suq Laban</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rasm qabbān</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suq al-quṭn</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rasm Dar al-Wakāla</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kharaj al-Kurum wa baṣṣāṭin</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bazār dibs</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ḥadād aqghnām wa mā’liz</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bazār dawāb</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Suq al-ghanam</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rasm dilājīyyat Suq al-ṣulūd</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rasm cāssīyyān</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Rasm wattārin</td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mahsūl ḥabbādīn</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dār al-ḥashīsh</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Maṣāṣir dibs</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Maṭāhin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Dulāb ḫarīr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Dilājīyyat Suq al-ṣimāṣh</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>6,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Jizyāt Naṣārā</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Jizyāt Yaḥūd</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Rasm Naḥāl</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Bād-i hāvā wa jurn wa jiḥāyat wa māghā'ib wa māl mafquḍ</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,105</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Taxes levied in Bayrut and some in its surroundings (akches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pp. 25-6)</td>
<td>(pp. 251-2)</td>
<td>(pp. 269-70)</td>
<td>(P. 408)</td>
<td>(pp. 51-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Iskele</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>283,333</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Iḥṭisāb</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Qābbān</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>16,667</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>16,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mizān al-ḥarīr</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ḫabbāzīn</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Qāsābān</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>9,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rasm dulāb ḥarīr</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maḥṣūl basātīn</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rasm maṣṣarah</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rasm maḥbana</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ushr Samak</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bāj Kafara</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hujiḥāj-i Naṣarā'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maḥṣūl</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>14,416</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḧammāra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rasm dakāキン</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ujrat Khān</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ḣammām al-</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīnā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Bāj Tujjār al-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuffār (those who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay in Bayrut)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rasm maʿiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa naḥl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rasm jawamīs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of muqāba‘a</td>
<td>T.D.169 (p.7)</td>
<td>T.D.430 (pp.334-5)</td>
<td>T.D.383 (pp.401-2)</td>
<td>T.D.401 (p.478)</td>
<td>T.D.423 (p.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Faydā-i milḥ</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>231,333</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Simsāriyya</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Maḥṣul dishtibānī qaḍā‘i</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Assiyya nafsi Bayrūt</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Maḥṣul boya Khāna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Jizyat al-Naqāra</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Jizyat al-Yahūd</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Bayt al-māl wa māl mafquḍ der nafsi Bayrūt wa nāḥiyat maṭn wa Jurdi wa Gharb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Taxes levied in Sidon and some in its surroundings (akches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Iskele</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dukkān qasabān</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Masbagha</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kiyāṭiyya wa mastakh</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Qabbān wa ihtisāb</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kishlak</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 'Ādat Kafara</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(who come to visit Jerusalem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tamghā dibs</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bād-i havā wa jurm wa jināyat</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bazar ašab wa dawāb</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mayyīḥāna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dulkān mašbana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ma‘ādīyya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Simsāriyya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ma‘āṣir zayt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rasm dulāb ḥarīr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 'Assiya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mamlāḥa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Jawāmīṣ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Jizyat Yahūd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Bayt al-māl wa māl ghāṭ ib</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ṭawāfīn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Kharāj arāḍī wa basārīn</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix No. 3

Names of Bāj Octrois and amount of money farmed yearly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahr al-Kalb</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilda</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.255)</td>
<td>(p.411)</td>
<td>(p.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥiṣn</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.255)</td>
<td>(p.411)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mazār</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.255)</td>
<td>(p.411)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāḍī Rumaylī</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.401)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.478)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāḍī Khālī</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.401)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.478)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muqālīd</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labwa</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.170)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šahshāh</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>41,444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td>(p.170)</td>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Baṣīd</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawārish</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.193)</td>
<td>(p.250)</td>
<td>(p.47)</td>
<td>(p.311)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazra'at</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.143)</td>
<td>(p.178)</td>
<td>(p.47)</td>
<td>(p.312)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghīthā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayr Zaynūn</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.91)</td>
<td>(p.143)</td>
<td>(p.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānyās</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.405)</td>
<td>(p.452)</td>
<td>(p.28)</td>
<td>(p.417)</td>
<td>(p.433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yābūs</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.163)</td>
<td>(p.248)</td>
<td>(p.303)</td>
<td>(p.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.361)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Maysalūn</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.439)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazra'at</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maysalün</td>
<td>(p. 439)</td>
<td>(p. 330)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazra'at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Arrād</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 442)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wādī al-'Arrād</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(p.479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 17)</td>
<td>(p.284)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ayn Fajjur</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 220)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.346)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wādī Baradā</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 310)</td>
<td>(p.19)</td>
<td>(p.304)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥusayniyya</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.302)</td>
<td>(p.280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qūṣayr al-ʿUmrāt</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.234)</td>
<td>(p.244)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān Lajūn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.247)</td>
<td>(p.255)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāra</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 11)</td>
<td>(p.158)</td>
<td>(p.24)</td>
<td>(p.387)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān Burayj</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qastāl</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.124)</td>
<td>(p.24)</td>
<td>(p.374)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qūṭayfa</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.1)</td>
<td>(p.23)</td>
<td>(p.355)</td>
<td>(p.261)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswa</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(p.491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.487)</td>
<td>(p.343)</td>
<td>(p.16)</td>
<td>(p.278)</td>
<td>(p.491)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saʿsaʿ</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(p.491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.496)</td>
<td>(p.349)</td>
<td>(p.16)</td>
<td>(p.278)</td>
<td>(p.491)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿUthmāniyya</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(p.492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.482)</td>
<td>(p.344)</td>
<td>(p.17)</td>
<td>(p.300)</td>
<td>(p.492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaqḥāb</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(p.489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.488)</td>
<td>(p.346)</td>
<td>(p.16)</td>
<td>(p.277)</td>
<td>(p.489)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qunayṭra</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(p.440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.417)</td>
<td>(p.541)</td>
<td>(p.26)</td>
<td>(p.403)</td>
<td>(p.440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimās</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.284)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p.479)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

The Genealogy of Al Hayar

Rabī'ah
Badr
Fadl
ʿUqba (?)
Haditha
Masʿ (d. 630/1232)
Muhanna
ʿIsa (d. 683/1284)
Muhanna (d. 735/1334)
Hayar (d. 776/1374)

Zahir
Muhammad Nuʿayr

ʿAmir
Gays ʿIJIL ʿAli
ʿAssaf ʿAdhra Musa Mudlij
Zahir

Haditha G. qrmās
(d. 856/1454)

Harmush I. Mudlij
(d. 945/1538)

III. Ahmad

Dandan Zahir II V. Fayyād

IV. Shadīd ʿAbbās

Naṣīr VI. Mudlij

Husayn Sayf
(d. 1033/1623)
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