

THE REGENCY  
OF TUNIS AND THE  
OTTOMAN PORTE,  
1777-1814

Army and government of a  
North-African Ottoman *eyālet* at  
the end of the eighteenth century

*Asma Moalla*

 **RoutledgeCurzon**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

**Also available as a printed book  
see title verso for ISBN details**

# THE REGENCY OF TUNIS AND THE OTTOMAN PORTE, 1777–1814

This study of the Tunisian army and government in the time of the Husaynid pasha-bey Ḥammūda (1777–1814) stresses the deeply Ottoman character of these institutions and the political and administrative impact of the jurisdictional authority of the Ottoman Porte on the province in general. The research thus initiates a systematic revision of a major thesis that has prevailed in the body of contemporary research on the Tunisian Regency. This book claims that the latter's administrative and political evolution, from the end of the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth, was a process of gradual and irreversible emancipation from the influence and authority of the central Ottoman state. The neglect of the links between Tunis and Istanbul in that historiography has been paralleled, on the Ottomanists' side, by the virtual exclusion of the Maghrib Regencies from the scope of research on the Empire. This present book fits an emerging trend that brings these provinces back within the Ottoman fold.

**Asma Moalla** was born in Tunis and educated at the University of Tunis and the Sorbonne, University of Paris. She received a Ph.D. in History from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, in 2000. She currently lives in Tunis and works as a translator.



THE REGENCY  
OF TUNIS AND THE  
OTTOMAN PORTE,  
1777–1814

Army and government of a  
North-African Ottoman *eyālet* at  
the end of the eighteenth century

*Asma Moalla*

First published 2004  
by RoutledgeCurzon  
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada  
by RoutledgeCurzon  
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

*RoutledgeCurzon is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to [www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk](http://www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk).”

© 2004 Asma Moalla

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available  
from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-98722-5 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-415-29781-8 (Print Edition)

FOR MY PARENTS



# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Note on transliteration</i>	xi
<i>Sources and historiography on Ottoman Tunisia: for a revision of the 'autonomy thesis'</i>	xiii
<b>PART 1</b>	
<b>Prologue: the Tunisian <i>eyālet</i> from the Ottoman conquest until the end of the eighteenth century (1574–1777)</b>	<b>1</b>
1 From the conquest to deylical rule (1574–1647)	3
2 Household politics and beylical rule (1631–1777)	24
<b>PART 2</b>	
<b>The policies and government of Ḥammūda Pasha (1777–1814)</b>	<b>47</b>
3 The wars and alliances of Ḥammūda Pasha	49
4 The pasha-bey of Tunis	69
5 The army	87
6 Central and provincial administration	108
7 The revenues of the beylical treasury	126
Conclusion: the evolution of the Tunisian government from 1574 to 1814	139



## CONTENTS

<i>Appendix A</i>	144
<i>Appendix B</i>	145
<i>Notes</i>	150
<i>Bibliography</i>	160
<i>Index</i>	168

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Michael Brett and Colin Heywood, who supervised my Ph.D. thesis, on which this book is based, I should like to express my thanks for their generous assistance and for encouraging me to publish my research. I should also like to say how much I appreciated, during the years that it took me to complete this work, the help and efficiency of the members of staff in the libraries of SOAS (London) and of the Institut des Belles-Lettres Arabes (Tunis). My thanks also go to Sarah Moore, Sue Leaper and Donna Gregory for their invaluable editorial assistance. Finally, Abdeljelil Temimi, whose Foundation has done much for the study of the Arab Ottoman provinces, and who gave me unfailing support, deserves special praise.



## NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

In this study, the transliteration scheme of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (with the exception of the ‘q’ instead of the ‘k’) applies to Arabic words used in the administrative terminology of the Regency (e.g. *bayt al-māl*, *makhzin*, *jund*), including most of the words of Arabic origin passed into Ottoman administrative usage (e.g. *amāna*, *wikāla*, *jamā’a*, *‘azab*), and normally Turkicized in the non-Arab provinces of the Porte. Finally, this transliteration scheme applies also to Turkish terms modified by Tunisian local usage (e.g. *bulūk bāshī*, *ūda*).

Many Turkish words relating to the Ottoman administrative terminology also recur in this study. They are often placed between brackets, to indicate the Ottoman origin of Tunisian terms, e.g. *bulūk bāshī* (Ott.: *bölük başı*), or are used in the context of descriptions of administrative usages and practices in the central Ottoman state. Most of these words have been transcribed in the Turkish modern alphabet (e.g. *kapı kulu*, *ocak*). I have, however, used some diacritical marks not found in that alphabet, in the case of words of current use in the Ottoman period, but fallen into obsolescence, or for the transliteration of Ottoman words or formulations in a few nineteenth-century texts extracted from the correspondence between Tunis and Istanbul and reproduced in this study (e.g. the petition sent to the sultan in 1816):

- ° as in *‘askeri*;
- đ as in *qāđi*;
- ġ (corresponding to the ‘gh’ of the Arabic transliteration), as in *tuġ*;
- ğ, or y (corresponding to the ‘y’ of the Arabic transliteration system), as in *beġi* and *yaya*;
- ħ (as in the Arabic transliteration system), as in *sılıħdar*;

## NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

- *ḥ* (corresponding to the ‘*kh*’ of the Arabic transliteration system), as in *ḥocas*;
- *q* (as in the Arabic transliteration system), as in *muqāṭālu*;
- *z* (as in the Arabic transcription system), as in *mu’aẓẓam*;
- *ẓ* (corresponding to the ‘*dh*’ of the Arabic transliteration system), as in *ẓūl qadr*.

# SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY ON OTTOMAN TUNISIA

For a revision of the ‘autonomy thesis’

From the conquest of Tunis by the troops of the grand vizier Sinān Pasha in 1574 to the imposition of the French Protectorate in 1881, the Tunisian Regency was, in regard to the international law of the time and in the eyes of its population, a province of the Ottoman Porte. One of the main theses upheld by the vast majority of twentieth-century researchers on that period of Tunisian history is that the country, during those three centuries, had been, in effect, and to a large degree, autonomous from the rest of the Ottoman sultans’ dominions. The ‘autonomy thesis’ is based on two main assertions concerning the political and administrative relationship between Tunis and Istanbul, i.e. first, that the government of the Porte had wielded only a weak, or insignificant authority on the deys and beys who ruled the Regency; and, second, that the Tunisian military and administrative institutions bore little resemblance to those of the heart of the Empire.

Before proceeding to a review and discussion of the themes and arguments linked to these two assertions, it is necessary, first, to study briefly the sources on which the contemporary historiography on the Regency has been based. These sources are varied and relatively abundant. There are, first, European sources including, in particular, accounts of travellers and observers of various origins and outlooks, among whom we may mention: official envoys to the government of the Regency (e.g. Monsieur de Brèves, ambassador for the French king Henri IV in 1628); priests acting for the redemption of Christian slaves in the Barbary region (e.g. Père Dan and Haedo in the seventeenth century); Europeans settled in the capital for varying lengths of stay (e.g. Nicolas Béranger, a trader from Marseilles at the end of the seventeenth century, Thomas

MacGill, an English trader who visited Tunis at the beginning of the nineteenth, and Dr Louis Frank, who was employed as the physician of the bey Ḥammūda Pasha at the same period); scientists and scholars on official or private tours to the Regency (e.g. the French botanists Jean-André Peyssonnel in 1724 and François Desfontaines in 1783, the English cleric Thomas Shaw in 1727, the German prince Pückler-Muskau in 1835, and the French officer E. Pellissier in 1848); military experts recruited by the beys, etc.<sup>1</sup> Another important proportion of European sources is composed of various archival documents, including in particular the official correspondence of European consuls appointed in Tunis, of which a considerable part was classified and edited by French historians during the colonial period (Plantet 1893; Grandchamp 1920–33; Monchicourt 1929). These foreign sources provide some descriptive accounts of the army and government of the Regency, with brief and infrequent references to the relations of the deys and beys with the Porte, and to the latter's policy in the Barbary region.

Arabic sources include administrative archives, as well as chronicles, a number of which were published after the independence of the country, albeit only partially in some cases. The main Tunisian historiographers of the Ottoman period were: Muḥammad ibn Abī Dīnār (died *c.*1698–9), Muḥammad al-Wazīr al-Sarrāj al-Andalusī (died in 1736–7), Muḥammad al-Ṣaghīr ibn Yūsuf (died *c.*1770–1), Ḥammūda ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (died in 1775), Aḥmad ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf (died in 1874) and Muḥammad Bayram al-Khāmis (died in 1889) (see Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6; Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970; Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967; al-Wazīr 1985; Ibn Yūsuf 1978, 1998; Bayram no date). Their writings contain descriptions of the institutions of government of the Regency, although, as in the case of European sources, these descriptions do not refer to a central Ottoman model. As concerns the value of the information they provide on the relations between the Tunisian beys and contemporary sultans, it is necessary to recall that all these authors, with the exception of the colourful janissary – farmer Ibn Yūsuf, were secretaries in the beylical Chanceries of their time, or, at least, close to the powers that be. Hence, we find in their chronicles relatively few, and often allusive or vague mentions, of the central Ottoman government, evincing the same concern to stress any evidence of good favour shown by the sultans towards their masters, and to hush down conflicts between Tunis and Istanbul. These authors were also anxious to avoid undermining the image of the beys as powerful dynasts in the eyes of the local population,

hence, probably, a tendency to sin by omission about evidence of a strong direct subordination to Istanbul.

In conclusion, therefore, we may consider that the nature of the sources reviewed above accounts, in some measure, for a toning-down of Ottoman influence in the Regency that favoured the success of the autonomy thesis. Other factors and motivations, however, contributed to an important extent to this success, throughout the colonial and post-colonial stages of the twentieth-century historiography on the Regency, as I shall now proceed to demonstrate.

Historical research on Ottoman Tunisia from the end of the nineteenth century and during the first half of the twentieth was carried out by French academics and others, who were concerned to investigate the past of the new country that had been added to French dominions. The sources used by these historians, very few of whom had a real knowledge of Arabic, were predominantly European ones. Among the favourite subjects of colonial historiography, we should mention, first, the corso waged by Tunisian galleys against European fleets or coastal villages, and the slave-trade linked to it. Pierre Grandchamp's prolific production includes, in particular, a study and translation of the account, by Jean-Baptiste Salvago, of the mission that he undertook in the Barbary region in 1610 (Grandchamp 1937). This Venetian dragoon was sent to the Regencies under the escort of an Ottoman envoy, in order to obtain the release of vessels and citizens of the Republic of Venice, that had been captured by Algerian and Tunisian corsairs. Salvago, who failed in his mission (the Tunisian corsairs sent a deputation to the Porte to argue their case), denounces the rowdiness of Ottoman officials in the Regency, which he sees as bordering on rebelliousness towards the Porte, and speaks contemptuously of the lowly origins of the Turkish janisaries in the Barbary region who 'have made (this region) the cesspit of the Ottoman Empire' (Grandchamp 1937: II, 487). Salvago's testimony, echoed by other Christian envoys, has led to the widespread assumption that the government of the deys, dominated by the power of the corsairs, was virtually out of control by the Porte. The neglect, or minimal attention, paid by historians to the link between the Maghrib corso and the strategy of the Porte in the western Mediterranean, moreover, has led to the belief that, in encouraging and developing the corso, the rulers of the Barbary Regencies were pursuing purely domestic material and political ends.



Another important theme of twentieth-century historiography on the Regency concerns the links, mainly commercial, established between the latter and the Christian world, and with France more particularly. Grandchamp's works, among colonial research on that subject, include the publication of a ten-volume compilation of the archives of the French consulate in Tunis and other documents concerning the French community in that city from 1582 to 1705, under the title *La France en Tunisie* (Grandchamp 1920–33). The historian Charles Roux, for his part, has studied the relations between North Africa and France from the tenth to the nineteenth century. The book, published in 1932, is significantly entitled: *France et Afrique du Nord avant 1830: les précurseurs de la conquête* (France and North Africa before 1830: the precursors of conquest) (Roux 1932). It is based on various French sources, including archival ones, and demonstrates the constancy of French military designs on the North African region since the seventeenth century.

Still on the issue of relations with France, there is a marked concern, among the historians of the colonial period, to stress that these relations were not exclusively economic ones. Articles published by Grandchamp include a short study on the life of Don Felipe, who was the scion of a powerful Ottoman official in Tunis, twice converted to Christianity in the seventeenth century, another on the life and career of a Tunisian *mamlūk* (slave) of French origin in the eighteenth century, a third one on the embassy of Sulaymān Āgha to Versailles in 1777, etc.<sup>2</sup> Colonial historians, including their most famous precursor, Alphonse Rousseau, who wrote his *Annales tunisiennes* shortly after the conquest of Algiers by France in 1830 (Rousseau 1985),<sup>3</sup> have also striven to promote the thesis of a long-standing friendship between the beys and the French government – particularly in studies on the nineteenth-century Regency. Colonial historians have presented the policy followed by the Husaynid beys of that period as one of resistance to Ottoman claims on the Regency, by seeking French protection. Their prime aim being, in most cases, to defend the legitimacy of French presence in North Africa, they have striven both to stress the *de facto* autonomy of the Barbary provinces and to undermine the *de jure* authority of the Porte over them. Their main argumentation was that these provinces had been forsaken by their sultan from an early stage following their conquest. The Ottoman Porte had, therefore, for too long waived its authority on the Tunisian Regency, when it attempted, belatedly, to assert it again in the nineteenth century.

Two studies on this period, published in the first decades of the twentieth century, and illustrating this colonial interpretation of history, deserve to be mentioned. The first of these studies, devoted to a description of the emblems of power of the Husaynid beys, and published in 1913 by Henri Hugon, aimed, as asserted in its preface, at:

(patiently reassembling) all the elements constitutive of the theory of Husaynid autonomy . . . The author shows how the Tunisian princes, in spite of sometimes difficult circumstances, took initiatives that attest to the emergence of a national consciousness. We may see the influence and the example of France present throughout that process.

(Hugon 1913: preface)<sup>4</sup>

The second of these studies, published by Jean Serres, a former consul in the North-African region, is entitled *La politique turque en Afrique du Nord durant la Monarchie de Juillet* (Serres 1925).<sup>5</sup> In its last chapter, the author reviews, with apparent neutrality, the arguments militating against, and those militating for, a *de jure* authority of the Porte on the Tunisian Regency. He stresses, on the one hand, the hereditary character of the beylical office, the fact that the beys signed treaties with Christian powers and had their own flag, and that European consuls were appointed in Tunis. On the other hand, according to the author, the Porte opposed to ‘these marks of power constituting all the features characteristic of complete sovereignty for a European jurisconsult’ (Serres 1925: 375), rituals sanctified by the force of tradition, such as the official investiture granted to the beys by the sultans (an occasion, for high officials in Istanbul to receive periodical tokens of the beys’ gratefulness) and the religious prerogatives of the sultan-caliph. Serres’ assessment of the situation of the Regency by the end of his period of study (1848) leads him to the conclusion that Tunisia finally emerged ‘almost totally independent’ (Serres 1925: 379) from the Porte, after the conflicts that had opposed them since 1830 – a feat to which the moral and military support of the French government had contributed in no small measure.

In the post-colonial period, the research on Ottoman Tunisia has made extensive use of Arabic sources, besides European ones. This research has been carried out either in the context of studies encompassing the whole of the North African region (or, by a return to its Arabic denomination, the Maghrib), or has been limited to the

geographical scope of the Regency. Among the first type of studies, Claude-André Julien's *Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord*, published for the first time in 1932, then, in a revised version, in 1952, four years before Tunisia's independence, should be considered as a pioneering work of that historiography (Julien 1952). Julien has elaborated in this book the main arguments and themes related to the 'Tunisian autonomy' thesis, which were later taken up, emphasized, or sometimes criticized, by his successors. The second type of studies, limited to the history of the Tunisian Regency, include, in particular, those published, from the 1970s on, by the first generation of Tunisian post-independence academics. The three founding fathers of Tunisian historiography on the Ottoman period have thus each devoted their main academic research to a different century of that period: the seventeenth for Taoufik Bachrouch (*Formation sociale barbaresque et pouvoir à Tunis au XVIIème siècle*), the eighteenth for Mohamed-Hédi Chérif (*Pouvoir et société dans la Tunisie de Husayn Ibn 'Alī, 1705–1740*), and the nineteenth century for Khélifa Chater (*Dépendance et mutations pré-coloniales: la régence de Tunis de 1815 à 1875*) (Bachrouch 1977; Chater 1984; Chérif 1986).

In post-colonial studies, the autonomy of the Regency, seen as a constant and increasingly accelerated process, is as strongly stressed as in the colonial historiography, and even more elaborately argued. It is linked to a traditional, nowadays strongly criticized, historiographical model, neatly dividing the life of the Ottoman Empire into the glorious first epoch of conquests ending with the reign of Sulaymān the Magnificent (1524–66), and the latter one, characterized by an irreversible though protracted 'Ottoman decline' until the fall of the dynasty in 1918. The implicit acceptance of this model by Tunisian historians underlies their assumption that the authority of the Porte over the Tunisian province was, from the beginning of the conquest (1574), a shaky one. Thence, the prevailing image, in contemporary historiography, of the Ottoman administration in Tunis, especially in its first two decades, as that of a corrupt and inefficient military institution, representative of a debased Ottoman political culture.

As a consequence of the inadequacy of the new ruling power in Tunis, historians have stressed the survival or rapid rehabilitation of administrative practices and cultural values inherited from the Hafsid sultanate, which had governed the country for more than two centuries before the Ottoman conquest. The Hafsid political revival, according to these historians, by breaking the traditional

Ottoman administrative mould, finally contributed to the transition from the deylical corsair state in the Regency to the beylical state, characterized by a stress on trade, rather than *jibād*, by the end of the seventeenth century. The role of the notables in this evolution, as vehicles of the Hafsid political culture, is stressed (Chérif 1981: 179–80; Bachrouch 1985: 55–6).

It should be noted, moreover, that the political past thus asserting its influence on the evolution of the Tunisian Regency is seen as extending as far back as the eleventh century, which saw the emergence of endogenous Muslim systems of rule in the Maghrib. The policies followed by the Tunisian beys from the end of the seventeenth century, therefore, were, for Julien, ‘a continuation of the policy of the Hafsids, Almohads and Sanhājas’ (Julien 1952: 277), or, for Abdallah Laroui, stemmed from ‘a will for renewal and concern to link with past rules’ (Laroui 1976: 261). The wars waged between the three Maghrib regencies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in particular, are invoked as an illustration of the permanence of centuries-old political concerns and strategies in the Maghrib region. For Julien, these wars, waged perfectly independently of the Porte, were ‘a revival of old greeds and hatreds’ (Julien 1952: 289). Finally, this return of the political past of the country is also seen as part of a general movement of revival of its cultural identity, plunging its roots into the most ancient periods.

The period of the Husaynid beylical dynasty from the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth (1705–1881) has been considered as the decisive and final stage in the uninterrupted and increasingly accelerated process of autonomy of the province. This particular view of the political and administrative evolution of the Regency, linked to a legitimizing quest for the origins of the young Tunisian state that emerged in 1956, has led a number of historians to stress that the Tunisian Ottoman polity, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had fulfilled some of the prerequisites for statehood in the European nationalist sense of the term. For Mohamed-Hédi Chérif in particular, the Husaynid period marks the completion of the process of peaceful assimilation of the Turkish ‘army rabble’ (Chérif 1981: 197), ethnically and socially through marriages, and culturally, through the fusion of Ottoman customs and practices into what has been described by Fernand Braudel as ‘la fine civilisation tunisienne’ (quoted by Chérif 1981: 195). On the political level, the allegiance of the notables, followed by other sectors of the population, to an increasingly ‘tunisified’

government, ruled by the 'semi-national dynasty' (Chérif 1981: 197) of the Husaynid beys has also been stressed.

The prevalence of the autonomy thesis has been both the cause and the effect of a lack of systematic and detailed investigation into the various links between the Regency and the rest of the Ottoman Empire, with the exception of the commercial ones. The attention paid to the subject of trade exchange by several post-independence historians may be explained by the existence of a relatively abundant archival, and particularly European, documentation concerning it, owing to the fact that Christian vessels ensured almost the totality of the transportation of goods and passengers leaving or going to the Regency. All other aspects of the relationship between Tunis and its suzerain, on the other hand, are treated cursorily and without innovation. Islamic solidarity is stressed as being the main reason for the Tunisian participation in wars fought by the Ottoman Porte during the nineteenth century, i.e. the disastrous naval expedition against Navarino in 1827 (Chater 1984: 341–2) and the Crimean War in 1854–5 (with the addition, for the latter conflict, of a desire 'to play a military role in international affairs') (Brown 1974: 303). The religious authority of the sultancaliphs is also seen as informing the persistence of the 'traditional' or 'ritual' manifestations of the beys' allegiance to Istanbul (the investiture granted by the Porte, the Friday sermon in mosques preached in the name of the sultan of the time, the currency minted in Tunis bearing his name). Effective political authority for the Porte in the Regency is unanimously denied. Lucette Valensi, for instance, describes 'the sultan's suzerainty (over the three Maghrib provinces) in the diplomatic and political realms', at that period, as just 'a fiction' (Valensi 1969: 90). The policy of the Ottoman Porte towards the Tunisian beys, particularly after the French conquest of Algiers in 1830 is, therefore, seen as a futile, doomed effort aiming at re-establishing an obsolete nominal authority. In contrast to colonial historians, however, those of the post-independence period have stressed the strategic concern of the beys to play France and the Ottoman Empire against each other, thus acknowledging that, in many instances, the Husaynids sought the protection of the sultan against French designs (Chater 1984: 453–62).

The numerous post-independence studies on the political institutions of Husaynid Tunisia also stress the Regency's increased differentiation from the rest of the Ottoman Empire. On the beylical administration, Julien asserts that 'the use of a few Turkish

terms, and the survival of one or two Turkish customs' were its only Ottoman features (Julien 1952: 302). Chérif and Chater, though conceding a greater degree of Ottoman influence, succinctly state, for the first, that this administration 'was based on the military, administrative and, above all, fiscal regulations introduced by the Ottoman conquerors, or their direct successors' (Chérif 1986: II, 208) and, for the second, that it was 'inherited from bygone days, when the Ottomans had set up institutions for the government of Tunis' (Chater 1984: 75). Finally, Leon Carl Brown, in his study of the reign of Aḥmad Bey (1737–53), sees in the beylical government of that period 'a blending of Ottoman rules and practices with an even older Hafsid tradition', synthesized in 'simple and despotic' methods of rule (Brown 1974: 95).

The possible existence of links, or similarities, between other institutions or systems of organization of the Husaynid state, and those of the Ottoman state, has been overlooked or, at best, treated superficially. Although Abdelhamid Hénia, in a number of his studies on the land tenure system of the Regency, has evoked, very briefly, the Ottoman centralizing influence, he has considered that the policies adopted by the beys in that realm in the eighteenth century served their domestic political and economic interests, and were unconnected, or even divergent, from those followed in other provinces of the Empire (Hénia 1997: 135–6). His detailed study on the al-Jarīd region from 1676 to 1840 is also based on this assumption, as well as on that of the survival, to an important measure, of Hafsid or earlier usages, in many aspects of the land tenure and tax collection systems in that region (Hénia 1980). As for Taoufik Bachrouch, whose study on the military and religious *élites* of the nineteenth-century Regency includes a chapter on the Tunisian janissary force before its abolition in 1830 (Bachrouch 1989: 493–514), and particularly on its hierarchical structure, he has not attempted to trace similarities in that aspect of the organization of the corps, created in the period following the Ottoman conquest of Tunis, with those of the imperial janissary corps.

The thesis on the autonomy of the Regency, though dominant, has not gone unchallenged. Since the first decades of the post-independence period, a few historians, and particularly Robert Mantran, have upheld that the imprint of Ottoman rule on the past and present of Tunisia was stronger than deemed by most (Mantran 1962) – a postulate whose corollary was that the Tunisian Regency (and its two neighbours) partook, to a non-negligible extent, of a system of political, economic and social

organization common to all the provinces of the Porte, and should be re-inserted within its Ottoman environment.<sup>6</sup> This view of the Ottoman period of the Maghrib has gained increasing audience in the past two decades, thanks to contacts developed with historians from the Arab world, and from Turkey in particular. It is now emerging among Ottomanist historians, who had formerly almost totally excluded the Maghrib regencies from the scope of their research. Studies, such as André Raymond's on the Arab dominions of the Porte, from Algiers to the Hijaz (Raymond 1989), and Şevket Pamuk's on the monetary history of the Ottoman Empire (Pamuk 2000), have recently started to bring back these provinces into the Ottoman fold.

Among Tunisian historians, however, the approach advocated by Mantran has mainly been limited to studies on the architecture of the Ottoman period (Djellouli 1995; Saadaoui 2001). It is, therefore, the ambition of this book to initiate an investigation of the political and administrative links between the Regency and the Ottoman Empire during the period of rule of the pasha-bey Ḥammūda ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn, from 1777 to 1814, corresponding to the *hijra* years 1191–1229. The study purports to answer two main questions: to what extent did the specific policies and reforms adopted by Ḥammūda Pasha mirror the policies and concerns of the Ottoman Porte at that period; and how closely did the structures, sources of recruitment and organization of the army and administration of the Regency conform to the model represented by those of the heart of the Empire and/or those of other Arab provinces, in particular Egypt? By way of an introduction to this investigation, the first two chapters of the book deal with the political and administrative history of the Tunisian *eyālet* (province) from its creation in 1574 until the beginning of the period of our concern, mainly from the perspective of its relations with Istanbul. The two chapters include, in particular, brief expositions on fundamental concepts of Ottoman administration and statesmanship, with the relevant terminology, and its Arabized, or Tunisian, variants.

This study is based, on the one hand, on the existing body of research concerning the heart of the Empire and the Arab Mashriq provinces, among which studies on the structures of the Ottoman military and administrative institutions have been especially useful. The findings and results of that research have provided a conceptual framework for the reading and interpretation of various sources on the Regency, the bulk of which, if we except a small set

of archival documents contained in the Tunisian national archives in the Dār el-Bey, is constituted by the writings of local chroniclers and foreign travellers. The accounts and descriptions of the Regency by authors from the time of Ḥammūda Pasha (foremost among whom is Aḥmad ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, who devoted an important chapter of his famous *Ithāf* to that bey) have been complemented by the testimonies of sources prior to, and, in some cases, later than, the period of our concern. The comparative method of research used in this study has revealed, in particular, that it was possible to extract precious information from the patchiest of descriptions, or from allusive statements, especially in Tunisian chronicles, when they are read in the light of what we know of the administrative and political organization of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, I hope to have demonstrated that, thanks to this approach, the limits of our knowledge of the Tunisian Regency, based on existing sources, may still, contrarily to the assertion of the historian Taoufik Bachrouch, be extended (Bachrouch 1987: 78–9).<sup>7</sup>





## Part 1

### PROLOGUE

The Tunisian *eyālet* from  
the Ottoman conquest until the end  
of the eighteenth century  
(1574–1777)



# FROM THE CONQUEST TO DEYLICAL RULE (1574–1647)

## **The corsairs, the Ottoman Porte and the conquest of Tunis**

The conquest of Tunis in 982/1574 sealed Ottoman domination of the eastern and central Arab Maghrib, over which the Hafsid dynasty, established in 1229, had extended its influence during the period of its apogee in the fourteenth and part of the fifteenth centuries. The region, which had been plunged, since the end of the latter century, into economic decline and political anarchy, had become the stake of a duel between the Ottoman and Spanish Empires for the control of the southwestern Mediterranean. The confrontation between the two powers pitted against each other the corsair forces affiliated to them – a frequent feature of naval warfare in those times. In the Ottoman camp, an original and far-reaching partnership was struck between the Porte and the Muslim corsairs, of whom the most prestigious was the famous Khayr al-Dīn Barbarossa. The latter, having succeeded his brother ‘Aruj as ruler of the small coastal town of Algiers, placed himself under Ottoman protection, and received from Sultan Selīm I a firman (sultanic decree) investing him with the governorship of Algiers, as well as an important janissary force. The new beylerbey (provincial governor) and his successors were thus provided with the symbols of legitimacy as well as the human and material resources that enabled them to resist Spanish attacks and embark on further conquests along the central coast of the Maghrib (Bona in 1522, Constantine in 1524). Another famous corsair, Dragut Re’is, who had been operating with frequent success against the Spaniards along the south-eastern coast of the Maghrib, was rewarded in the same way in 1556 by being appointed beylerbey of Tripoli. From there, he was able to conquer Jirba in 1560 and, progressing

in the hinterland, occupied Qayrawān, which had been ruled by the Shābbiya religious order that had successfully defied Hafsid authority in the region (Julien 1952: 250–75; Barbour 1969: 76–90).

Tunis, the capital of the Hafsid sultans and their last remaining stronghold, did not fall easily under Ottoman domination. The city, twice conquered and occupied by Algerian corsair-beylerbeys: Khayr al-Dīn, from 1529 to 1534, and ‘Ilij ‘Alī from 1569 to 1572, was both times surrendered to Spanish troops, who restored Hafsid rule there. Finally, in the summer of 1574, a naval expedition under the command of the grand vizier Sinān Pasha, seconded by ‘Ilij ‘Alī who had, in the meantime, been appointed *kapudan pasha* (grand admiral of the Ottoman fleet) sailed from Istanbul to the Tunisian shores. There it was reinforced by contingents sent from Qayrawān, Tripoli, Algiers and Mashriq provinces of the Porte. The Ottoman fighters first successfully stormed the fortress of Ḥalq al-Wād, near Tunis, where a Spanish force had been garrisoned for the protection of the Hafsid monarch, Mulāy Muḥammad, and then finally secured the capital (von Hammer-Pürgstall 1840–4: II, 191–2; Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 287–99). The campaign lasted two months and its victorious outcome resulted in the creation of the third, and last, Ottoman province of the Arab Maghrib, or the Barbary region, as it was denominated by Europeans.

The successive conquest of the *eyālets* (provinces) of Algiers, Tripoli and Tunis, known as the ‘western hearths’ (Ott.: *garp ocakları*) of the Porte, and situated on the western frontier of the Empire, had represented important territorial assets in the war waged by the Ottomans against their main European foe, Charles V of the House of Habsburg, whose dominions extended to Spain in the western Mediterranean. It is interesting to note, however, that this strategic consideration lost most of its importance soon after the conquest of Tunis (or maybe as a result of it): in 1578, the signing of a truce between Murād III and Philip II, who had succeeded Charles V as king of Spain, led to the definitive cessation of large-scale naval warfare between the two powers (although this did not, for the next century and more, exclude corsair operations). From then on, while Spain turned to its new Atlantic possessions, the Ottomans shifted their attention to the Safawi threat in Anatolia and to their European territories (Hess 1977: 75).

More importantly, the addition of the Maghrib provinces to the realm of the Ottoman sultans represented a further extension of

the latter's domination over the Muslim Arab world. We may attempt, at this point, to make some conjectures on the effect of the victorious campaign of Sinān Pasha and the solemn institution of Ottoman rule on the minds and perceptions of the Tunisian population. The authority of the Hafsid dynasty had certainly been increasingly eroded since the end of the fifteenth century and, especially, under its last monarchs who could only keep their throne by entrusting it to the protection of a Christian power. To the memory of the brutalities committed by the Spanish army against the inhabitants of the capital in 1534, were added rumours, real or fictitious, probably spread by pro-Ottoman propagandists, on profanations perpetrated after the second occupation of Tunis by Don Juan's forces in 1572.<sup>1</sup> After the city had been snatched twice from the weak control of Khayr al-Dīn and 'Ilij 'Alī,<sup>2</sup> the 1574 expedition dispatched from Istanbul and led by the grand vizier Sinān Pasha himself, probably appeared to many as ushering in a new radiant era. The country was now, at last, closely reunited with the *dār-al-islām* (the realm of Islam) under the rule of the Turkish sultans, whose military excellence was seen as evidence of their true Islamic faith, and whose victories proclaimed that God was on their side. We may, furthermore, presume that the setting-up of Ottoman rule in the new province was received by the local ulama (religious authorities and doctors of law), not with the resigned acquiescence reserved to mighty usurpers, but with a measure of genuine enthusiasm. The religious propaganda sanctioning Ottoman rule, amplified and spread in the cities by the ulama's Friday sermons, would also filter down to the countryside and to the ever turbulent, but not totally impervious, tribes. Furthermore, the population in towns must have welcomed the army and administration of the powerful gunpower Empire as an effective protection against anarchy and Beduin raids.

### The beginning of Ottoman rule in Tunis (1574–91)

The Ottoman administrative structure set up by Sinān Pasha in the newly-created Tunisian *eyālet* conformed to the general pattern established for provincial governments throughout the Empire. Supreme power in the province devolved on the sultan's representative, the pasha, or beylerbey, appointed for a limited period. The victorious Ottoman conquest army, or *wajaq* (from the Ott.: *ocak*) the greatest part of which remained in the province after their commander's departure to Istanbul, was now entrusted with

implementing Ottoman law and order in the province, and protecting it from the threat of Christian attacks. The *wajaq*, in Tunis, soon became more commonly designated by the Arabic word *jund* (army). Its members, upholding the Muslim Ḥanefite rite followed by the Turkish Ottomans, in contradistinction to the local population who adhered to the Malekite rite, formed the privileged tax-exempted group of the *ʿaskeris* of the province. Although the *jund* was formally placed under the supreme authority of the pasha, its *dīwān*, constituted by the body of janissary officers who were empowered with prerogatives for settling all legal and administrative matters concerning their corps, enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. Of this *dīwān*, and, indeed, of the whole *ʿaskeri* structure of which it was in charge in the Tunisian *eyālet*, the eighteenth-century chronicler Ḥusayn Khūja asserts that ‘it was copied on those of Algiers and Egypt’ (Khūja 1975: 88). The *jund*, in addition to fighters, included various categories of officers principally entrusted with administrative and accountancy duties, since the public service, throughout the Ottoman Empire, was an integral part of the *ʿaskeri* class. The highest-ranking of these officers was the bey. The *jund* also included the Hanefite *qādis* (judges and religious jurisconsults), who were appointed by the *ser ʿasker* (supreme military commander) of Rumelia (Raymond 1989: 351). Finally, a group composed of its highest-ranking officers, to whom were added a few city notables,<sup>3</sup> formed an influential political council, called (like the administrative body regulating the affairs of the *jund*), the *dīwān*, which assisted the pasha in making decisions and implementing sultan orders in the province.

The Tunisian *eyālet* was ruled, at its incipience, by a sort of condominium set up between the Porte and ʿIlij ʿAlī, corsair-beylerbey of Algiers and *kapudan pasha* of the Ottoman fleet, until the latter’s death in 1587 (Julien 1952: 265). It is worth noting here, that, since the fifteenth century, the process of extension of Ottoman rule over new territories was almost systematically divided into two stages, as has been noted by Halil Inalcik: ‘[The Ottomans] first sought to establish some sort of suzerainty over the neighbouring states. They then sought direct control over these countries by the elimination of the native dynasties’ (quoted by Holt 1968: 83–4).

This observation applies also to Tunisian *eyālet*, with the difference that, in the first stage, the native Hafsid dynasty, which sank into total oblivion after Sinān Pasha’s victory over its Spanish protectors, was replaced by the corsairs, who had preceded the

Porte in the conquest of the Maghrib. Sources on this brief period, however, have provided no detail on the nature and extent of the jurisdiction of 'Ilij 'Alī on that province. In order to probe further this issue, it is worth recalling that the supreme commanders of the Ottoman navy, in the fifteenth century, were granted the governorship of some coastal territories in the Greek archipelago as an appanage to their office. To these were added, at least, the governorships of Algiers and of the town of Mahdiyya on the eastern Maghrebi coast, when Khayr al-Dīn Barbarossa was appointed at the head of the admiralty by Sultan Sulayman in 1528 (Ozbaran 1978). It seems, therefore, that as the Ottoman conquest progressed in the Maghrib, coinciding with the period when the first Algerian beylerbeys, from Khayr al-Dīn to 'Ilij 'Alī, monopolized the command of the Ottoman navy, the coastal territories of Tunis and Tripoli (with the whole of the Algiers province) were integrated into what came to be called 'the *eyālet* of the *kapudan pasha*'. By the end of the sixteenth century, however (presumably from the death of 'Ilij 'Alī), the domination of the Algerian corsairs over the Ottoman admiralty had been successfully fought off by the government of the Porte, and the territorial scope of that *eyālet*, in spite of an increase in its geographical dimensions, became, again, limited to the eastern Mediterranean region (Beckingham 1965). The Maghrib provinces, which became directly ruled by the Porte after 1587, nonetheless remained after that date, to an important extent, under the jurisdiction of the *kapudan pasha*, as we shall see below.

It was also during the years from 1574 to 1587 that the initial territory covered by the Tunisian *eyālet* in the period following the conquest was, by sultanic decree, considerably extended to the south and east, to cover new regions that had previously been placed under Tripolitan jurisdiction (Bachrouch 1977: 163–4). As concerns Ottoman rule in Tunis in that period (and the few following years, until the military uprising that broke out in 1591), it has been described by Tunisian historiography as marked by acts of exploitation and violence, inherent to any foreign military occupation. Two specific instances of these abuses in Tunis have, indeed, been recorded by sources: first, Rajab Pasha's policies of extortion (1576–7), which led to complaints being filed against him and resulted in his quick dismissal (Bachrouch 1977: 135, 139); second, the exactions of an Ottoman *qāḍī*, against whom a group of local ulama and notables voiced their protests (and eventually probably won their case) (Chérif 1972: 37–50). It is worth noting, however,



that in these two cases, at least, the abuses were stamped out. This, in addition to several admonitory letters sent to high officials in Tunis by the Porte, following reports about abusive practices in the new province at that period (Samih 1969: 261–2; Témimi 1995: 198–207), should therefore rather lead us to infer that the new ruling power and its representatives paid some attention to the rights and grievances of the local population.

In 1591, the uprising of the Tunisian *jund* led to important changes being made in the Ottoman administrative structure set up by Sinān Pasha in the province. Before studying this episode and its consequences, it is necessary to deal, first, with the origins and composition of the Ottoman army in Tunis on the morrow of the conquest.

### The Tunisian Ottoman army and the 1591 uprising

The armies of the Ottoman sultans in the sixteenth century were of a heterogeneous composition. There was, first, the prestigious imperial janissary corps, originally exclusively manned by Christian Rumelian youth recruited and trained to follow a military or an administrative career in the Ottoman government, after having converted to Islam. These young men, who enjoyed the envied status of *kapı kulus* (slaves of the Porte), monopolized, since the fifteenth century, most of the high posts in the army and administration of the Empire. In addition to the janissaries, a variety of auxiliary contingents fought in the sultan's wars. The greatest proportion of these contingents was recruited among groups of armed Muslim young men from the Anatolian plateau, where they were known as the *sekbans*. The increasing financial difficulties of the Porte, from the middle of the sixteenth century on, led it to resort increasingly to the *sekbans*, who represented a cheap fighting force, paid only for the duration of each campaign. The *sekbans*, who were organized by the Ottoman military authorities into various formations, are mentioned for instance, in sources on Selīm I's campaigns in Syria and Egypt in 1517, or on the wars in Hungary between 1594 and 1607 (Finkel 1988: 37). We may, therefore, presume that there was a number of these contingents among Sinān Pasha's expeditionary force against Tunis and, thence, among the first Tunisian *jund*. This fact may also be deduced indirectly by assembling two pieces of information provided by Ibn Abī Dīnār on that army: first, that it included the 101st janissary *orta* (division), which Sinān Pasha had brought with him from Istanbul and, second, that its

total number was 3,000 fighters (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 199 and 301). Since the *ortas* of the imperial janissary corps, even in wartime, did not, according to the most liberal evaluations, number more than 500 men (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 61n.) this would imply that the Tunisian *jund* included only a small proportion of regular janissaries, and that the remaining number was made up of *sekbans* and other auxiliary forces.

Discontented or idle *sekbans*, disbanded between campaigns, became an increasingly serious cause of social unrest in Anatolia in the second half of the sixteenth century. The Porte, therefore, hoped to alleviate that problem by allowing these young men to settle in the territories that they had helped conquer. Whereas posts in the Ottoman central government and army remained (theoretically) reserved for Rumelians, these Muslim Anatolians of humble origins found an outlet for their ambitions, particularly in the far-away dominions of the Porte. An opportunity was thus offered for the *sekbans* to begin a new life in Tunis as the *ʿaskeris* of the province. In addition to enjoying the benefit of regular pay, they were granted one of the most strenuously upheld claims of the *sekbans* across the Ottoman Empire, i.e. their promotion to janissary status (Inalcik 1970: 346, 348): thence their denomination as the *kul ʿasker* of the province in Tunisian Ottoman documents (see Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Carton 220, Dossier 346, document 3).

The incipient Tunisian *jund*, placed under the supreme command of an *āgha* from the janissary corps of Istanbul, was also structured on the pattern of their corps, being divided into sections of 20 to 25 men, placed under the orders of officers called the *bulūk bāshīs* (Ott.: *bölük başıs*, or section commanders), presumably sent from Istanbul, or, at least, appointed from among the small contingent of imperial janissaries that had participated in Sinān Pasha's campaign. According to the eighteenth-century historian Muḥammad al-Wazīr, furthermore, the *jund* also included, from its beginning, another category of officers called the deys (Ott.: *dāy*, i.e. maternal uncle), who were placed in command of divisions of 100 men (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 338). This assertion, however, is contradicted by Ibn Abī Dīnār, according to whom the deys only emerged after the revolt of the *jund* in 1591, as the elected spokesmen of the rebel janissaries (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 201). Several historians on Ottoman Tunisia have sanctioned the latter account, thus rejecting, implicitly or explicitly, al-Wazīr's assertion (Pignon 1950: 102; Bachrouch 1977: 134–5; Raymond 1994:

II, 32). This choice may have been based on the assumption that, since Ibn Abī Dīnār lived at an earlier period than al-Wazīr, and therefore nearer in time to the 1591 uprising (he died in the last years of the seventeenth century), his account of the circumstances of that event would be more precise and reliable. It may be argued, however, against this assumption, that Ibn Abī Dīnār, being a client and propagandist of the Muradite beys of his time who were engaged in a bitter conflict against the deys, was particularly anxious to deny any formal Ottoman status or legitimacy to his patrons' enemies. Al-Wazīr, on the other hand, who was himself a beylical secretary in the eighteenth century, wrote at a time when that conflict had been settled to the beys' clear advantage, and could therefore afford concessions to truth on that issue. Furthermore, as a piece of deductive argumentation to substantiate al-Wazīr's version on the origins of the deys, and in the light of the fact that the *sekbans*, in Anatolia, were organized in groups of 100 men (Inalcik 1973: 48), we may plausibly suggest that the deys of the Tunisian *jund* (also commanding 100-men-strong divisions, as indicated above), were the original leaders of the *sekban* contingents recruited for the Tunis campaign.

The central Ottoman government, thus, officially acknowledged the authority of the Anatolian *sekban* chiefs, who had acquired ascendancy over their men through years of hardship and semi-vagrancy between campaigns, by integrating them within the hierarchical structure of the *jund* of Tunis (as well as those of Algiers and Tripoli). This policy was motivated by the permanent concern of the Porte to ensure a system of checks and balances in its provincial armies and governments. Such a system helped alleviate the risk that one particular official or group of officials would succeed in establishing a clear supremacy over the others, and thus monopolize a measure of power that would enable them to challenge the authority of the Ottoman central government. Finally, it should be noted that, although the deys may have appeared for the first time in the *junds* of the Maghrib *eyālets* during the sixteenth century, they did not, *pace* contrary assertions made by some historians, remain an exclusive feature of these provincial corps (Le Tourneau 1965): thus, sources of the end of the eighteenth century report that janissaries, under the leadership of their deys, launched insurrections in Serbia in the time of Sultan Selīm III (1789–1807) (Aksan 1998).

In the Tunisian *jund*, the deys, plebiscited by the grass-roots janissaries, represented a counterweight to the *bulūk bāshīs*,

emanating from the powerful janissary hierarchy. The authority of the *bulūk bāshīs*, however, clearly predominated within the *jund*. They were four or five times superior to the deys in number, and exercised a harsh rule over the *yuldāshes* (Tur.: *yoldaş*, i.e. rank and file janissary) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 200). We may therefore plausibly presume that the deys' frustration at having their influence over their men thus thwarted was the underlying cause of the 1591 uprising. This interpretation does not contradict, but rather completes Ibn Abī Dīnār's assertion that the arrogance and harshness of the *bulūk bāshīs* had brought to its utmost the exasperation of the *yuldāshes*, who massacred over 80 of these officers, with the complicity of some officers of the *dūwān* (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 200). It is, moreover, supported by the fact that one of the consequences of the uprising was the soaring of the deys to political supremacy in the province, as we shall see in the following section of this chapter.

### A new Ottoman policy in the Maghrib

The 1591 uprising, occurring in the context of the grave political, social and economic crisis that started in the last quarter of the sixteenth century in the Ottoman Empire and was marked by the breaking out of revolts and mutinies led by janissaries and *sekban* forces in various provinces (Inalcik 1970: II, 342–8; Inalcik 1973: 48–51), led to considerable changes in the administrative and political organization of the Tunisian *eyālet*. In the new government structure that emerged finally by the turn of the seventeenth century, following a troubled transitional period, on which sources have provided very little information,<sup>4</sup> the three main officials were: first, the dey, elected or chosen by the *dūwān* among the 40 janissary officers holding that title;<sup>5</sup> second, the bey; and, third, the pasha.<sup>6</sup>

It is important to examine critically, at this stage, the widespread assumption, in the contemporary Tunisian historiography, that the government of the Porte, submerged on all sides by the serious problems of that period, had bowed down to the *fait accompli* of the 1591 uprising in Tunis and had hastened to ratify the new order that emerged from it (Bachrouch 1977: 51). The fact that Tunisian sources on the period have been totally silent on the subject of the reaction of the Porte to the uprising, admittedly, might be considered as an argument in favour of this assumption. I have already pointed out, however, the possibility that the political biases of

Tunisian chroniclers led them to distort facts, or, at least, to sin by omission, as concerns such issues as the circumstances that led to the emergence of deylical power in the province and the status and relations of the deys with the Ottoman Porte. I would argue, furthermore, that it is difficult to believe that the Porte stood utterly powerless in the face of the 1591 events in Tunis, if we recall that a few years later (in 1605), the breaking out of a mutiny in Egypt led to the appointment of an energetic and ruthless pasha who dealt with trouble-makers with an iron hand (Holt 1968: 82). It is, therefore, more plausible to assume that the post-1591 administrative order was essentially devised and edicted by the Porte itself, though it took into consideration the claims of the rebel *jund*. As, for instance, in the aftermath of the widescale 1524 rebellion in Egypt,<sup>7</sup> envoys must have been sent to Tunis, once the storm had started to abate, bearing various *amrs* (orders) and *qānūnnāmes* (codes of laws), to impose order in the province and reorganize it.

The 1591 events also led the Porte, in particular, to adopt a new decentralized method of rule over the whole of its Maghrib dominions. The three Maghrib provinces were thus each granted the status of *eyālet mümtāze* (privileged province) – a designation corresponding to the term ‘Regency’ in the European diplomatic language (Bachrouch 1977: 139). This new administrative status entailed, first, that the *junds* of the Regencies became totally independent of the imperial janissary corps, and their *āghas* and other officers were thenceforth promoted from within their own ranks. Each of the Regencies, furthermore, had its own fleet, headed by a local *qubṭān* (the word being an arabized version of the Ottoman ‘*kapudan*’). Second, in contrast to the Arab Mashriq provinces, the treasuries of the Maghrib Regencies did not have to remit any proportion of their yearly revenues to the central Ottoman treasury in Istanbul (Grandchamp 1937: II, 448). In return for this financial exemption, these provinces were required to fulfil specific naval and military duties, i.e. supplying the Ottoman admiralty with a number of galleys on its campaigns, and waging the corso against the Christian enemies of the Porte. Third, the governments of the Regencies were empowered to sign treaties with Christian powers, within conditions that will be described below.

It should be stressed, however, that the decentralization of Ottoman rule in the Maghrib region, which took on a more accentuated form in the Tunisian *eyālet*, by no means constituted a radical revolution in the Ottoman order of things. Political,

historical, or geographical considerations had, in several instances, led the Porte to relinquish a number of its prerogatives to provincial governments, including the acknowledgement of the supremacy of local rulers over its own official representatives (Imber 2002: 180–1). This trend was even increasingly asserted from the mid-seventeenth century. In this context, it should be observed that the setting-up of a deylical regime in Algiers in 1672 was no matter of chance, but represented the implementation of the same formula of decentralized government as that inaugurated in Tunis more than half a century earlier.

### The *jund*: a suggested dichotomous pattern

Before proceeding to study the powers and prerogatives of the two main officials in the post-1591 Tunisian government, i.e. the dey and the bey, it is necessary, first, to dwell on the evolution of the janissary corps, that was both the cause and the result of the important political evolution of the Regency from the end of the sixteenth century until the mid-seventeenth century. The following suggested pattern of organization and development of the Tunisian *jund* is based on the assumption that this corps was characterized by the same structural dichotomy that constituted a fundamental feature of Ottoman military forces in the Arab Mashriq provinces (Raymond 1980: 354). It is drawn up, in particular, on the model provided by the Egyptian Ottoman army, on which a valuable body of research is today available (Shaw 1962: 190–210; Holt 1993).

In the Egyptian *eyālet*, the bulk of infantry forces were divided into two main regiments, known, respectively, in the Ottoman terminology, as the *müstahfizan* and the *'azab*. The recurring confrontations between these two regiments attracted the other smaller formations in support of one side or the other, and were at the source of the successive political and civil conflicts that affected the province throughout the seventeenth century. The *müstahfizans*, who formed what was considered the janissary regiment of the province par excellence, held the exclusive privilege of guarding the citadel of that capital, and their contingents were, at least in part, periodically renewed by contingents sent from Istanbul. I shall therefore assume that the Tunisian *jund* also had a 'noble' regiment, entrusted with guarding the Qasbah citadel, at the heart of Tunis. Given, however, the origins of that *jund* and its autonomy from Istanbul, I would suggest that this regiment did not include in its midst janissaries from the imperial corps, but was reserved,

instead, for the *sekbans* born and recruited in Anatolia. These fighters were considered as the heirs of the glorious conquerors of Sinān Pasha's army; their deys, furthermore, were the only ones eligible to achieve the supreme dignity of the title dey of the Regency, since this official, according to a European source, had to be 'a pure-blooded Turk' (Venture de Paradis 1983: 28). It is worth noting that the dey Qāra Akūz (1665–6), was a former *āgha* of the Qasbah citadel (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 40).

The second main Egyptian regiment, that of the *ʿazabs*, belonged to an auxiliary Ottoman military corps recruited among the population of coastal towns and villages in the Ottoman Empire. The *ʿazabs* were often garrisoned in sea-shore garrisons, or were in charge of the surveillance of maritime and fluvial waters, as in Egypt. They were included in most, if not all, of the provincial armies of the Empire. In Algiers, for instance, the *zbanṭūt*, or *zambaṭūt* (a denomination that was the local distortion of the Ottoman *ʿazaban*), composed a regiment of 1,000 renegades, who were employed for corso expeditions (Gaid 1974: 94; Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 451–2). Finally, the *ʿazabs* were present in the Tunisian *jund*, as is attested by fleeting mentions of them in a few sources.<sup>8</sup>

We may presume, concerning the composition of the *ʿazab* regiment in Tunis, that its members, as in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, originated from coastal regions. This meant that, with the exception of those among them who were recruited from the Anatolian shores, the Tunisian *ʿazabs* were, in their majority, converts, who gained access to the *ʿaskeri* class in the Regency by serving as *mamlūks* (slaves) in the households of important Ottoman officials. The converts included, first, fighters from the Rumelian coasts and the Greek archipelago. The rest came from the northern shores of the western Mediterranean: young Christians captured by Tunisian corsairs, who, despairing of redemption, chose to convert to Islam, or hardened adventurers attracted by the profits of the corso under the Ottoman banner (Bachrouch 1977: 38–9). Thus, the dichotomy established within the Tunisian janissary corps, between the Muslims and the converts, corresponded to an ethnic-geographical divide between the Anatolians and the Europeans. The *ʿazab* regiment, whose development was, to a large extent, linked to the activities of the Tunisian corso, gained gradual importance during the first half of the seventeenth century.

The beys who, as we shall see later, were converts (or descendants of a convert), were therefore members of the *ʿazab* regiment.

Finally, we should mention here a smaller formation within the *jund*, which was that of the *reïses*, or corsair captains. We may presume that the corps of the *reïses*, or an important part of it, at least, emanated from the regiment of the *ʿazabs*, if we recall, first, the maritime vocation of the *ʿazab* regiment and, second, the fact that the most prestigious Tunisian *reïses* in the seventeenth century were European renegades (Bachrouch 1977: 64–5). One of the latter was Uṣṭa Murād Genovese, who had served as a *mamlūk* in ʿUthmān Dey’s household (1598–1616). Uṣṭa Murād, abetted by a group of renegades, managed to seize beylical power in 1637 (Pignon 1955: 353; Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 209–10). This *coup de force* represented the first of a number of transgressions committed in the mid-seventeenth century against the Ottoman stipulation restricting eligibility to the deylicate to members of the Anatolian regiment.

### The policies of the deys (1598–1647)

The period of the deys’ effective political supremacy coincided almost exactly with the first half of the seventeenth century, beginning with the rule of Qāra ʿUthmān (1598–1616), succeeded by Yūsuf (1610–37), then by Uṣṭa Murād (1637–40) and, finally, by Aḥmad Khūja (1640–47). The dey is also designated, in Tunisian sources, as the *serdār* (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 293). The *serdārs* were the commanders of janissary garrison troops in the capitals of Ottoman *eyālets* (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 156). They were normally subjected to the pashas’ authority, from which we may deduce that the 1591 uprising in Tunis had led to an inversion of the ranking orders of the pasha and the *serdār* in Tunis. The dey was also designated by the title of *dawlātli* (Arabized form of the Ottoman *‘devletlii’*, probably used in the Porte’s correspondence with this official, and meaning: ‘invested with power’) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 302; Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 19). It is interesting to note that, in the Egyptian province, the honorific epithet *‘devletlii’* applied to high officers of the Ottoman army, in contradistinction to the Circassian beys (Winter 1980: 104).

Historians have acknowledged that the deys’ rule ushered in a period of quiescence and order in Tunis (Bachrouch 1977: 135). This evolution towards greater stability should be seen as evidence that Ottoman authority was restored to greater effectiveness in the Tunisian province, and probably also in the other two



Regencies, after they were granted the status of *eyālet mümtāze*. It is important, in this regard, to mention the role assigned to the *kapudan pasha* in the pattern of decentralized Ottoman rule in the Maghrib. This official, although he no longer exercised an independent jurisdiction on the Maghrib *eyālets*, was thenceforth considered as the main intermediary between the Porte and the Regency rulers. He was entrusted with enforcing and checking the observance of the laws and stipulations laid down by the central Ottoman government. The authority of the *kapudan pashas*, one of whom is reported to have ordered the execution of a recalcitrant pasha in Tripoli at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was not to be made light of (Chérif 1986: I, 79).

The power of the deys, commanders of the janissaries, garrisoned in the capital and a few other cities and towns of the Regency, was essentially urban-based. The public works (constructing covered *sūqs*, or markets, and religious monuments, adducting water, cleaning rubbish dumps) and policing measures implemented under their rule were of benefit to all town-dwellers (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 202–10; al-Wazīr 1985: II, 343–99). Urban development and crafts in the Regency in that period were also stimulated by the arrival of waves of Morisco refugees, who settled in Tunis or created villages and small towns in other parts of the country. They enjoyed the sultan's special solicitude and were exempted from many taxes (Témimi 1983: 169–80). A number of them, admitted into the *jund*, provided its navy with a new source of recruits whose frustration and desire for revenge probably instilled new vigour into the corso. Finally, important financial and administrative measures to reorganize the *jund* were adopted in the time of Uṣṭa Murād (1637–40) (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 377–8).

The relations of the Regency with Christian states were conditioned by the policies and interests of the Ottoman Porte. The deylical government had to sign, with a number of Christian powers, treaties and conventions based on the Capitulation agreements previously concluded between the latter and the Ottoman sultan. The signatories on the Regency's side, referred to as the 'powers of Tunis', were the pasha and the *dīwān* of the janissaries.<sup>9</sup> Thus, treaties were signed, under the Porte's tutelage, with France in 1605, with Holland in 1622 and with England in 1662. On the basis of these accords, commercial exchange was developed, particularly with France, which emerged as the main naval power in the western Mediterranean. On the sultan's orders, a French comptoir for coral-fishing and for the exportation of wheat to the

South of France was set up in Cap Nègre (on the northern coast of the Regency) in 1627 (Roux 1932: 114). These exports, however, were stopped during some years of drought, under the rule of Uṣṭa Murād (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 210), presumably in conformity with Ottoman orders, since we know that, in the Egyptian province, for instance, the sale of grains to Christian powers during periods of scarce harvests was forbidden by the Porte (Shaw 1962: 84).

The treaties signed between the Regency and European states contained, specifically, clauses guaranteeing the immunity of vessels belonging to these countries from corsair attacks (see Rousseau 1985: 430, 474, 475–80). Transgression of these stipulations was, at times, committed by the Tunisian corsairs, thereby necessitating the sending of deputations from complaining countries, accompanied by emissaries from the Porte (Ott.: *kapıcıs*), for arduous negotiations with the *dīwān* (Grandchamp 1937: I, 315–22; Rousseau 1985: 38–40). The corso, however, thrived during that period, in particular against Spain and the Italian states.

In addition to waging the ‘small wars’ of the corso in the western Mediterranean, the Maghrib fleets were expected to contribute to the sultans’ naval campaigns. Thus, under Uṣṭa Murād, the Tunisian navy participated in a joint Algerian–Tunisian expedition under the orders of the *qubṭān* ‘Alī Bitshnīn of Algiers (the ‘Ali Picinino’ of the correspondence of Venetian *bailos*) against the Venetians (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 209; Rousseau 1985: 48–9). The province even contributed to the Ottoman campaign against Crete by sending war equipment, as well as contingents of Tunisian *rā'iyya* for two successive years, during the rule of Aḥmad Khūja (1640–7) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 211; al-Wazīr 1985: II, 408).<sup>10</sup> The sultans’ military victories were also widely advertised in Tunis. The *zīna* (illumination of cities to celebrate a happy event or a religious feast) for the capture of Baghdad from the Safawids lasted several days (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 211).

Finally, the first part of the seventeenth century witnessed the beginning of conflict between Tunis and the neighbouring Barbary provinces. In 1613, following an armed clash between the Tunisian and the Tripoli tan *junds*, the island of Jirba, which had been part of the Tripoli province, was annexed to the Tunisian Regency (Bachrouch 1977: 159–60). From then on and until the end of the nineteenth century, the Tunisian government was under obligation to pay to Istanbul an annual sum known as the *qaṭī 'al-wālida* (the tribute to the sultan’s mother), deducted from the taxes paid

by the island.<sup>11</sup> The annexation of Jirba by the Tunisian rulers, however, should not be seen as the result of a local armed conflict, whose consequences were imposed on the unwilling Porte. A more plausible assumption is that the conflict and the gain resulting from the Tunisian military victory had been previously agreed upon between the deylical government and the Porte (where the ladies of the harem held sway at that period), according to a recurring scheme in Ottoman policy in the Maghrib, of which later instances will be provided in this study.<sup>12</sup>

Several quarrels also broke out between the Tunisian and the Algerian governments, as to their respective jurisdictions over tribes in the north-western region. In 1614, an agreement delimiting the frontier between the two Regencies was signed, with the mediation of ulama and holy men. More serious trouble broke out around 1628. The Porte sent a mediator, who was not heeded. Although the Tunisians suffered a severe defeat in the armed confrontation that ensued, the treaty signed shortly after that between the two provinces, confirmed and detailed the demarcation delimited in 1614 (Bachrouch 1977: 160–2). This particular fact, therefore, leads me to one last observation concerning the frontier litigations between Tunis and its two neighbours in the first half of the seventeenth century. The geographical limits of the Tunisian Regency, as I have indicated earlier, had been gradually defined, after several additions were made to its original territory, at the expense of the Tripolitan province, during the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The addition of Jirba to the Tunisian dominions in 1613 represented the last of these adjustments. After that date, the frontiers between the three Regencies remained unchanged for the whole of the Ottoman period, in spite of the numerous conflicts that broke out between them during the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries and, in particular, between Tunis and Algiers. Thus, the policy followed by the Porte in the Maghrib from the beginning of the seventeenth century, preceding by several centuries that of colonial and post-colonial Europe on the African continent, was one of firm abidance by the principle of the intangibility of frontiers between its provinces.

### The bey

The bey belonged to a category of military commanders known, in the Ottoman Empire as the *sancak beğis* or, in the exact Arabic equivalent of that title, *amīr liwā's* (lords of the flags). This

designation drew its origin from the fact that, in the early period of the Empire, these commanders, on being appointed as the supreme representatives of the Sultan in newly-conquered territories, were each given a *sancak*, or flag, as a symbol of that delegation of power. The provincial territories commanded by the beys, which were also designated as *sancaks*, became, from the fifteenth century on, administrative divisions integrated into larger provinces, or *eyālets*, placed under the supreme authority of the pashas, or beylerbeys (Ott.: *beğlerbeği*, i.e. ‘bey of beys’). The respective rankings of the bey and the beylerbey within the Ottoman administration were symbolized by the number of *tuğs* (horse-tails displayed on a pole-shaft) awarded to each of them: one for the first, two for the second. The beylerbeys and, increasingly, the beys, were recruited from among the new military and administrative elite enlisted from the *kapı kulus* of the Porte trained in the sultan’s household, who were rapidly superseding the old aristocracy of the Turkic warlords (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 138–45). The corps of Egyptian beys constitutes an interesting instance of these Ottoman officials in an Arab Mashriq *eyālet* (Holt 1961 in particular). These beys were entrusted with the governorships of the *sancaks* into which Egypt was divided and with other high offices.

Ramaḍān Bey, the first bey of the Tunisian *eyālet* was, according to some sources, a *kapı kulu* sent from Istanbul in the period following the conquest (Roy 1917: 197). From the beginning, Ramaḍān was entrusted with high administrative and fiscal responsibilities in the province, but it was only after the setting-up of deylical rule that he assumed permanently the responsibility of commanding the bi-annual *maḥalla* in the Regency. The term ‘*maḥalla*’ meaning, in Maghrib usage, ‘a military column, or camp’, also designated the military and administrative expeditions sent to tour the greatest part of the province’s territory lying outside the capital, for tax-raising (Dozy 1881). The *maḥallas* were the main source of fiscal revenue in the Regency, and their proceeds ensured in particular the payment the *jund*’s salaries. The bey thus represented, as asserted by a European observer of the period, the ‘Grand Trésorier’ of the province (quoted by Abun-Nasr 1975: 76). It should be noted here that, in the classical Ottoman provincial administration, the holder of this post of supreme financial and fiscal authority was the *defterdār*, generally ranking second after the pasha (Gibb and Bowen 1950: 150, 201). In Ottoman Egypt, this post was offered to the most influential beys (Holt 1961: 222).

Twentieth-century historians on Ottoman Tunisia have considered that the beylical *maḥallas* were the continuation of an old Hafsid usage, while acknowledging that these fiscal expeditions, in the Hafsid period, were not organized with the regular periodicity that characterized them under the Ottoman administration (Bachrouh 1977: 48; Raymond 1989: 356). It should be pointed out, however, that several Ottoman pashas, in Arab provinces in particular, were responsible for the leading of annual fiscal expeditions (called ‘*dawras*’, i.e. tours, in the province of Damascus, for instance), in the districts of their *eyālets* (Rafeq 1966: 21–2). In the present state of our knowledge about these Ottoman fiscal expeditions, we should not rule out the possibility that their systematic development and extension across other provinces of the Empire may have occurred after the conquest of Tunis, and may therefore have been inspired by the original Hafsid *maḥallas*.

Ramaḍān Bey, during his *maḥalla* expeditions, had to fulfil various duties, linked to his tax-raising functions. He was, thus, probably in charge of surveying the population and the sources of wealth in the rural and tribal regions of the Regency, gradually brought under Ottoman control during the first half of the seventeenth century. It was on the basis of such local surveys that *qānūns* stipulating, in particular, tax-rates imposed on the *rāiyya* in each province were drawn up by the central Ottoman administration and sent to provincial officials for implementation.<sup>13</sup> The bey was also entrusted with dividing the province into administrative units, headed by local governors.

Ramaḍān was the ‘bey of the *maḥalla*’ in the Regency until his death, c.1613. By then, several other officials had also been granted the title of bey, although Ramaḍān seems to have enjoyed pre-eminence among them. The beys – some of whom, at least, were Ramaḍān’s own *mamlūks* – were granted district governorships, or were appointed as deputies (*kāhiyas*) of the ageing bey of the *maḥalla* (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 227).<sup>14</sup> After the death of Ramaḍān, who left no son, one of his *mamlūks*, Murād ‘Kursū’ (the Corsican), successfully vied against the ambitions of the brother and the nephew of his former master, and managed to impose himself as the main bey of the *maḥalla* in the Regency. Murād, shortly before his death (1631), bought the dignity of pasha from the Porte, and his beylical title was passed on to his son Ḥammūda. The latter, during his long period of rule (1631–66), was able to assert the increasing beylical influence in the province. Having subdued most of the still insubordinate tribes in the Regency, he completed the

administrative set-up of the province and recruited tribesmen into the standing and auxiliary cavalry corps placed under his command (*ṣubāyhis* and *mazārgis*). Finally, in his old age, Ḥammūda, like his father before him, received the title of pasha from the Porte, which he kept for three years (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 239). His prerogatives and privileges were distributed between his three sons, the most important of which – the leadership of the *maḥalla* – was bestowed upon Murād, the eldest (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 239).

It should be noted here that the monopolization of beylical power by Murād I and his descendants was not a singular feature of the Tunisian government. By the end of the sixteenth century, the principle of the inheritability of many army and government posts was increasingly asserting itself across the provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Many of these posts were thus held for life by their incumbents, and were next passed to their eldest sons, if the latter proved eligible. The development of this practice, in the case of offices entailing important financial prerogatives, was motivated by particular considerations of Ottoman statesmanship (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 256): it was expected that the Tunisian beys, as the main tax-collectors in the province, would abstain from pressurizing too harshly the tax-paying population and thus safeguard its welfare and material prosperity, in order to preserve the long-term interests of their descendants.

### The fiscal organization of the Regency

The fiscal organization of the Tunisian province, since its creation, conformed to the same principles and practices as in the rest of the Empire. We know that the essential aim of taxation in the Ottoman Empire was to ensure a livelihood to the *ʿaskeris* out of the dues and customs paid by the *raʿīyya*. By the end of the sixteenth century, this organization was constituted of the juxtaposition of three different taxation systems, introduced successively by the Ottoman administration. The first system, bearing some similarity to the feudal European system, consisted in the attribution of *timars* to the Turkish cavalymen, or *sipāhis*, who had rallied round the banners of the first Ottoman sultans. Each *sipāhi*, in addition to a plot of land for his own cultivation, was granted the right to collect, for his own benefit, taxes from the local population living on a specific stretch of territory, whose size varied according to his rank. From the end of the sixteenth century on, an increasing number of *timars* and *ziʿānets* (a superior category of *timars*) were converted into

private property, sometimes with the acquiescence of the Ottoman authorities and, at other times, abusively. The second Ottoman taxation system, developed from the end of the fourteenth century, reflected the emergence of an increasingly centralized state, dominated by the salaried *kapı kulu* army. The coffers of the Treasury were financed by the taxes collected in towns and those collected from the peasants living on the ever-expanding *mīrī* lands (i.e. lands owned by the state), by agents of the Ottoman administration, who were themselves salaried *kapı kulus*. From the sixteenth century on, however, the growing need for ready cash led to the rapid development of *iltizāms* (concessions for tax-farming), whereby the right to collect a given type of tax, whether in an urban or a rural environment, was put up for auction and sold to the highest bidder, who might often be a rich member of the *rāiyya*, rather than an *ʿaskeri*. The tax concession owner, or *multazim*, kept to himself the total amount of the dues collected by him, in return for the payment of a fixed annual sum to the state (Shaw 1962: 26–7).

The Tunisian fiscal organization was marked, first and foremost, by the imprint of the *kapı kulu* system. It was centred around a powerful treasury providing the salaries of the *ʿaskeris* of the province and controlled by the bey. Ibn Abī Dīnār interestingly reports, in this regard, that the leadership of the *maḥallas* that provided the bulk of the revenues to the Tunisian treasury, was, in the early period of the conquest, offered as an *iltizām* to competing officials.<sup>15</sup> The appointment of the bey as permanent leader of these fiscal expeditions after 1591, therefore, ensured that the most important sources of fiscal revenue of the province were controlled by a *kapı kulu* official. This measure also put a halt to the abuses of the *iltizām* system, which caused suffering to the peasant population in many provinces of the Empire at that period. The fiscal organization of the Regency, nonetheless, included various *iltizāms* for the collection of a number of other taxes, particularly in the cities, which were held by Ottoman officials and Malekite notables (Pignon 1961: 201).

Finally, we note that the correspondence of the Porte with Tunis in the last decades of the sixteenth century contains severe reproof of some members and officials of the Tunisian *jund* for having abusively arrogated to themselves a number of *timars* and *ziāmets* (Témimi 1995: 206–7). It seems, in this regard, that *timars* were restricted to a very small proportion of the lands of the Ottoman Maghrib: an archival document of the same period, stating that the Ottoman Porte had fixed the number of *ziāmets* in the Tripoli

province to four (Témimi 1995: 208), provides an indication on their relative unimportance.

As a last point, it is worth quoting, in the context of this description of the fiscal organization of the Regency, two instances of semantic confusion in the writings of Tunisian authors of the Ottoman period, resulting from their ignorance of the Ottoman administrative language. The first concerns Ibn Abī Dīnār's assertion that 'a great number of (Ḥammūda Bey's) *mamlūks* were *zu'amā'* (plural of *zā'im*), and were considered as *mulūk* (plural of *malik*)' (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 238). For an Arabic reader (and, very probably also, for the author himself), the two words *zu'amā'* and *mulūk* would translate, respectively, as 'chiefs' and 'kings', thus suggesting that Ibn Abī Dīnār wished to establish a striking opposition between the servile status of the *mamlūks* and their exalted position in the Tunisian government. Placing these two terms within the context of Ottoman administrative usage, on the assumption that the above sentence was copied by Ibn Abī Dīnār from a source written in Turkish, will, on the other hand, lead us to a less lyrical, but more informative statement, i.e. that 'Ḥammūda Bey's *mamlūks* were granted *zi'āmet*s, which they were able to hold as their *mulk* (with full property title)'. Thus, *timars* in the Regency, seem to have been attributed, not to the Turkish members of the *jund*, but to some *mamlūks* of the bey, and probably to the latter also. The second example concerns the '*aṣlānīs*' that were, according to al-Wazīr, disbursed to the janissaries who had participated in the conquest of the Tunisian province (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 377). We may observe here a distortion of the Ottoman word '*salyāne*', meaning 'annual salary' into a word of close consonance, current in Tunisian usage, and meaning 'original, initial'. The apparent irrelevance of this adjective in the sentence is tempered by the fact that the author was referring to a reduction, in Uṣṭa Murād's time, affecting the (initial) amounts of the salaries paid to the janissaries.



# HOUSEHOLD POLITICS AND BEYLICAL RULE (1631–1777)

## The beylical and the deylical households

In the heart of the Ottoman Empire and in its provinces, the numerous households of relatives, followers and servants kept by prominent officials and notables, in emulation of the sultan and the grand vizier, served as foci of power striving to attract a clientele of various social and geographical origins, in order to serve the political interests of their masters. Hence, the term ‘household’, as used in the Ottoman historiography, refers, beyond the physical boundaries of houses and palaces, to the large social and political webs of influence centred around important Ottoman office-holders, and whose development, from the sixteenth century onwards, was linked to the weakening of the central sultanic power and the emergence of harshly competing forces within the Ottoman state. The structures, policies and rivalries of these provincial households have been studied in some detail in the case of Ottoman Egypt (see in particular Holt 1961, 1968, 1982; Hathaway 1995a, 1995b, 1997). The observations and results of this body of research will help us describe and analyse the evolution of the political conflict, reflected in household strategies, that opposed the deys and the beys in the Regency in the middle of the seventeenth century.

The militant core of the Ottoman households in the Regency, as in the other Arab provinces, was constituted by the *mamlūks*. The Arabic term ‘*mamlūk*’ (meaning ‘owned, belonging to’) applied to slaves of Christian origin who, after having converted to Islam, were kept in the service of those officials or notables who had bought them, or otherwise acquired them. They enjoyed the privilege of some education and powerful patronage, which allowed them to hold important offices. These exalted ‘slaves’, who were

expected to devote their life and career to furthering the interests of their masters, therefore stood as the provincial equivalents of the Istanbul *kapı kulus* brought up and trained in the sultan's palace. A number of *mamlūks* in the powerful households of the Tunisian Regency originated from Christian communities of the Empire and were bought in Istanbul or other Ottoman cities. The rest, in greater number, came as part of the booty of corso raids against Christian coasts or vessels. Among the *mamlūks* whose power was nurtured in the shadow of the deys in the first half of the seventeenth century, two in particular played an important political role: Uṣṭā Murād Genovese, from Qāra 'Uthman's household, and Māmī Ferrarese, from Yūsuf Dey's (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 205). Tunisian sources, however, have stressed the number and influence of Ramaḍān Bey's *mamlūks* (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 227). It is, indeed, plausible that the first bey of the Regency had managed to surround himself with an active and tightly-knit group of *mamlūks* to serve and increase his power. His own 'slave' origin, and the training he had received in government circles in Istanbul as a young *kapı kulu*, had probably provided him, in that regard, with experience that the raw Anatolian deys lacked. This initial advantage was further consolidated by Murād and his son Ḥammūda, who, having inherited the beylical household with the office, were able to assert their leadership over the group of Ramaḍān's *mamlūks*, to preserve its cohesion, and to enlarge it. Deylical households, in contrast, were numerous and weakened by mutual rivalries.

The conflict between the beylical and the deylical households, rooted, to an important extent, in the division of the janissary corps into the *'azabs* and the Anatolians, polarized the allegiances of the Ottoman officials at the top ranks of the *'askeri* structure of the province. Two episodes of that conflict in the time of Ḥammūda ibn Murād (1631–66) reveal the hostility of one of the pashas of that period to the bey. They also illustrate how the giants' struggle could result in tragically crushing lesser officials, namely, two interpreters (*tarjumāns*) of the *dīwān*: the enmity of the first, 'Alī Huwḡā, to that bey, led to his imprisonment and alleged suicide (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 213), whereas the allegiance of the second, Fallārī, caused him to be executed on the dey's orders (Bachrouh 1977: 171).<sup>1</sup> The influence of the beylical and deylical households also spread to the Malekite *ra'iyya*. Generally speaking, we may consider that the rural population, and its notables in particular, was the obvious base of recruitment for the beys'

clientele. Ibn Abī Dīnār thus assures us that ‘every *shaykh* (tribal leader) wished to be (Ḥammūda Bey’s) *mamlūk*’ (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 237). The deys’ constituency, on the other hand, was mainly based among the Malekites of the capital, such as ‘Alī Thābit, the powerful *éminence grise* of Yūsuf Dey (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 205).

The policies and tools used by the heads of Ottoman provincial households in order to increase their influence were varied. Among them were marriage alliances, which have already attracted some interest from researchers on the Egyptian province (Hathaway: 1995a). In the Regency, we note that one of Ḥammūda’s wives was the daughter of an influential tribal leader of the time, ‘Alī al-Ḥannashī. Ḥammūda also married his second son, Muhammad al-Hafsī, to the daughter of the pasha ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, and, most importantly, sealed an alliance between his household and one of the most important other deylical households in Tunis, through the marriage of his eldest son, Murād, with the granddaughter of ‘Uthmān Dey (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 212, 214). An even more potent tool in household policies was the material rewards that each of the bey and the dey could grant to his clients and followers in order to attract or preserve their allegiance. This issue is linked to the administrative and fiscal organization of the Regency. We may easily assume that considerable latitude was given to the beys for the granting of *iltizāms* and other related offices (such as the governorships of some rural districts) to their protégés in the broad and generally prosperous *maḥalla* country lying under their jurisdiction. Similar prerogatives were devolved on the dey, but they extended over a much smaller territory, restricted to the capital and its environing district.

Finally, we should point out scattered evidence, provided by sources, of the extension of the policies of Tunisian households beyond the boundaries of the Regency and their intermingling with other interests and rivalries within the Maghrib region. Thus, the Tunisian beylical household in the time of Murād II (1666–75) was allied to that of ‘Uthmān, the dey-pasha of Tripoli, whose daughter was married to Aḥmad, a son of the Tunisian bey. Murād resisted attempts by some members of the *dīwān* of Tripoli to win him to their side against ‘Uthmān, and, in 1672, invaded that city in retaliation for the latter’s murder (Bachrouch 1977: 174–5). The Tunisian deys, on the other hand, tended to seek support from their western neighbours: during the sharp conflict that broke out between Murād II and Sha‘bān Dey, the latter, according to sources, appealed to Rajab, bey of Constantine, promising him

the Tunisian beylicate in return for his help (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 44). Finally, we should note that the involvement of the pashas of the Porte in the conflict between the bey and the dey in Tunis, as illustrated by the episode that led to the execution of al-Fallārī, in the time of Ḥammūda Bey, or during the uprising of the *jund* against Murād II in 1673 (as we shall see below) suggests the existence of a link between the Tunisian (and other Maghrib) households and the main central Ottoman households in Istanbul.

After this description of the tools of household policies in the Regency, I shall now review the main developments of the conflict that opposed the beylical and the deylical households from the middle of the seventeenth century until 1675, and their final outcome.

### The conflict between the deys and the beys (1600–75)

The rivalry between the two main power-holders of the Regency, latent in the first decades of the seventeenth century, took on an increasingly overt character during the long period of rule of Ḥammūda Bey, who had varying relations with the deys of his time. With Uṣṭa Murād (1637–40), who enjoyed uncontested political supremacy over the province, the young bey presumably showed the same prudent deference shown by his predecessors towards Qāra ʿUthmān and Yūsuf Deys. Ḥammūda also showered gifts on Aḥmad Khūja Dey, but a sharp conflict arose between the two men towards the end of Khūja's tenure (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 211–12). The bey showed even greater generosity towards the third dey of his time, Ḥāj Muṣṭafa Lāz (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 414), whereas his relations with the fourth, Qāra Akūz, were marked by clear hostility. The latter was poisoned, it was rumoured, at the instigation of Ḥammūda's sons, shortly after their father's death, for which they held him responsible (Bachrouh 1977: 171).

Under Murād Bey II (1666–75), the tension between the beylical and the deylical households reached the point of open armed confrontation. After the death of Qāra Akūz Dey in 1666, the new bey ensured the accession to the deylicate of one of his protégés, Hāj Ughli.<sup>2</sup> A few years later, however, this dey was declared unsound of mind, and the *dīwān* ruled his deposition. Hāj Ughli was succeeded by Sha'bān Khūja, who managed to supersede Murād's own candidate. A sharp conflict arose between the bey and the dey's party in the *jund*, ending in Murād's victory, and the

exile of several Hanefite officers in 1672. Muḥammad Mantashālī was then elected to the deylicate, not in the *dūwān*, according to legal formality, but in the bey's camp, outside Tunis (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 243).

The *jund* engineered a second uprising in 1673. The uprising, supported by the pasha ʿAlī Barbar (Bachrouh 1977: 175), resulted in the deposition of Mantashālī from the deylical office and his replacement by ʿAlī Lāz. A number of the supporters of Murād Bey in the *jund* were killed, and ʿAlī Lāz asserted his power in the capital by appointing a new bey to serve in his government. Murād joined forces with his younger brother Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī, and the Muradites rallied their supporters and armed contingents outside the capital. The bey emerged, once again, victorious from the battle that ensued with the dey's forces (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 244–6).

Following this victory, a high deputation was sent to Istanbul to submit Murād's account of the events to the Porte. The ensuing firman issued by the Porte, in the words of Ibn Abī Dīnār, 'fulfilled (the highest) expectations' of Murād, who thus 'reached heights of glory that his father or his grandfather had never attained, nor anyone else in the whole of the Maghrib' (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 246). The author provides no details on the extent of the political gain scored by the bey after 1675, other than briefly mentioning that '*qānūn* judgements (i.e. judgements on matters of civil and political law, lying outside the scope of the religious *shariʿa*) were thenceforth issued in the capital on Murād's orders, or recommendations' (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 246). Thus, the bey's already considerable judicial authority was no longer confined to the countryside, but extended now to the seat of the Tunisian government. I would, therefore, suggest that the dey, who had risen to supremacy in the province after the victorious uprising of the Anatolians, was now officially supplanted by the bey, following his defeat by Murād's forces.

### The causes of beylical supremacy in the Regency

Historians on Ottoman Egypt have considered that the supremacy of the beys in that province, which asserted itself during the eighteenth century, was due to the fact that their corps had harboured the survivors of the old elite of the Mamluk sultanate that had developed to highest efficiency the techniques of household politics linked to the *mamlūk* institution in the pre-Ottoman period of the

country (Holt 1968: 83–4). Yet, in the Tunisian Regency where this political tradition did not exist, the beys were able, by the second half of the seventeenth century, to score a quicker and more complete triumph. This triumph was, undoubtedly, the direct result of the irresistible development of the Muradite household. The real causes for the latter phenomenon, however, should be sought not so much in the superior manoeuvring skills of the beys in household politics, compared to their rivals (even if this may be taken as a reasonable assumption), as in specific features of the beylical office: first, the inheritability of this office, which ensured the cohesion and continuous development of the household headed by the Muradites and, second, the considerable financial and administrative prerogatives devolved to it, which attracted to the beys a large clientele across the Regency.

We may therefore say that, in the administrative structure edicted by the Porte at the end of the sixteenth century, while political supremacy was formally granted to the dey, true power lay with the bey. The reason for this deliberate and subtle Ottoman policy is not difficult to make out. The dey stood, essentially, as the symbol of the Ottoman military institution, which had become a constant source of threat to the interests of the Ottoman state. With his Anatolian followers, he represented, through his ethnic origins, the Turkic *timar* cavalry and, through his formal status, the increasingly unruly janissaries of the Empire. The bey, on the other hand, representing, with his *mamlūks*, the Rumelian Ottoman administrative institution, headed by the grand vizier in Istanbul, was the ‘man of the Porte’ in Tunis. We may assume, in this regard, that the status of *kapı kulu* held by Ramaḍān, was passed on to his *mamlūk* Murād and his descendants, although the latter never set foot in Istanbul. Finally, the granting of the title of pasha to Murād I and his son Ḥammūda, was another mark of the Porte’s favour. The conferring of a second *tuğ* on these beys represented an administrative promotion granted at the close of a deserving career.

On the local front, things appeared even rosier for the Muradites. In the eyes of the majority of the local population, little aware of the suzerainty of the remote Ottoman sultans, the beys, who had taken up their residence in the Bārdū palace where the last Hafsid sultans had dwelt, appeared as the natural successors of these sovereigns. Panegyrists and local poets would also, no doubt, vie to amplify that image and thus pander to the ambition of the Muradites to attain the status of full-fledged dynasts. The

suspicious Porte, instructed by bitter experience in other provinces, particularly in Egypt, could not have been unaware of the temptation of increasing autonomy for these powerful officials. With this concern in mind, the central Ottoman government, since the beginning of the post-1591 administration, had conferred the title of bey to several officials, who stood as counter-weights to the power of the main bey of the *maḥalla*. In the mid-seventeenth century, Ramaḍān Bey, Ḥusayn Bey, Jaʿfar Bey and Muṣṭafa Bey, acted as Ḥammūda’s deputies (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 229) and as his potential replacements or successors, should he step beyond the bounds fixed for a servant of the Ottoman state. These beys, or others probably appointed after them, assumed the same role during the rule of Murād II.

### The fratricidal conflict (1675–86)

The conflict that arose between Muḥammad and ʿAlī, respectively the eldest and the second sons of Murād II, shortly after the latter’s death in 1675, ushered in a period of political crisis and civil trouble that lasted until 1686. The two main sources on that period are Ibn Abī Dīnār (whose chronicle stops in the year 1681), and the eighteenth-century historian al-Wazīr. The two accounts appear mostly as a jumble of confused occurrences, occasionally interspersed with brief, or vague explanations. Placing the events of the period within the framework of Ottoman household dynamics will, however, enable us to shed some light on an important aspect of the fratricidal conflict. I shall, therefore, assume that the Muradite household was split, at Murād II’s death, into two warring parties, each headed by one of the rival brothers, and which will be thenceforth designated here as the Muḥammadiya and the ʿAlawiyya households.

Concerning the respective constituencies of the two households, it seems probable that the bulk of the Muḥammadiyya partisans must have originated from the initial Muradite household, whereas the ʿAlawiyya included its former discontented elements, half-hearted allies and opponents. Ibn Abī Dīnār, a clear champion of ʿAlī’s cause, has provided us with the names of the most important members of that bey’s household. These included, first, two prominent personalities linked to ʿAlī by blood ties: his paternal uncle, Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī, and his maternal uncle, Aḥmad Shalabī. The latter, being the son of Yūsuf Dey, had himself inherited one of the most prestigious deylical households of the Regency. The other

### Box 2.1 Members of the household of ‘Alī ibn Murād Bey

#### ‘Alī ibn Murād’s household (1675–85)

- 1 His ally in the Muradite family:
  - Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī, second son of Ḥammūda ibn Murād Bey.
- 2 Ottoman grandees or officers:
  - Aḥmad Shalabī, Yūsuf Dey’s son;
  - Muḥammad Bīshāra, secretary of the *dīwān*, then dey;
  - Faraj Ṭurkhān, military officer;
  - Muḥammad Ṭābāq, corsair captain, then commander of Muḥammad’s troops, then dey under ‘Alī Bey;
  - Muḥammad Samāya, *Kābiya* of Ghār-al-Milḥ (garrison commander);
  - *Qā’id* Muḥammad ibn *Qā’id* Ḥasan, and his sons.
- 3 *Mamlūks*:
  - Muṣṭafa Sbanyūl (i.e., the Spaniard), military commander;
  - Ibn Mūsā Khaznadār (possibly a Jew);
  - *Qā’id* Murād ibn ‘Abdallah;
  - his exact homonym, *Qā’id* Murād ibn ‘Abdallah (the patronymic name Ibn ‘Abdallah being often attributed to *mamlūks* after their conversion).
- 4 Malekites:
  - ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī’l-Qāsim ibn Khalaf, descendant of the patron saint of Tunis, Miḥriz ibn Khalaf, *kātib* (secretary);
  - Abū Mahfūz Miḥriz ibn Khalaf, probably a cousin, or nephew of the former, *kātib*;
  - Muḥammad Ṣaddām al-Yamanī, from Qayrawān, *kātib*;
  - Aḥmad Salīm;
  - The son of Khalīfa ibn Zā’id al-Warshafānī;
  - *Shaykh* Sulṭān ibn Munaṣṣar, of the Ḥanānsha tribe, ‘Alī Bey’s father-in-law.



members of the ʿAlawiyya household originated from the three main socio-ethnic groups of the Regency: the *mamlūks*, the officers of the *jund*, and the Malekites (see Box 2.1).

Tunisian sources are far from providing a coherent or satisfactory account of the role of the central Ottoman government during the years 1675–86. Their accounts, nonetheless, mention several direct interventions of the Porte in the Regency at that period. We may also, at other times, through plausible deductions, perceive in the events of those troubled years the hidden influence of Ottoman interests and policies, as well as the change in these policies. It is, thus, possible to say that the decade of fratricidal conflict in the Regency reflected the fluctuations of the local household conflicts, which were themselves influenced by central household conflicts in that equally troubled conjuncture for the Ottoman Porte. In this regard, it is hoped that Ottomanist research will help shed more light on the rifts and changes within the central government during that period, in order to be able to trace more clearly their consequences on the conflicts in the Tunisian province.

In the light of the factual information provided by sources, and of the hypotheses suggested above, we may thus propose a fairly coherent – though no doubt tentative and incomplete – analysis of the conflict between the two beylical households from 1675 to 1686, considered from the perspective of Ottoman policies in the Regency. The first stage of the conflict covering the years 1675 to 1677, started with the contention raised by ʿAlī against Muḥammad’s investiture as bey of the Regency, although the latter, as his father and grandfather before him, had assumed the functions of bey of the *maḥalla* in the last years of Murād II’s life. The *dīwān*, acting as referee, called for a sharing of the leadership of the *maḥalla* between the two brothers (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 452). The *dīwān*’s ruling, which broke from the rule established for beylical succession in the Regency may, nonetheless, have been inspired, or dictated, by the Porte itself, in support of ʿAlī Bey and his camp in the Regency. This hypothesis seems plausible, if we examine the role played by ʿAlī Bey’s uncle and ally, Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī, at that stage. This member of the Muradite family, following Muḥammad Bey’s refusal to share power with his brother, was appointed by the *dīwān* to the beylical office. ʿAlī gave his hearty agreement to the new arrangement, while Muḥammad, having rallied his supporters in the region of al-Kāf, prepared to attack the new bey in the capital. Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī, in the absence of support from the *jund*, fled to Istanbul. On his appointment to the

title of pasha of Tunis by the grand vizier Fāzil Ahmad Köprülü in 1676, he sailed back to the Regency to assume his new office. Some of the pashas of Tunis, as will be recalled, had, during the conflict between the deys and the beys in the preceding period, managed to cause the latter considerable trouble. Therefore, when Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī's ship reached the port of Tunis, his elder nephew, who had regained beylical power, simply refused to let him land, obliging him to return to Istanbul – a gesture of unprecedented defiance to the Porte (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 453–6).

As for 'Alī, fleeing from his brother's vengeance, he sought support, first in the Algerian Regency, where he stayed with his uncle Ahmad Shalabī, then among the tribes of the Jabal Wislāt, who had, only a few years before (1674–5), risen in rebellion against his own father (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 50) – a fact that confirms that the younger bey's household represented a counterforce to the Muradite traditional constituency in the province. Relentless armed confrontations ensued between the two brothers in various regions in the Regency. Each of them went through an alternation of victories and defeats – the latter being often the consequence of the defection, or treason, of the janissary troops under his command. Finally, a decisive battle, fought not far from the capital, in 1677, secured for the victorious 'Alī a relatively long tenure of power, albeit a troubled one (1677–84).

'Alī Bey, having exiled the dey Māmī Jamal, who had served the interests of his brother Muḥammad, appointed to the deylate Muḥammad Ṭābāq.<sup>3</sup> While the fighting continued across the Regency's territory between the two brothers, the new dey and his men were, for a time, besieged in the Qasbah of Tunis by another faction of the *jund* at the orders of Muḥammad Bey (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 224–5). During that conflict, food prices soared in the capital, until, according to al-Wazīr, 'God blessed the population with the arrival of ships laden with wheat from the land of the Turks, which brought prices down' (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 479). Ṭābāq finally managed to repel his enemies and consolidated his power in the capital.

In 1678, the pasha Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī came back to Tunis to assume his functions, but soon engaged in a conflict with Ṭābāq Dey. The latter's supplication to Istanbul led the Porte to act against the pasha; in 1679, a ship sent from Istanbul took Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī into exile to Crete or to some other obscure fate (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 483). Ṭābāq next turned to confront the bey himself, but his temerity cost him his life; 'Alī Bey ordered

his execution in 1682 and appointed in his place Aḥmad Shalabī. At this stage, however, the young bey's own presumption and arrogance, or, more probably, the winds of change within the central Ottoman government, which had already caused his uncle's ruin, led to a reversal in his fortunes. Discord promptly settled between 'Alī Bey and Shalabī Dey, causing the latter to invite Muḥammad to the capital, where he received the beylical investiture from the *dīwān* in 1683–4. The alliance between Shalabī and Muḥammad Bey led to the military defeat of 'Alī and the death of the most prominent of his *mamlūks*, later that year (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 501–12).

Soon after that, however, a new development ushered in the last episode of the conflict. The two brothers, having sealed a mutual alliance and obtained Algerian support, confronted Shalabī Dey. The Algerian army, who had already intervened once, c.1678, as pacific mediator in the conflict between the two brothers by securing the conclusion of a short-lived agreement for sharing power between them in the Regency, this time acted more energetically. Tunis, where the deylical forces were entrenched, surrendered after a long siege in 1686, leading to Shalabī's execution and the appointment of a new dey, Ḥāj Baqṭāsh. The agreement on the sharing of power between the two brothers was, once again, a brief one. A few days after the Algerian and beylical troops entered Tunis, 'Alī was killed by a group of janissaries, leaving Muḥammad Bey at the head of the province (al-Wazīr 1985: 513–44). The Algerian dey, presiding, a few days later at the investiture of Muḥammad Bey, solemnly stated, according to a European source in the Regency, that he was the mere instrument of the sultan's authority on the province:

He appointed Muhammad as the single and only Bey of Tunis, declaring that he was acting on the orders of the Ottoman Sultan, on whose express authorization he had relied in all his actions. After which, he recommended that everyone should strictly observe the limits of his obligations.

(Béranger 1979: 53)

Ottoman legality thus finally prevailed. What were the main features of the new administrative order in the Regency, compared to the old? First, at the top of the Tunisian administrative structure, the supreme authority of a single bey was forcefully asserted.

Second, we note that, on the other hand, the deys continued their struggle to avoid being reduced to mere puppets, as had been the case for many of them since the days of Ḥammūda ibn Murād Bey (1631–66). They seem, at times (as during the quarrel that broke out between Tābāq Dey and the pasha Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī) to have enjoyed support from the central Ottoman government of that period, or, at least, powerful factions in it – an assumption supported by the fact that, under Muḥammad Bey’s rule, the dey Baqtāsh (1686–7) also held the title of pasha during his short tenure of office (Rousseau 1985: 71).<sup>4</sup> As for the office of pasha of Tunis, we know that it was granted, in 1688, to a semi-disgraced official from Istanbul (Heywood 1993: 225–6) presumably followed by others of relatively modest, or tarnished, standing in the central administration. The issue of the *pashalik* of Tunis was thus kept in abeyance until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when it rose again to prominence in the three Maghrib Regencies, as we shall see later.

### The last Muradites and Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf (1687–1705)

Thanks to the elimination of ‘Alī’s most important *mamlūks* in 1685 and the consolidation of Muḥammad’s rule over the province after 1686, the Muḥammadiya household was probably able to reconstitute the original web of alliances of the Muradite household, with the reintegration, within the winner’s camp, of most of those who had for a time forsaken it. The Porte acknowledged the efficiency of Muḥammad’s rule by granting him the second *tuğ* to which *sancak* beys throughout the Empire were promoted at that period (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 63). As a formal sign of additional power accruing to the beylical office, we also note that, from the last decade of the seventeenth century, treaties with Christian powers, formerly signed by the pasha and the *dīwān*, thenceforth bear the signature of the bey, following that of the sultan’s representative (see, for instance, a treaty signed with France in 1698, Rousseau 1985: 488).

According to sources, Muḥammad Bey enjoyed the support, within the central Ottoman government, of the powerful renegade and former dey of Algiers, Ḥasan Mezzo-Morto. Conflict with other members of the Algerian *dīwān* had led this official to escape to Istanbul, with the assistance of Muḥammad Bey, and eventually secure the command of the Ottoman admiralty (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf

1963–6: II, 63). Muḥammad Bey's relations with Mezzo-Morto's enemies in power in Algiers, on the other hand, were marked by hostility: in 1694, the Algerians engineered a *coup d'état* in the Tunisian Regency and brought to power Muḥammad Bey's estranged *mamlūk* and former *āgha* of the Turkish *şubāyhis* (a prestigious cavalry corps), Ibn Shukr. The latter's rule, however, was a brief one; Muḥammad, having rallied his supporters, was able to expel Ibn Shukr from the province and reasserted his authority over the Regency until his death, one year later, in 1696.

Two firmans from the Porte, constituting the limited official Ottoman documentation available on that period, give us some insight into the relations of the central government with the Maghrib Regencies, which seem to have reached a low during that period. The first expresses the sultan's angry remonstrations to the dey of Algiers, for having invaded the Tunisian Regency in 1695 (Samih 1969: 318–19). The second, dated the month of *Shawwāl* 1106/1695, triumphantly announces the reconquest of Sākiz (Chios) from Venice to the rulers of the three Regencies, while ominously recalling that they had not obeyed the sultan's orders to provide their assistance in that naval campaign (Samih 1969: 324).

Muḥammad Bey was succeeded by his weak-willed brother Ramaḍān, the senior male member of the Muradite family. The imprisonment and physical torments inflicted by this bey on his nephew Murād, 'Alī's son, led the latter to escape for protection, as his father 'Alī had done in 1676, to the Jabal Wislāt. Murād eventually succeeded in killing his uncle and acceded to the beylicate in 1699. The young bey's vengeance, which led him, according to sources, to acts of inhuman cruelty (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 667–72), struck Ramaḍān's close circle of boon companions, and many others. We have no way, however, of determining whether this bey's policy aimed systematically at rehabilitating the 'Alawiyya household at the expense of the Muḥammadiya. The rule of Murād III was, moreover, marked by wars with the Algerian Regency, in which he was supported by the Tripolitan bey. Finally, the *āgha* of the Turkish *şubāyhis* of the Regency, Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf, an officer of Anatolian origin who had been sent on a mission to Istanbul, was ordered by the Porte to kill the dangerously unbalanced young bey (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 77). The murder of Murād and of the remaining male members of his family in May 1702 brought the Muradite dynasty to an end (al-Wazīr 1985: 673).

The subsequent rule of Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf displays various instances of household politics. The new bey strove, at the beginning

of his rule, to win the allegiance of many of those who had served under his predecessor, with the intention of imposing himself as the new head of the Muradite household. He also married Limbārka ('al-Mubāraka'), the daughter of a tribal chief, who had been married previously to Murād III and, before him, to Muḥammad Bey (Béranger 1979: 124): it seems therefore that 'inheritable wives' constituted a feature of the Tunisian beylical household, as was the case for the households of Ottoman Egypt (Hathaway 1995a: 133–49). Finally, by inviting his brother from Anatolia to Tunis, al-Sharīf was planning to add his own family cement to the Muradite household (Béranger 1979: 124).

A short time after his assumption of office, al-Sharīf added to his beylical title the title of dey (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 81). Although Tunisian sources may lead us to believe that al-Sharīf, in adopting this unprecedented measure, had acted according to his own whim (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 81), it is certainly more plausible to assume that he had obeyed in this the orders of the central Ottoman government, particularly in the light of Sultan Muṣṭafa II's attempt to consolidate the power of the Turkic *timar* cavalry, to serve his own political ambitions (1695–1703). This policy, which had already led the sultan, in 1702, to encourage the Anatolian Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf to seize power in the Regency, and which culminated in the 'Edirne Event' in 1703, soon came to a sore end (Quataert 2000: 43). This explains why, in the Regency, the fusion of the offices of the dey, representing the Turkish warlords and cavalymen of the Ottoman state, and the bey, representing its Rumelian *kapı kulus*, did not outlast al-Sharīf's short rule (1702–5), and probably ended before it. It was also in the time of this bey, that the Porte inaugurated a more successful and lasting policy that consisted in granting the title of pasha to the rulers of its Maghrib provinces.<sup>5</sup>

Intense warfare with Algiers and Tripoli, which had started in the time of Murād III, continued with Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf. The lack of available data does not allow us, at present, to study these wars, resulting from household conflicts across the whole of the Maghrib, from the perspective of the probable link between these households and those of Istanbul – although I shall attempt this task in the next chapter of this study, when dealing with the 1807 war between Algiers and Tunis.<sup>6</sup> The last battle fought by al-Sharīf against the Algerians in July 1705 led to his capture by the enemy army. The *dīwān*, in Tunis, appointed to the vacant beylical office the *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis* of the Regency, Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, whose

solemn investiture was celebrated in the Qasbah square, in the month of *Rabīʿ al-Awwal* 15 July 1705 (Chérif 1986: I, 122–3).

### Beylical succession at the end of the seventeenth century

In 1694, 1703 and 1705, respectively, three *āghas* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis*: Ibn Shukr, al-Sharīf and Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, acceded to beylical rank in the Regency. Whereas the seizure of power by the first, with the assistance of the Algerian dey, was condemned by the sultan and was soon brought to an end, the investiture of the other two received the blessing of the central Ottoman government. It seems, therefore, that in the hierarchy of ranks within the Tunisian army and government set up by the Porte at that period, the post of *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis*, which went together with the title of *kābiya* (deputy) of the bey, could, in certain circumstances, be a stepstone to the beylical post.<sup>7</sup> This official was, thus, an important element in the policy of the Ottoman Porte concerning beylical succession in the Regency, whose evolution during the seventeenth century needs to be briefly sketched here. From Murād I to Ḥammūda and from Ḥammūda to Murād II, the rule of succession within the Muradite family was based on the handing-down of the beylical office from father to eldest son. During that period, the beys appointed as deputies of Ramaḍān I and of the first Muradites represented, for the government of the Porte, potential successors to the bey, should the latter incur the wrath of the sultan, or should he leave no eligible heir at his death – as was the case when Murād I succeeded Ramaḍān Bey in 1613.

After a decade of civil conflict that followed the death of Murād II in 1675, and included two attempts at the instauration of a beylical diumvirate, Muḥammad Bey, Murād II's eldest son, was finally brought to power in the Regency in 1686. In the new government structure set up for the Regency following these events, the *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis* assumed the same role as the deputy beys of the first half of the seventeenth century. The implementation of this policy, however, seemed to face difficulties at first. One year after Ibn Shukr's illegal and short-lived *coup d'état*, when Muḥammad Bey died in 1696, leaving a son in his infancy, the Porte failed to play the card of the *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis*. It had to acquiesce, owing to its weakness, to the rule of succession by seniority among the enlarged Muradite family, presumptuously

adopted by the latter in imitation of the new succession arrangements devised by the Ottoman sultans. The ensuing alternation between the Muḥammadiyya and the ʿAlawiyya to power in the Regency exacerbated and gave permanence to the rivalry between the two households. Furthermore, the licentious Ramaḍān and the sanguinary Murād III were particularly unsatisfactory rulers. All these considerations finally led the exasperated Porte, in 1703, to order the execution of all the male members of the first beylical dynasty in the Regency.

### **Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī and the continuation of household conflicts (1705–40)**

On the origins of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, Ibn Abīʿl-Ḍiyāf informs us, with some diffidence, that his father, ʿAlī al-Turkī, who came from the island of Crete to the Regency in his youth, 'was, according to some, a *mamlūk*' (Ibn Abīʿl-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 85). The sparse additional information that this author provides about Ḥusayn's father allows us, moreover, interesting insights into a *mamlūk*'s strategy for gaining power in the Regency's spheres of government at the end of the seventeenth century. ʿAlī, who was sent to command garrisons in various cities of the province, married first a woman from the Shannūfī Arab tribe in the al-Kāf region, from whom he begot a son, Muḥammad. His second wife, from the Sharnī Berber tribe (living in the region of Qayrawān) gave him another son, Ḥusayn (Ibn Abīʿl-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 85; Bey 2002: 165).

No details are provided about the social backgrounds of ʿAlī's wives, but we may presume that this high-ranking janissary could undoubtedly pretend to alliances with influential local clans. ʿAlī's marriage alliances furthermore seem to have followed a strategy which may be discerned more clearly through the marriages and careers of his sons, and which consisted in cementing links with the two rival beylical households in the Regency, the Muḥammadiya and the ʿAlawiyya, including their tribal constituencies. This would guarantee that, whatever the issue of the conflict, one of ʿAlī's sons would be on the winning side and would then favour his brother's fortune. Thus, of Muḥammad, the elder son, we know that he married the daughter of *Qāʿid* Murād, who had been one of ʿAlī ibn Murād's faithful supporters.<sup>8</sup> As for Ḥusayn, he first served under Muḥammad Bey, and, in spite of a period of disgrace after his participation in Ibn Shukr's government, was quickly reintegrated in the service of this bey and of his successors Ramaḍān



and Murād III (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 86). Ḥusayn was married, first, to a cousin on his mother's side, then to Fāṭima ʿUthmāna, the granddaughter of ʿUthmān Dey (Bey 2002: 170), who had previously been married to Ramaḍān Bey (Chérif 1986: I, 120).

Family solidarity and marked opportunism were therefore two crucial elements in the policy of ʿAlī al-Turkī's household-in-the-making. Thus, after Murād's murder, Ḥusayn found shelter for some time near his brother before being readmitted into the ruling elite (Béranger 1979: 120). The two brothers next cooperated closely and successfully to ensure the fall of Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf. When war broke out between Tunis and Algiers in 1705, Muḥammad escaped across the border with the Drīd tribe to the Algerian camp (Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz 1925: 196–7). As for Ḥusayn, the lacunar and ambiguous account left by al-Wazīr on his behaviour during the battle that led to the capture of al-Sharīf near al-Kāf, suggests that he betrayed the latter at that crucial stage (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 740–5).

Ḥusayn, having received the beylical investiture, had to confront the Algerian army, which had penetrated further into the Regency until it reached the outskirts of the capital. The bey and the dey of Tunis appealed to the Porte, who sent a *kapıcı* ordering the three Regencies to stop waging wars between themselves and to punish all those responsible for the persistence of conflicts (Chérif 1986: I, 156). After attempts at conciliation with the Algerians had failed, the Tunisians finally managed to repel the invaders (September 1705). With the establishment of peace, Ḥusayn, thanks to the links woven by himself and by his brother with the two Muradite households, was able to secure the allegiance of the majority in both camps. There lay the secret of the stability of the greatest part of his period of rule, and of his success in overcoming various difficulties and crises that he had to face, particularly at its beginning. The first of these crises erupted, soon after the end of the war with Algiers, between Ḥusayn and the dey Muḥammad al-Aṣfar. The latter, striving to restore the sorely diminished deylical authority in the Regency, allied himself with Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf, who had been freed by the Algerians and who, still in exile, was attempting to win back beylical power in Tunis. Ḥusayn rallied the forces loyal to him outside the precincts of Tunis, and besieged the dey in the capital. Al-Aṣfar was finally forsaken by the janissaries, who had rebelled on the pretext of delayed payment of their salaries, and was executed by a group of them, on 1 January 1706. Ḥusayn entered the capital in triumph and Qāra Mustāfa, who was later

to marry the bey's daughter, was elected to the deylicate (Chérif 1986: I, 136–40). As for Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf, he was killed a few days later by Ḥusayn's men as he attempted to land on the Tunisian northern coast (Chérif 1986: I, 141).

In 1708, the Ottoman *kapudan pasha* Djanim, having landed in Tunis, attempted to replace Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī with Muḥammad ibn Mustāfa at the head of the Regency. The latter had been a powerful former *mamlūk* under the last Muradite beys and under Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf, whom he had betrayed, as had many others, during the last battle fought by this bey against the Algerians (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 83). Ḥusayn, with the support of the *dīwān*, firmly managed to get rid of the interfering *kapudan pasha*, whose initiative, it seems, had been taken independently of the Porte (Chérif 1986: I, 157–8). Djanim sailed back to Istanbul with his protégé, who was killed, years later, by Ḥusayn's men, as he attempted to come back to Tunis from Egypt, where he had sheltered, across the Tripolitan desert (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 16–17).

During the period of rule of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, beylical power was reinforced and increasingly centralized in the Regency. The Porte seized the opportunity offered by Ḥusayn's victory against al-Aṣfar to deal another powerful blow to deylical power. The dey's prerogatives were now drastically reduced. They became limited to police maintenance in the Qasbah and the adjoining districts in the daytime (these functions being transferred to the Malekite *shaykh al-madīna* at night). The dey's presidency of the *dīwān*, as well as the latter's political role, moreover, had a mostly formal character (Chérif 1986: I, 186; Raymond 1994: II, 32).

In the economic realm, Tunis, where commerce with various Mediterranean cities of the Northern shore had gradually developed since the seventeenth century, became an important trading centre in the region. The conclusion of peace between the Ottoman Empire and Austria in 1725 at Passarowitz, on the other hand, affected considerably the corso in the Barbary region, since the jurisdiction of the Habsburg state extended over the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, formerly an easy prey for the Maghrib corsairs.<sup>9</sup>

The last years of Ḥusayn's rule were marked by the rebellion of his nephew 'Alī, son of Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Turkī, known in Tunisian historiography as 'Alī Pasha. This young man had initially entertained strong hopes of succeeding his uncle who, on his accession to the beylicate, had no son. These hopes were crushed as a consequence of the birth of male children to Ḥusayn by his second wife. In 1725, the bey secured from the Porte a firman authorizing

him to delegate the leadership of the *maḥalla* to his eldest son, Muḥammad, thus designating the latter as heir to the beylical office (Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz 1925: 211). ʿAlī, who had, till then, assumed the duty of replacing his uncle as bey of the *maḥalla*, was awarded the title of pasha as a consolation prize. A source of that period asserts that the bey himself – who should normally have received that title – had applied to the Porte to have it granted to his nephew, in order to soothe the latter’s frustration (Gandolphe 1923: 212–13). ʿAlī, however, decided to flee from Tunis and the empty honours of his new office. In 1728, like ʿAlī ibn Murād and Murād III before him, he escaped to Jabal Wislāt, the traditional stronghold of the ʿAlawiyya, and there started an insurrection against his uncle (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 36–42).

ʿAlī Pasha’s contention for the beylicate should be studied in the light of the three different rules for beylical succession in the Regency, described above. One of these, i.e. the candidature of the *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyḥis* to the post, had become obsolete in Ḥusayn’s period of rule, with the integration of that corps into the beylical official household, which relegated their *āgha* to political insignificance. There remained two possible choices for the bey’s successor among the beylical family itself. ʿAlī Pasha upheld the principle of succession by seniority among the descendants of ʿAlī al-Turkī. Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, with the support of the Porte, upheld the principle of succession from the incumbent of the beylical post to his eldest son. The new conflict for beylical succession in the Regency, which reopened the rift between the ʿAlawiyya, to which ʿAlī Pasha’s father had belonged, and the Muḥammadiya, the original power base of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, coincided with a period of sharp economic difficulties that affected the whole of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>10</sup> ʿAlī Pasha’s rebellion was, at first, severely defeated: the young man, besieged in Jabal Wislāt for several months by Ḥusayn’s army, managed to escape to the Sāḥil, then to the south, and finally to Algiers. There he was held in semi-captivity by the dey Qur ʿAbdī, in exchange for an annual sum of money sent by Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 94–114).

The arrangement, however, soon broke down, and Ḥusayn faced the increasing threat of having ʿAbdī Dey’s successor, Ibrāhim, champion ʿAlī’s cause (Chérif 1986: II, 73). The Tunisian bey appealed to the Porte, who refereed in his favour (Samih 1969: 345). This was of little avail, since in 1735 the Algerian army crossed the frontier and defeated Ḥusayn’s army at Sminja. ʿAlī was invested as bey in Tunis by the *dīwān* in the month of

*Rabī ʿal-Thānī* September 1735, while Ḥusayn fled to Qayrawān. For more than five years, the increasingly devastating household conflict continued dividing the Regency. Historians on Ottoman Egypt have noted the intermingling of conflicts in its *ʿaskeri* structure with deep-rooted divisions in local society, especially in the first half of the eighteenth century, when the rival Faqāriyya and Qāsimiyya households became allied to tribal leaders belonging to the two main tribal confederations, the Saʿad and the Ḥarām (Holt 1968: 86–7). Similarly, the division of the Maghrib tribal society into two rival *şoff*s (moieties) was exploited and exacerbated by the warring beys. The complex web of alliances and oppositions evolving with the extension of the conflict and probably leading to changes in the make-up of the original Muḥammadiyya and ʿAlawiyya households, divided the Regency into two camps, designated, in local history, as the *Bāshīs* (siding with ʿAlī Pasha) and the *Ḥusaynīs* (Ibn Abīʿl-Diyāf 1963–6: II, 113).

Ḥusayn was finally defeated and killed by Yūnis, ʿAlī Pasha’s eldest son, in 1740, while his sons fled in their turn to Algiers. The Porte resigned itself to the inevitable and adapted with no qualms to the *fait accompli* of ʿAlī Pasha’s investiture by the *dūwān* of Tunis after his victory at Sminja. The subsequent Ottoman investiture was sent with remarkable speed to the new bey, owing, according to some, to the support he enjoyed from Djanim Pasha, Ḥusayn’s old foe (Chérif 1986: II, 157).

### ʿAlī Pasha and the return of the Husaynids (1735–77)

ʿAlī Pasha, after having eliminated his uncle’s most prominent partisans and followers probably managed to rally round him the bulk of the former beylical household. Centralization and concentration of power within the beylical office characterized the rule of this bey as much as, or even more than, they had his uncle’s. ʿAlī Pasha also held concomitantly the titles of bey and pasha, a privilege that was thenceforth conferred uninterruptedly on the series of beys who ruled the Regency for the rest of the Ottoman period.

Under ʿAlī Pasha, the island of Ṭabarqa, which had been ceded, since the mid-sixteenth century, by the Ottoman sultan to Genoese interests engaged in coral-fishing and trade with the local tribes, was occupied and annexed by the Tunisian army in 1742. This military action succeeded in pre-empting the ambitions of the French government in the region, following reports that the latter

was engaged in negotiating with the Genoese in order to obtain the cession of Ṭabarqa. Considering the jealously held prerogatives of the Ottoman Porte in frontier and territorial matters in the Regencies, we may presume that the expedition, commanded by Yūnis Bey, was carried out on the order of the central Ottoman government. The Tunisian troops occupied the island, enslaved the Genoese and, on the way back to Tunis, destroyed the French comptoir of Cap Nègre. After a French attempt to invade Ṭabarqa, later that year, had failed, peace was finally signed between ‘Alī Pasha and Louis XV (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 196–208).

‘Alī Pasha’s relatively long and stable rule degenerated in its last years, when Yūnis Bey headed a rebellion of the *jund* in 1752, then escaped to Algiers, where he ended his days in confinement (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 293–312). Finally, in 1756, the Algerian army invaded the Regency, and brought Ḥusayn’s sons back to power in Tunis, probably on the instigation of the Porte. ‘Alī Pasha’s long years of tenure had not, for the central Ottoman government, entailed prescription of his original crime of disobedience. He remained, essentially, a *mūtağallibe*: the term, from the Arabic *‘mutağhallib*’, meaning, ‘oppressive ruler’, or ‘usurper’, was also used, in Ottoman usage, to designate rebel local rulers, or any enemy of the Porte, who might be ‘successful for a time’ (Redhouse 1857). After having ordered the execution of ‘Alī Pasha, the Algerian dey presided, as his predecessor had done in 1687, at the investiture of the new bey of the Regency, i.e. Muḥammad, Ḥusayn’s eldest son. But this time, the Algerian army only departed from Tunis after having dictated precise conditions on its government, including the payment of an annual sum to Algiers and the acceptance of Algerian pre-eminence in matters of protocol and in the realm of foreign relations (Rousseau 1985: 157–61, 252–3).

During his short period of rule, Muḥammad Bey, whom some local sources describe as an ailing young man (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 155), is reported to have entered into secret inconclusive negotiations with France, in order to obtain the protection of that country against Algiers, in return for the cession of Ṭabarqa to the French king (Roux 1932: 274–80).<sup>11</sup> Muḥammad, who left at his death two infant boys, was succeeded by his younger brother ‘Alī, on 12 February 1759. ‘Alī Bey’s long period of rule (1759–77) marked a new stage in the reinforcement of beylical authority in the Regency. The additional power gained by the bey is reflected, first, in the fact that, in treaties with Christian powers from then on, the only signatory, on the Regency’s side, was the pasha-bey (Rousseau

1985: 449, 557). The anchoring of Husaynid power in the country, moreover, was ensured thanks to the successful quelling of a three-year long insurrection fomented by Ismā'īl ibn Yūnis, a grandson of 'Alī Pasha, which ended effectively the contention of that branch of the beylical family in the Regency. In 1762, the bey's troops, backed by tribal forces, brought to heel the Jabal Wislāt, the ultimate refuge of Ismā'īl, and, before him, of successive challengers to beylical authority. Ismā'īl fled to Algiers, and the Wislātīs were scattered throughout the Regency and forbidden from settling again in their impregnable mountain heights (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970: 47–90). The Regency, in the time of 'Alī Bey, also enjoyed a period of prosperity and economic growth: demographic increase, abundant harvests that ensured important revenues from wheat exports to the Northern Mediterranean countries, and the development of urban handicrafts and trade (Chérif 1977: 107–8).

In 1759, the fact that the firman bearing the Ottoman investiture (or reconfirmation of investiture) initially intended for Muḥammad reached the Regency in time to coincide with the investiture of 'Alī by the *dīwān*, in the period following his brother's death, had already struck many of his contemporaries as a happy augury (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970: 45–6). 'Alī Bey's rule, indeed, represented a new stage in the relations between the Regency and the Porte, characterized by reinforced coordination and mutual support. Thus, in 1762, the bey, receiving a *kapıcı* of the Porte sent to announce the birth of a male heir to Sultan Muṣṭafa III, at a period when the war against Ismā'īl had reached its last stages, ordered a sumptuous *zīna* in the capital (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970: 386). In 1770, the efficient mediation of an Ottoman envoy ended the war that had broken out that year between the bey and the French king. The war, caused by French claims against the Tunisian corsairs, and by difficulties opposed by the bey to renewing commercial concessions formerly granted to France, led to heavy bombardments of coastal positions in the Regency (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 166–70; Rousseau 1985: 170–85). In the same year, a Tunisian fleet was also sent to assist the sultan in his war against Russia (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 170–1). Finally, the very devout 'Alī, echoing a similar measure periodically adopted by the Ottoman sultans, decreed, at some undefined date, the closing-down of all wine taverns in the country (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970: 373).

'Alī Bey was succeeded in his lifetime by his eldest son, Muḥammad, popularly known as Ḥammūda. The Ottoman investiture granted to Ḥammūda ibn 'Alī on 1 *Muḥarram* 1191/9 February

1777 inaugurated a long period of rule that lasted until 29 *Ramaḍān* 1229/16 September 1814.

### Conclusion

During the period reviewed in this chapter and the preceding one, we have seen that armed conflicts involving officials at the top of the Tunisian *ʿaskeri* structure were at the origin of successive changes in the structure of the government of the Regency, as the Porte would sanction the outcome of these conflicts and translate into administrative arrangements the new balance of power within that structure. These conflicts, more often than not, ended with the victory of those who enjoyed the support of the central Ottoman government, i.e. Murād II (against ʿAlī Lāz Dey) in 1673, Muḥammad Bey (against Shalabī Dey) in 1687, or Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (against al-Aṣfar Dey) in 1705. In opposite cases, as in the aftermath of the 1591 uprising, or following ʿAlī Pasha's victory over his uncle in 1735, the Porte, as was its wont, in the words of P. M. Holt, 'recognizing effective power, without prejudice to further action' (Holt 1966: 177), bided its time until it could seize the opportune moment for putting things to rights.

The last political change brought about by military force in the Regency occurred in 1756, with the elimination of ʿAlī Pasha and the return to power of the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, championed by the Porte. The power of the Husaynid beys in the third quarter of the eighteenth century was strengthened on the domestic level, but they had, on the other hand, to submit to a partial suzerainty by Algiers. The circumstances that led to this change in the relations between the two Regencies, its influence on the relations between Tunis and Istanbul in the days of Ḥammūda Pasha, and how the latter finally managed to put an end to it will be studied in the next chapter.

Part 2

THE POLICIES  
AND GOVERNMENT OF  
ḤAMMŪDA PASHA  
(1777–1814)





## THE WARS AND ALLIANCES OF ḤAMMŪDA PASHA

The successive wars that punctuated the period of rule of Ḥammūda Pasha made him the warrior-king among the Husaynid beys and contributed in no small measure to the greater-than-life stature conferred on him by traditional historiography. They represented, with his military and administrative reforms, the study of which constitutes the main subject of the following part of this book, the most salient features of Ḥammūda's policies. The present chapter purports to demonstrate, through an analysis of the relations of the Tunisian Regency with the Ottoman and the Christian worlds, that these wars, and the formal or informal alliances concomitant to them, were closely linked to the policies and interests of the Porte at that period.

### **Estrangement and reconciliation with the Ottoman Porte (1777-95)**

Not long after the investiture of Ḥammūda ibn 'Alī as the new pasha-bey of Tunis, the relations between the Regency and the Ottoman Porte seem to have gone through a period of marked coolness. Many episodes provide evidence for this. Thus, in 1777, when Russia (in conformity with the clauses of the Küçük Kaynarci treaty) attempted to conclude peace with the Barbary states, the Tunisian and Algerian governments demurred, the second having protested against the fact that Russia had approached Tunis before it (Rousseau 1985: 188). In 1781, Austria, backed by Ottoman emissaries, sought a renewal of her peace treaties with the Regencies; Algiers claimed an excessive sum of money, while Tunis answered that its agreement could only be given after Algiers' (Rousseau 1985: 192). We should also note that, during the war that broke out between the Regency and Venice in 1782

as the result of financial claims made by the Tunisian authorities, the Ottoman sultan did not acquit himself – even symbolically, during this crucial period when the Empire was fighting for its own survival – of the traditional duty of *i'āna* (help, of a military nature, or in any other form, during wars) towards his province (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 29). In 1789, furthermore, Ḥammūda Pasha, by abstaining from sending a delegation to Istanbul to congratulate and pay homage to Selīm III on his enthronement as successor to his uncle 'Abdu'l-Ḥamid (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 29), was guilty of a serious breach in the protocolary obligations of *wālis* (governors) towards the Ottoman sultan. Finally, in 1792, when the drawn-out conflict with Venice was brought to a fairly satisfactory conclusion for the bey, this was achieved without any intervention of the Porte – whereas it should be recalled that the latter's mediation, in 1770, had quickly brought to an end the war that had broken out between the Regency and France.

In order to explain this period of estrangement in the relations between the Tunisian province and its Ottoman lord, it is important to recall that the Algerian deys, since 1756, had been exercising a form of political suzerainty on the Tunisian government, clearly manifested in the first two episodes mentioned above, from which we may infer that the bey's powerful western neighbours stood behind his alienation from Istanbul. A corollary to this thesis is that the Regency of Algiers had become increasingly defiant towards the government of the Porte at that period, and that, from 1789 in particular, as will be further elaborated in this chapter, it was one among the numerous opponents against which the great and unlucky reformer, Sultan Selīm III, had to wage a relentless conflict.

The relations between Ḥammūda and Selīm III, however, soon underwent a striking change as a result of developments that originated, not in Algiers, but in Tripoli. The political and administrative evolution of the eastern neighbour of the Regency had led to the installation of the beylical Qaramanli dynasty at its head at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In 1793, conflict broke out among the Qaramanli family, leading to intense civil trouble. This situation was exploited by an ambitious Ottoman officer, 'Alī Burghul, who used his influential connections within the admiralty in Istanbul – his brother was a *kāhiya* (lieutenant) of the *kapudan pasha* of the time – to secure a firman entrusting him with the task of restoring order in Tripoli, in return for its

governorship (Médina 1907: 21–32). ‘Alī Burghul, having sailed to the province with Turkish contingents from Istanbul, occupied its capital, while the bey Aḥmad Qaramanli and his two sons escaped to Tunis.

The mission undertaken by ‘Alī Burghul was a continuation of the energetic policy followed by the Ottoman central government during the preceding decades in order to curb the increasingly wayward behaviour of many provincial governors and officials throughout the Empire. The main proponent and executing agent of this policy, under Sultan ‘Abdu’l-Ḥamīd (1773–89), had been the *kapudan pasha* Ḥasan Ghāzī Djezā’irli Pasha (Mordtmann-[Kuran] 1971). In 1786, in particular, an expedition led by this official had asserted the sultan’s authority in the Egyptian province, close to the Maghrib regencies: having landed in Alexandria, the *kapudan pasha* forced the beys Murād and Ibrāhīm to flee from Cairo and restored, for a time, direct Ottoman rule over the province (Holt 1968: 89). Djezā’irli, who died two years before ‘Alī Burghul’s expedition to Tripoli, had been, according to some sources, the latter’s patron (Médina 1907: 22). It is also worth noting that both men, at different times, had been important officials in the Regency of Algiers, from which they fled as a result of internecine conflicts within its *dīwān*, before being appointed to serve the central Ottoman government.

‘Alī Burghul’s expedition did not stop in Tripoli. A few months later, one of his lieutenants headed an attack on the nearby island of Jirba. It is important to note here, that Jirba, which was annexed relatively late to the Tunisian Regency, seems to have constituted the ‘soft belly’ of the beys’ dominions in their relations with Istanbul: thus, in 1713, the *kapudan pasha* Djanim had used the non-payment of the *qatī’* imposed upon the island as a pretext for intervening in the Regency’s domestic affairs. ‘Alī Burghul’s troops secured an easy victory over the scanty Tunisian military force in the island and caused its *āmil* (governor), Ḥ’mīda ibn ‘Ayyād, to flee to the capital. Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf’s terse account of the episode of Jirba’s occupation in 1793 is based on the more or less explicit assertion that this was an act of purely unjustified aggression (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 23). The author describes how ‘Alī Burghul’s lieutenant, having secured the place, summoned the population, and ‘flourished a writ, which he pretended to have been sent by the sultan, although only God knows what was in it’ (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 23). Yet, in spite of the author’s dismissive tone, this specific detail suggests the possibility, even

the probability, that the Porte had signed a firman authorizing Burghul's expedition in Jirba. More evidence supporting this hypothesis is provided by the fact that Ḥammūda Pasha, after having reconquered the island in 1794, refrained from punishing the notables who had quickly rallied round the Tripolitan army (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 27). The bey also proceeded to replace his former *ʿāmil* in Jirba (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 27), which suggests that accusations concerning iniquities committed by the latter had provided the legal justification for this military intervention made in the name of the Ottoman Porte.

The occupation of the south-eastern part of the Maghrib by ʿAlī Burghul appeared as highly threatening, not only to the Tunisian bey, but also to the Algerian dey (Chérif 1977: 121). It was, therefore, most probably with the blessing of his western neighbour that Ḥammūda Pasha sent two detachments of troops, respectively to Jirba and Tripoli, in December 1794 and January 1795. ʿAlī Burghul's men were defeated and driven away from both positions and the Qaramanlis were restored to power in Tripoli. Ḥammūda's next step, after having first sought and obtained the support of the French and English ambassadors in Istanbul (Plantet 1893: III, 527; Roy 1906: 283), was to send an embassy to Sultan Selīm III, in order to justify his behaviour.

The Tunisian delegation, laden with presents and headed by Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābiʿ, embarked for its voyage to the Ottoman capital in May 1795. According to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, whose father had been part of the embassy, the Tunisians initially encountered a none too friendly reception by the Ottoman authorities at their arrival (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 28–9). By the end of their stay in Istanbul, however, the clouds that had darkened the relations between the Regency and the Porte were totally dissipated. This was achieved thanks to the accord soon reached between Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābiʿ and the *kapudan pasha* of the time, Küçük Hüsayn. This official, who commanded the Ottoman navy during the greatest part of Selīm's reign, i.e. from 1792 to 1803, acted during these years, according to the traditional prerogatives of his office, as a powerful intermediary between the central Ottoman government and the rulers of the Maghrib Regencies. Küçük Hüsayn was, with the *reʿisül-küttāb* (head of the chancery) Rātib Pasha, one of the closest collaborators of Selīm III; by appointing two staunch supporters of his reform program to these strategic posts, this sultan seems therefore to have ensured coordination, frequently lacking in the past, between the admiralty and the Porte.

In their talks, Şāhib al-Ṭābīʿ and Küçük Hüsayn at first vented mutual grievances concerning events prior to the Tripoli expedition. While the Tunisians were reproached for not having sent a deputation and presents to congratulate Selīm on his accession to the throne in 1789, Yūsuf Şāhib al-Ṭābīʿ reminded the *kapudan pasha* that the Regency had not received from the sultan the assistance to which it was entitled during its war against Venice (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 29). As regards the Burghul affair, however, the position of the Tunisian bey was not as delicate as might have been feared. It is not implausible to suggest, first, that the precarious power of Sultan Selīm and his supporters, especially in the early stages of his reign, was such that, in 1793, the newly-appointed *kapudan pasha* Küçük Hüsayn had had to agree, against his will, to the expedition that had already been sanctioned by 'Alī Burghul's powerful patrons in the admiralty. Furthermore, the population of Tripoli, after the occupation of the city by Burghul's troops, had delegated a group of notables to Istanbul to complain to the sultan against the exactions committed by the new governor and his men. These complaints, in addition to Ḥammūda's vigorous reaction, must have definitely convinced the Porte of the unsoundness of a direct military intervention in the Maghrib, at a period when all military efforts should be concentrated against the Christian enemies of the Empire.

Yūsuf Şāhib al-Ṭābīʿ stayed several months in Istanbul, during which, in Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's words, 'he displayed his munificent generosity and bound to him a great number of officials (by links of affection and gratefulness)' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 29). The good impression caused by the Tunisian embassy was such that, still according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, Küçük Hüsayn eventually confided to its head that, rather than restoring the discredited Qaramanlis to power, Ḥammūda Bey should have appointed a Tunisian official to rule the Tripoli Regency.<sup>1</sup> Yūsuf Şāhib al-Ṭābīʿ sailed back to Tunis in 1795, bearing the sultan's pardon, the present of a frigate and a firman of confirmation of investiture for Ḥammūda Pasha, as well as a robe of honour for the Qaramanli bey in Tripoli (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 30, 31).

The 1795 embassy to Istanbul, to which Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf devotes four full pages in a generally terse account of the main events of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule, represented a watershed in the relations between the bey and the Porte. Both parties were linked by a common opposition to Algiers. The real – and carefully hidden

– aim of the Tunisian embassy, in fact, may well have been to forge an alliance with the Porte against the Algerian Regency, in particular by securing some assurance or promise in that regard. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf – though very briefly – does mention that the relations between Algiers and Tunis were touched upon in the talks between Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi' and the *kapudan pasha* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 29). Sultan Selīm, for his part, had gained an ally in his arduous fight to impose reforms in the Empire. Instead of the use of force, diplomacy had proved a cheaper and more efficient policy for obtaining the collaboration of the Tunisian government. The main agent of this collaboration was the ambitious and zealous Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi', whose power in the Regency was on the rise. The next stage of Ḥammūda's period of government was marked by intensive reforms in the military, administrative and economic realms, which, as will be seen in the next chapters, closely aligned the Regency with the administrative practices and policies of the Porte at that period.

### The war with Algiers (1807) and the janissary rebellion (1811)

In order to put in its proper context the 1807 war between Tunis and Algiers, it is necessary to go back to the origins of the relations between the two provinces and to study, especially, the particular status conferred on the Algerian province in the Maghrib region since its incipience. As already indicated, the Algerian beylerbeys-*cum-kapudan pashas* had, in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, exercised some form of jurisdiction over the Tunisian and Tripolitan *eyālets* until 1587. Even after that date, when the three Maghrib provinces had been placed under the exclusive authority of the Porte, the warrior *eyālet* of Algiers retained a particular prestige which gave it pre-eminence over its two neighbours. During the sultans' naval campaigns, for instance, the Barbary fleets sent to assist the Ottoman navy were put under the command of an Algerian admiral. Finally, we have also seen that, from the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the Algerian *jund* was used by the Porte to restore order in the troubled Tunisian province – although the see-saw relations between the central Ottoman government and the often insubordinate Algerian *dīwān* led the latter, as in 1694 for instance, or in 1705, to invade the Regency on their own initiative, or, more precisely, in contravention to the official policy of the Porte.

The 1756 Algerian expedition against the usurper 'Alī Pasha was, most probably, carried out on the instructions of the vengeful Porte. As for the ensuing instauration of a form of Algerian suzerainty over Tunis, we have no way of determining whether it had been negotiated beforehand by the Algerian dey with the Porte, or whether it was imposed by the former as a *fait accompli* and resignedly sanctioned by the latter. The new status quo between the two Maghrib provinces, in any case, presented at least a material advantage for the Ottoman central government. The accelerated decline of the corso in the eighteenth century had made it increasingly difficult for the Algerian government to finance the pay of its army, since the scarce economic resources and trading capacities of the province could provide no adequate compensation for the loss of that source of revenue. It would, therefore, have been the duty of the sultan to assist the Algerian *eyālet* – a difficult task in such times of financial strain, and from which he was thus fortunately discharged by the bey of Tunis. Furthermore, the Algerian threat of a complete annexation of the Tunisian Regency, hanging like the sword of Damocles that only the Porte could prevent from falling on the beys' heads, still represented an efficient dissuasive tool against the latter's possible dissidence.

The clout gained by the Algerian province at that period was also reflected, in 1770, in the appointment to the post of *kapudan pasha* of a former Algerian dey, the formidable Ḥasan Djezā'irli Pasha, already mentioned above. This appointment represented a renewed acknowledgement of the particular status enjoyed by the Algerian corsairs among the sultan's naval forces: thus, the corsair-beylerbeys Khayr al-Dīn and 'Ilij 'Alī in the sixteenth century, and Ḥasan Mezzo Morto, at the end of the seventeenth, had been among the most prestigious and successful of the *kapudan pashas* in the history of the Empire. The loyalty of Djezā'irli Pasha to Sultan 'Abdu'l-Ḥamīd was rewarded by a constant increase of his influence within the central Ottoman government (Mordtmann-Kuran 1965). This official was responsible, in particular, for the dismissal and execution, in 1785, of the grand vizier Halil Ḥamid Pasha, who was indicted for plotting to remove 'Abdu'l-Ḥamīd in order to enthrone his more liberal nephew, Selim. In 1789, not long after Selim finally ascended to the throne, Djezā'irli was appointed to the grand vizierate. His short tenure at the head of the government of the Porte might be considered as a forced acknowledgement, by the new sultan, of the power wielded by this representative of the old guard – although it is also possible that,



by alienating Djezā'irli from the admiralty, Selīm had, in effect, striven to divest him of the influence he had acquired there. Djezā'irli was in charge of negotiating with the commander of the victorious Russian army, at war with the Ottomans since 1787. In the midst of that bleak period, the only ray of military glory for the Ottomans came from the *jund* of the Algerian Regency, Djezā'irli's original base of power, who conquered Oran and Mers el-Kebir from the Spaniards in 1791. In that same year, however, Djezā'irli Pasha died, either by sheer providence, or by foul act (it was rumoured that he had been poisoned on Selīm's orders).

This brief review of Djezā'irli's career can lead to interesting hypotheses, if it is examined from the perspective of an important aspect of Ottoman political life, i.e. its division into rival households. These divisions, fed by succession conflicts within the Ottoman dynasty, extended their ramifications to the provincial governments of the Porte, including those of the Maghrib Regencies. I would therefore suggest that Djezā'irli Pasha assumed an eminent role in an important central Ottoman household that had deep-rooted interests both in the admiralty and in the Algerian Regency, and which, although it managed, at some periods, to bring its own candidates to supreme authority at the head of the Empire, usually acted as a powerful centre of opposition to the sultan and the grand vizier. Thence, the *rapprochement* between Ḥammūda Bey and the Porte in 1795, made above the heads of the Algerians, aimed at breaking the power of that household and weakening the threat that it posed to the sultan's reforms policy. Finally, concerning the development of the pro-Selīm coalition in the Maghrib region during that period, we should also note the close relations established by Ḥammūda Pasha with the Tripolitan bey and with the 'Alawī sultan of Morocco (al-Imām 1980: 421; Chater 1984: 36). The latter country, on the western border of Algiers, represented a permanent and powerful opponent to that province – and, therefore, possibly enjoyed the tacit support of the central Ottoman state.

The precarious nature of Selīm's power probably prevented him from standing firmly in support of Tunis against Algerian domination in the Maghrib region. The Tunisians were therefore left, or secretly encouraged, to fight their own war against the Algerians, in order to create a new status quo, which the Porte would readily sanction.<sup>2</sup> Ḥammūda, who had been for years engaged in reforming and improving his army, finally declared war on Algiers in 1807. The first battle between the two armies near Constantine, in the

east of Algeria, ended in a shameful rout for the Tunisians. A new expedition was sent to the western frontier two months later, under the command of Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābiʿ, solemnly invested with full powers by the bey. Yūsuf managed to inflict a severe defeat on the Algerians and came back crowned with glory in August 1807 (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 41–50).

At the time when Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābiʿ set off with his troops towards the Algerian frontier, in May 1807, however, an armed insurrection in Istanbul resulted in the deposition of Selim and the accession to the throne of Muṣṭafa IV. The latter was replaced, one year later, by Selim's cousin and confidant, Maḥmūd II. The new sultan, owing to the strength of Selim's former opponents, was unable, in the first stages of his reign, which extended well beyond the date of Ḥammūda's death, to pursue any reforms policy, or wield any real power. Ḥammūda, at the very moment of his triumph, had thus lost his patrons in Istanbul. His victory, however, yielded its fruit, since the Regency, from then on, stopped its annual payments to Algiers and regained its diplomatic autonomy (Chérif 1977: 125). The Algerian dey and, particularly, his corsairs, who carried on a war of attrition against the Tunisian navy, however, did not officially admit defeat (Chérif 1977: 125). Until the end of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule, and for many years after it, no definitive reconciliation between the two Regencies could be achieved, in spite of the efforts deployed by the Ottoman Porte.

In 1811, the janissary rebellion which broke out in Tunis, and which represented a local attempt by the vivacious anti-reform forces to seize power in the Regency during the uncertain post-Selim period, should also, like the war with Algiers, be considered from the global perspective of Ottoman internecine conflicts. The rebellion plunged its roots into the irreducible opposition between the deys and the beys, which represented an extension of one of the permanent rifts, fuelled by household politics, within the Ottoman state. The Tunisian beys, in spite of the political supremacy they had quickly secured by the end of the seventeenth century, still had to face the hostility of the disgruntled deys and janissaries of the Regency, which drew strength and support from the latter's ties with the deylical regime in Algiers. This situation led repeatedly, throughout the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, to the betrayal of the beys by their janissaries during conflicts with Algiers (as, for instance, in the battle that led to the defeat of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī by 'Alī Pasha at Sminja in 1735). The ties

between the Algerian and the Tunisian janissaries were not merely the expression of ethnic affinities. Here again, I would suggest that the allegiance of the greatest number, or the most combative group in each of the *junds* of the two provinces, went to the same powerful household or group of interests, that was headed by Djezā'irli Pasha at the end of the eighteenth century.

In spite of Ḥammūda Pasha's efforts to win the loyalty of the *jund*, the bey was betrayed by his janissaries during the first military campaign against Algiers in 1807 – which led, following the defeat, to the punishment or exile of a number of their officers. For the second, victorious, campaign, of June and July 1807, the bulk of the army was formed of contingents of local origin: there were, according to sources, no more than 1,500 janissaries out of a total of nearly 20,000 fighters, composed in their majority of tribal cavalrymen (Chérif 1977: 124; al-Imām 1980: 204–5). Ḥammūda Pasha thenceforth adopted an increasingly strict attitude towards his *jund*. His relations with the deys of his time, moreover, had an overtly conflictual character in two instances at least: in 1805, the dey Ibrāhīm Būshnāq, who had ordered the beating of a Malekite urban notable, was dismissed (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 36–7), and in 1808, the dey Muḥammad Qāra Burnālī was executed, presumably for plotting with Algiers against the bey.<sup>3</sup>

The crisis that had been building up for several years finally broke out in September 1811, when the janissaries entrenched themselves in the citadel of the Qasbah and declared their revolt against the bey. The uprising was crushed by forces loyal to Ḥammūda, led by Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābī', with the assistance of foreign artillerymen. The defeated Turks, fleeing in the direction of Algiers, were chased down and slaughtered by the Arab *ṣubāyḥis* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 53–6; Rousseau 1985: 270–6).

### The Regency, France and England

The tightening of the links between the Tunisian provincial government and the Ottoman Porte under Ḥammūda Pasha is clearly reflected in that bey's policy towards the Christian world and, particularly, to the two greatest rival powers of the time, France and England. Of these two countries, France, as a consequence of the alliance that had been set up between François I and Sulaymān the Magnificent in the sixteenth century, sealed by the conclusion of Capitulatory agreements regularly renewed by their successors, had enjoyed commercial and diplomatic prominence over other

Christian powers in the Ottoman Maghrib. Frequent official embassies were exchanged between the Tunisian deys and beys and the French kings (starting from the mission led by M. de Brèves, the envoy extraordinary of King Henri IV in 1608, to the embassy of Sulaymān Agha in Versailles in 1777). There was also, in Tunis, a relatively important trading community representing commercial interests in Provence and Marseilles, in addition to the Cap Nègre comptoir that had been granted to the Compagnie d'Afrique in 1627. Finally, in the time of the Husaynid beys, Muḥammad and 'Alī, French military experts were sent to the Regency to help rebuild and reinforce fortifications in the Regency, such as those of Qayrawān, which had been partly demolished during the civil conflict between Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī and 'Alī Pasha (Roux 1932: 224).

In the eighteenth century, however, serious frictions occurred between the Regency and France, which even led to armed confrontations in 1742 and in 1770. The deterioration of relations between the two countries, which had started slowly and sporadically, took a sharper form during the period of rule of Ḥammūda Pasha. This change was reflected, in particular, in the waning influence of Muṣṭafa Khūja, a privileged friend and client of France, who had been a powerful *mamlūk* in the government of 'Alī Bey. Muṣṭafa Khūja, under Ḥammūda Pasha, was quickly overshadowed, and eventually relegated to political insignificance, by the increasing power of his youthful rival, Yūsuf Ṣāḥib al-Ṭābi' (al-Imām 1980: 112, 114), whom the French consul in Tunis considered as 'the most vehement enemy' of his country (Plantet 1893: III, 93). It is also worthwhile noting that, while Muṣṭafa Khūja was put in command of the expedition against 'Alī Burghul in 1793, Yūsuf Ṣāḥib al-Ṭābi' was sent at the head of a conciliation embassy to Istanbul a few months later: the opposite stances of these two officials towards French influence in the Regency are thus coupled with their respective positions as concerns relations with the Ottoman Porte.

The sharp turn in the relations with France in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha can be dated from 1798, with the occupation of Egypt by Bonaparte – which represented the first occupation of an Arab Ottoman province by a Christian power. This change may be followed with some precision, thanks to the correspondence of the French consul in Tunis, Devoize, who, on 3 January 1799, was invited to the Bārdū palace, where he was informed that the bey had declared war on France. Devoize, who had previously assured his minister in Paris that the Barbary provinces would remain

neutral in the war that had been declared between France and the Ottoman Porte (Plantet 1893: III, 367–8, 369), nonetheless found some consolation in the fact that the bey ‘had observed extreme prudence of language’ (Plantet 1893: III, 372) during their meeting. He described the measures that were immediately implemented by the Tunisian authorities thus:

I was escorted by fifty cavalymen commanded by two aghas, in order to protect me from the insults of the populace, during the one-mile long road from the palace to the consular house; my papers were sealed, the flag was hoisted down, and the French citizens in Tunis were gathered inside the *funduq* (caravanserai), watched by a numerous guard, for their security.

(Plantet 1893: III, 372)

The consul, however, was unable to keep for long this flippant attitude. A short time later, the crew of a French warship that had anchored in Ḥalq al-Wād, unaware of the state of war between their country and the Regency, were arrested and subjected to harsh treatment (Plantet 1893: III, 395, 400). The consul’s letters are also eloquent as concerns the situation of the French tradesmen sequestered inside the *funduq*. Thus, writing to the bey on 17 June 1799, he asserted that if the shops and selling counters of French traders in Tunis remained sealed any longer, ‘the rats and dampness (would) destroy their books completely’, adding: ‘in the complete absence of trading activities, several traders are in dire need of retail sales proceeds to cover their daily expenses. They ask for permission to receive the sums due to them from these sales’ (Plantet 1893: III, 390). One year later, the situation had not improved. On 19 May, Devoize wrote to the bey:

I was far from imagining that the French people would be treated with such rigour after the declaration of war on our country. If they had committed any crimes, I am sure these would have been atoned for after these seventeen months’ imprisonment, whereas their fellow citizens in Algiers and Tripoli were released sixteen months ago.

(Plantet 1893: III, 405)

It is interesting to compare this picture of the situation of the French community in Tunis during the three years of war between

the Regency and France, as it emerges from Devoize's correspondence, with that provided by two later nineteenth-century sources. The first source is Alphonse Rousseau, who asserts, in his *Annales tunisiennes*, published towards 1832, that Ḥammūda Pasha had declared war against France under strong Ottoman pressure and that he only kept the French under watch in their *funduq* 'in order to protect them from the insults of the fanatic mob' (Rousseau 1985: 237–8). By giving this version of events, Rousseau intended to promote the image of a constant friendship between the Regency and France, who, following the conquest of Algiers, was then posing as the ally of the Tunisian beys against Ottoman domination. It is, however, less easy to guess what made our national chronicler Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf echo this version of events and even add to it, stating that, thanks to Ḥammūda Pasha's special solicitude, French traders were able to pursue their activities and lived in perfect security during the years when their country was at war with the Regency (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 33). The authority enjoyed by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf among contemporary historians explains why the version thus presented by him of a lip-service war declaration against France by the Tunisian authorities has been accepted without discussion.<sup>4</sup>

It may also be observed, admittedly, that – apart from the detention of French subjects in Tunis – the Regency had no active involvement in the war. No attacks were carried out by Tunisian corsairs against French ships during the war (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 33), although this might be explained either by the far superior naval strength of the French, or by the fact that their ships, at that period, were the main transporters of Tunisian trade goods. The Maghrib Regencies, however, were asked by the Porte to provide financial assistance for the war – an application rarely made in the past by the central Ottoman government (Plantet 1893: III, 392). Finally, we note that, in 1800, a short-lived truce was signed between France and the Algerian and Tunisian Regencies. An embassy was sent by Ḥammūda to Istanbul some time later to justify this initiative (al-Imām 1980: 420), which should, here again, be attributed to Algerian pressure. Threats from the Porte led to the cancelling of the truce and the issuing of a new war declaration by the two Regencies, which remained in force until the signing of a definitive peace treaty in the wake of the Treaty of Amiens signed between France and the Porte in 1802 (al-Imām 1980: 420).

The Ottoman Porte, during the conflict with France, had been allied to Russia (an unnatural, short-lived alliance) and, more

effectively, to England who, according to a treaty signed on 5 January 1799, pledged to preserve the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. This alliance had consequences on the relations of the Tunisian Regency with the neighbouring Italian states, representing pawns on the chess-board of the intense conflict between Napoleon and England. Thus, in September 1799, the conclusion, under English auspices, of a truce between the Maghrib Regencies and Portugal, Sardinia and Sicily, aimed, in the words of Talleyrand, the French minister of foreign affairs, 'at guaranteeing greater ease and security to these three European states, engaged in blockading Malta' (which was at the time occupied by the French) (Plantet 1893: III, 398). In 1800, furthermore, three Ottoman *kapıcıs* arrived on board an English frigate to order the unconditional freeing of a number of Christian slaves, in particular Neapolitans carrying passports delivered by Admiral Nelson (Naples being then divided between the French and the English influence) (Plantet 1893: III, 402).

For the five years that followed the end of war with France, the Regency observed a neutral attitude towards the conflict between that country and Britain in the Mediterranean, in conformity with the central Ottoman policy at that period. Dynamic French diplomacy in Istanbul, added to Napoleon's shining victories at Ulm and Austerlitz in the latter part of 1805, favourably impressed Ottoman statesmen, who seemed tempted to side with the former long-time allies of the Empire. This feeling was certainly shared by Ḥammūda Pasha, who professed a great admiration for Napoleon and used to declare that Muslims would have been in a different situation if they had been blessed with a sultan possessing his courage and qualities (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 33). The signing of a new treaty by the Porte with Britain in 1807, however, led to a change in the bey's policy towards France. Devoize, in a long letter of grievances addressed to Ḥammūda Pasha on 8 December 1808, deplored that the latter had refused to recognize the annexation of the Ionian islands to the Italian states governed by Napoleon, and complained of the discrimination suffered by French corsairs landing in Tunisian ports, compared to the English (Plantet 1893: III, 478–80). He furthermore observed:

Today, I can no longer congratulate myself for the praiseworthy dispositions of your Excellency towards the French people, which I had been so proud to report to my government in the past. It will be, to the contrary, my unpleasant

duty to inform them of the deplorable conditions of life reserved to those of my fellow-countrymen staying in Tunis

(Plantet 1893: III, 480),

before concluding with a veiled threat: 'The not so far future will show your Excellency where the true interests of the Regency lie, and how little credit should be given to France's relentless detractors' (Plantet 1893: III, 480).

In another letter written in the same month to his government, the consul complained of the irascible character of the bey, 'who only (showed) some consideration for the English', attributing his hostility to what he described as 'libellous pamphlets printed in Seville and Malta, spreading rumours about the setting up (by France) of an African corps for the conquest of the Barbary region' (Plantet 1893: III, 482).

The ebbing prestige of the French consul in Tunis, whose meetings with the bey tended to be more and more frequently shortened or postponed (Plantet 1893: III, Introduction, XLIV), was further affected by an intense personal enmity between the two men. After Devoize's departure to France in 1809, ostensibly on leave, a simple *chargé d'affaires* remained to manage the French consulate (Plantet 1893: III, 482, 483–4). In 1814, however, following the restoration of the monarchy in Paris under Louis XVIII, Devoize was sent again by the new government to Tunis. Ḥammūda Pasha adamantly refused to allow the offensive French envoy to land in the Regency and obliged him to sail back to Toulon. From there, the furious Devoize wrote to Paris, suggesting 'the sending of a 1,600-strong French force that would land in La Goulette (Ḥalq al-Wād) and attack the bey in his palace' (Plantet 1893: III, Introduction, XLIV–XLV).

Hostility towards France, generally kept within bounds dictated by prudence, was coupled with an increased cooperation with the English during the last stages of Ḥammūda Pasha's rule. Active diplomatic contacts between the Regency and Britain took place between 1810 and 1813. There was, first, the important embassy sent in 1810 to London, led by Maḥmūd al-Jallūlī (al-Imām 1980: 422–3). The same official was also a residing envoy in Malta from 1810 to 1813, where he supervised the building of ships for the Tunisian fleet, in addition to representing other Tunisian military and commercial interests (al-Imām 1980, 422–3). In 1812, a convention was concluded with Britain, which the French saw as



harmful to their interests (Rousseau 1985: 296). There was also, still under British auspices, a renewal of the truces concluded with Sicily in 1812 and Portugal in 1813 (al-Imām 1980: 410–11). These agreements defined the conditions for ransoming off the subjects of these two countries that had been captured by Tunisian corsairs. The efforts made by the French *chargé d'affaires* for the conclusion of a similar treaty between the Regency and Naples at the same period, on the other hand, came to nought (Rousseau 1985: 279–83). Such an agreement was only concluded in 1816 under the aegis of Lord Exmouth: thus, Britain scored most of the points in the competition engaged with France at that period for the honour of liberating Christian slaves held in the Barbary region.

### Curso and trade

The temporary revival of the ‘small wars’ of the corso, under Ḥammūda Pasha, reflected a strengthening of the *jihād* ideology in response to the European onslaught on the *dār al-islām*. This revival, after a long period of almost continuous decline, however, could not have taken place, had it not been for the elimination of the most redoubted enemies of the Maghrib corsairs, i.e. the Knights of St John of Malta, whose Order had been dismantled by Napoleon in 1798. It led to an increase in the number of Tunisian expeditions against European (mostly Italian) vessels and coasts, which rose from 29 in 1784–8, to 75 in the period between 1789 and 1803 (Panzac 1993: 75–6). Only a small proportion of these expeditions, however, was carried out by the state fleet, whereas the remaining three-quarters were carried out by private vessels (Panzac 1993: 77). The most important patrons of the private corso were: Yūsuf Šāḥib al-Ṭābī, the governor of Šafāqus, Maḥmūd al-Jallūli, and the governor of al-A‘rāḍ, Ḥmīda ibn ‘Ayyād. After 1805, however, the number of corso expeditions, which was 79 in that year, fell to an average of 14 for the remaining years of Ḥammūda Pasha’s period of rule (Panzac 1993: 78). The reason for this evolution was that the small Italian states, which had been the main prey of the corsairs, passed under the domination of the great European powers.

The corso, indeed, as lucidly acknowledged by Yūsuf Šāḥib al-Ṭābī to one of his collaborators, was drawing to its end (Chérif 1977: 123), which was brought about in 1816 by Wymouth’s expedition to the western Mediterranean. This awareness led Ḥammūda Pasha to pursue a policy timidly started, then aban-

done, under his father's government, i.e. the development of a Tunisian trading fleet. In the former period, the Tunisian state fleet had been almost exclusively devoted to the corso, and all Tunisian travellers and goods were taken on board foreign vessels, especially French ones. Britain's imposition of a maritime blockade on France, starting from 1806, allowed the Ottoman trade fleet (commanded by Greek captains) to develop in the new Mediterranean environment (Panzac 1993: 78). The Tunisian Regency also profited by the new conjuncture. A small Tunisian merchant fleet was constituted with vessels captured by corsairs or bought from Europe, and by converting a number of boats formerly used for the corso into trade ships. The results of this policy were clearly reflected by statistics on the number of Tunisian ships landing in European ports. This number, in Marseilles, for instance, rose from 2 in 1802 to 9 in 1809, reached 20 in Leghorn between 1809 and 1814, and 224 in Malta between 1801 and 1816 (Panzac 1993: 78–9). This evolution, however, was sharply interrupted in 1811–12, as a result of the blockade of the port of Ḥalq al-Wād by the hostile Algerian navy. Finally, in 1814, the fall of Napoleon led to the lifting of the English blockade on French ports, and liberated European fleets in the Mediterranean, thus eliminating the weak Tunisian fleet (Panzac 1993: 81–2).

Other aspects of the trading and economic policy of the Regency under Ḥammūda Pasha represented a continuation of this bey's wars and political alliances with the Christian world. There was a considerable development of trade relations between the Regency and Britain, especially via Malta, which fell under British rule in 1800. Commercial exchange between the Regency and this island quickly reached a level comparable to the level of those established for more than a century with Marseilles, Leghorn and Genoa. Besides the import of English products for its own market, the Regency, owing to its neutrality in the conflict between France and England, also served as a transit place for the cotton and sugar brought to the island by the English, which were re-exported to the European continent (Chater 1984: 33). Wheat and cattle were also shipped from the Regency to Malta and Gibraltar, for the feeding of English troops garrisoned there (Panzac 1993: 79). Commercial conventions with Britain, concluded in the last years of Ḥammūda's period of rule, stipulated, in accordance with the liberal trading policy of that country, that English goods imported into the Regency would be invariably taxed at three per cent, even if they did not come from English ports, or were not imported on board

English ships (whereas the French, in order to protect their fleet, required heavier taxation if French goods came on board foreign ships) (MacGill 1815: 104).

Ḥammūda Pasha's economic policy was, furthermore, characterized by an increasing tendency to concentrate all branches of trade with Christian countries in his own hands and in those of a few government officials (Chater 1984: 31–2). European consuls and traders, complaining about what they described as the bey's 'avarice', were echoing the grievances expressed by their predecessors towards Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, who, towards the last years of his rule, had adopted a similar policy (Chérif 1986: II, 88) – although this was, it seems, abandoned in the mid-eighteenth century. The beylical quasi-monopoly of trade, combined to a very high rise in import duties in 1808 (Chérif 1977: 123), deeply affected French and Italian commercial interests in Tunis.<sup>5</sup> It led to the disappearance of 15 out of the 20 French concerns settled in that city (Chater 1984: 31–2). Ḥammūda's protectionist policy may be seen as aiming at strengthening the economic capacities of the Tunisian state and limiting European commercial penetration in the Regency. It raises the issue of a possible common economic strategy of the Ottoman *wālis* at that period and, in particular, of a similarity of policies and objectives between this bey and the much discredited Djezzār Pasha, in Palestine and Syria, who was bitterly criticized in his time, in particular, for establishing an increasing number of monopolies.

The almost total interruption of the importing of luxury products from abroad and the encouragement of local industry, represented other aspects of this defensive economic policy against European economic penetration. Sources have reported, in particular, on the bey's spectacular gesture of discarding cashmere shawls, replacing them by woollen shawls produced in Jirba (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 78). This type of measure conformed with the implementation of anti-sumptuary laws and a general policy of austerity of the Porte during that period, promoted in particular by the grand vizier Halil Hamid Pasha (1782–5) and by Sultan Selīm III (Inan 1976: 72). The bey furthermore strove to encourage inter-Ottoman trade, particularly by bringing down the rate of customs duties on goods sold to, or bought from, the other Ottoman provinces, from eight per cent *ad valorem* to four per cent (Zouari 1990: 70). In addition to trade with Algiers, carried out via al-Kāf and the al-Jarīd region in the South, the greatest part of the commercial exchanges with the Ottoman Empire was carried on

from the capital and from Şafāqus. From the latter city, situated on the south-eastern coast of the Regency, a consequent community had migrated to Cairo and Alexandria. It played an important role in the development of commercial relations with Egypt, reinforced by strong cultural ties.<sup>6</sup> Merchants from Şafāqus and Jirba also traded with cities in Turkey (especially Istanbul and Izmir) and in the Morea. The goods exported from the Regency to the rest of the Empire included, in particular, the *shāshiyyas* (red bonnets made by the Andalusians), silk, woollen cloth and perfumes, and agricultural products. It should also be noted, concerning the last products, that on some years important quantities of them were shipped out to other Ottoman provinces affected by drought and insufficient harvests, on the instructions of the Porte. Eighteenth-century sources, thus, mention the sending of quantities of oil to Egypt and grains to Tripoli and Algiers in 1724 (Chérif 1986: II, 11), and of wheat to Syria in 1769, 1771 and 1773 (Faroqhi 1994: 546–7). We do not know on what terms, or at what prices, these shipments were delivered.

### Conclusion and epilogue

The analysis made above of the wars and alliances of Ḥammūda Pasha, stands in marked contrast to the assessment made of this bey's relations and policy with the Ottoman Porte by contemporary historians, who have unanimously viewed his period of rule as the culmination of a linear and constant process of autonomy from Istanbul, started since the seventeenth century. This view has been summed up neatly by Khélifa Chater in these words: 'Hammouda Pacha gouvernait la Régence "en toute indépendance." Il ne rejetait guère l'autorité ottomane tant qu'elle le laissait gouverner à sa guise, ne s'immisçait pas dans les affaires de la Régence et n'intervenait pas au Maghreb' ['Ḥammūda Pasha ruled the Regency "in utter independence". He did not reject the authority of the Ottoman State, as long as the latter let him govern as he wished, and did not meddle in the affairs of the Regency, or intervene in the Maghrib'] (Chater 1984: 34).

I shall not, however, dispute the second assessment made by contemporary historiography of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule, i.e. that it represented the end of an era for Ottoman influence in Tunis. The succession crisis that followed the death of Ḥammūda Pasha at the end of 1814, at the age of 55, ushered in crucial new developments in the Regency. The bey, whose only son had died

when still a child in 1800, had firmly kept his relatives, and in particular his elder cousin Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad, from exercising any influence within the government of the Regency. The designation of ʿUthmān, Ḥammūda's younger half-brother, as the new bey by Yūsuf Ṣāḥib al-Ṭābiʿ was, presumably, the one conforming to the interests, or the stipulations, of the Ottoman Porte. ʿUthmān's rule, however, was a brief one: three months later, a palace conspiracy led to his murder and to the accession to the beylicate of the ageing Maḥmūd (1815–24). Yūsuf Ṣāḥib al-Ṭābiʿ, in his turn, was brutally executed, less than one year later.

It is possible that French assistance, or tacit support, had been secured for the *coup d'état* engineered by the elder branch of the Husaynid family, since Maḥmūd Bey hastened to ask for the return of the French consul Devoize, who, as indicated above, had been banned from the Regency in the last stage of Ḥammūda's reign (Rousseau 1985: 296). As for the Porte, according to its usual practice, it bowed down to the *fait accompli*, and finally granted its investiture to Maḥmūd, but all its subsequent efforts to regain its hold over the Regency were thwarted by increasing French influence in the region. The beginning of the end for Ottoman rule in the Maghrib started with the French occupation of Algiers in 1830. Although the Algiers Regency had been definitively at peace with Tunis since 1821 (Chater 1984: 277), thanks to the efforts of the Porte, the ambiguous stance of the Tunisian government, prompted by vindictiveness and foolish ambitions, impeded desperate attempts by the Ottoman sultan to prevent the loss of the largest of his Maghrib provinces. Half a century later, the Tunisian Regency was placed under the French Protectorate, which was to last from 1881 until 1956.

## THE PASHA-BEY OF TUNIS

This chapter on the pasha-bey of Tunis will not deal with the policies or with the functions and responsibilities entrusted to Ḥammūda Pasha as supreme power-holder in the Regency. Various aspects of the bey's prerogatives in the army and administration of the province will, in any case, be brought to our attention in our following study of these two institutions. The present chapter will, rather, probe the link between the Tunisian pasha-bey and the central government in Istanbul from the perspective of Ottoman legality and protocol. Following the introductory analysis on the evolution of Ottoman policy as concerns beylical succession in the Regency during the period of our concern, the various sections of this chapter will successively deal with: the ceremony of investiture of Ḥammūda ibn 'Alī; his titles, emblems of power and formal privileges; and the organization of his household in the Bārdū palace.

### **Introduction: beylical succession after 1756**

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the policy adopted by the Ottoman Porte as concerns beylical succession in the Regency reflected a new ruling strategy that ensured a more flexible, yet more efficient hold, on the province. First, the newly created Husaynid dynasty was provided with stronger guarantees for a secure tenure of power than its Muradite predecessors. This consisted in the granting of the title of pasha to the bey from the time of Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf (although, as we have seen, this measure was postponed for specific political reasons in the case of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī), and the abolition of the power formerly devolved to the *āgha* of the Turkish *ṣubāyhis*, as potential contender for the beylical title. In 1756, furthermore, the Porte fulfilled its obligation of supporting its legitimately acknowledged pasha-beys by ordering

the removal of the usurper ‘Alī Pasha from power. The Porte, on the other hand, was able to intervene more energetically in the process of beylical succession than it had done under the last Muradites. Thus, the central Ottoman government, having excluded the elder branch of the Husaynid family, possibly because Muḥammad Bey (1756–9) had not given satisfaction to his suzerain, proceeded, with the younger branch, to implement two traditional tenets of its policy as concerns beylical succession. The first was the priority given to the principle of inheritability of the office from father to eldest son, if the latter was eligible. The investiture of Ḥammūda ibn ‘Alī in 1777 therefore sanctioned as much the father’s satisfactory record of services, as his son’s merits. We may note that, with this in mind, ‘Alī Bey had provided his scion with a relatively careful education – at least by his predecessors’ standards – which may be seen as the equivalent of the training reserved to young *kapı kulus* in Istanbul. Ḥammūda, in particular, was the first (and probably the last), among the Husaynids to receive a formal teaching in the Turkish language (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 11). Finally, the young man had been trained in the duties of his office, since he acted as deputy to his father for a number of years, under the latter’s supervision, before his investiture (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 176–7).

Another tenet of Ottoman policy as concerns beylical succession in the Regency, which had been neglected after the period of the first Muradites, was that if the incumbent bey had accomplished a given length of service or had reached a certain age, his son would succeed him in his lifetime. ‘Alī Bey was thus an official of the Ottoman state, who, after 20 years of office (from 1172 to 1191 *hijra*), was allowed to go into retirement, leaving his son the one and only pasha-bey in Tunis. This fact has not been acknowledged by twentieth-century historians on the Regency, who have dated the start of Ḥammūda’s rule from ‘Alī Bey’s death in 1782 (Chérif 1977: 108; Chater 1984: 23; al-Imām 1980: 1). Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf, however, makes it very clear that ‘Alī Bey was no longer in power after 1777, describing him thus at the close of the ceremony of his son’s investiture: ‘He retired into his apartments, having unburdened himself of the responsibilities of governorship, happy and content with his deposition’ (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 177).

As an additional symbolic advantage for the prestige of the Porte in the Regency, the Ottoman investiture given to the son in his father’s lifetime was organized before the local *bai‘a* (i.e. the public

homage and display of allegiance to the new ruler, given, according to Islamic tradition, by the members of his government and his subjects), whereas the assumption of power by a new bey at the death of his predecessor implied his receiving the *ba'fa* a long time before the firman of investiture arrived from Istanbul.

## The investiture of Ḥammūda ibn 'Alī

### *The application to the Porte*

In order to obtain the beylical office for his son Ḥammūda, 'Alī Bey sent a formal application to the Porte, stressing that he was acting in conformity to the wishes expressed by his subjects (Ibn Abī'l-Diyāf 1963–6: II, 177). As evidence of this popular consensus, a petition by the *dīwān* to that intent must have been attached to 'Alī's letter. Although the correspondence between the Regency and the Ottoman Porte in the Tunisian archives at the Dār el-Bey does not include a petition expressly drafted for this application to the central Ottoman government, we may reasonably assume that its opening paragraph was similar to that of the petition sent by the *dīwān* to Istanbul and dated on 7 *Jumādā* 1231/5 May 1816, a few days after the failure of a janissary uprising in Tunis (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 346, documents 3 and 3 bis).<sup>1</sup> The text, written in Turkish and accompanied by the signatures of 51 officials, begins thus:

We, the most humble *dāy* of the *ocaks* of *Tūnus el-meḥrüse*, *dār el-cihad* (Tunis the well-guarded, province of the holy war), the *qādis* (judges) and *müftis* (theological jurisconsults) of the Hanefite and Malekite rites, upholders of the *şer'ā*, the *ülema*, the *awliyā' al-şālihūn* (men of holy repute), the *imams*, preachers and *şerīfs* (the Prophet's descendants), the *ağa* (commander) and *kāhiya* (intendant general) of the janissaries, the *yaya başıs* (a category of high officers of the janissaries), the *ḥocas* (secretaries) of the *dīwān*, the *sancakdār ḥocas* (intendants of the army), the *çavuşes*, *oda başıs* (two categories of janissary officers), *re'ises* (commanders of corsair or artillery units), *serdengeçtis* (special assault units), *'alemdars* (flag-holder officers), *sipāhis* (cavalry), *aşçıs* (a category of janissary officers), the *iḥtiyar* and *muteqā'id* officers (veterans and pensioners) of the *ocaks*, and all the *kul 'asker* (the



janissaries), the *ʿāyān* (notables) of the *vilāyet* (province), the tribes' *ṣeyḥs* (leaders) and all the *reʿāya* and *berāya* (i.e. the tax-payers and those exempted from this obligation) whose names are given below, humbly and sincerely address this motion to the dust of the august steps of the most just, magnificent and compassionate Sultan of the world, the most powerful and awe-inspiring *Ḥān* of the world and *Ḥāqān* of the two Seas and the two Lands, our master the Sultan, son of the Sultan, may God make his rule last as long as the stars and keep it as elevated until Doomsday, *ʾAmin*.

A small delegation, headed by an official chosen from among the dignitaries of the Regency originating from the Empire, then sailed to Istanbul, carrying the application documents and laden with presents (the *hadiyya*). We have no information on the gift sent by ʿAlī Bey on that occasion, but we may presume that, as in the case of the much trumpeted embassy of Ḥammūda Pasha to the Porte in 1795, though on a more modest scale, the bey's offerings comprised a wide range of the country's raw materials and handicrafts wares. Among the latter, a huge banner with verses from the religious poem '*Al-Burdah*', written by the Maghrib poet al-Buṣayrī in praise of the prophet, embroidered on it with a silken thread represented an exclusive contribution from the Tunisian Regency among the offerings by Arab provinces to the Porte (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 28; Bayram no date: I, part one, 134). Jewels, as well as weapons and curios encrusted with precious stones were also destined for the sultan and the highest officials of his *sarāy* (palace) and of the central Ottoman government.<sup>2</sup>

In Istanbul, formalities for interviews with officials and for presenting the bey's application to the sultan were carried out with the assistance of the bey's *kāhiya*, or deputy at the Porte (Ott.: *kapı kāhyası*, in Arabic: *khalīfatuhu bil-bāb*). The latter belonged to a category of Ottoman officers who were entrusted with representing provincial pashas in Istanbul and acting to forward their administrative interests (Mantran 1959: 330; Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 239). After notification was given of the acceptance of the envoy's presents by the sultan, the firman of investiture would be drafted in the Chancellery of the Porte. The envoy was then able to sail back to Tunis, accompanied by a *kapıcı*.

*The ceremony of investiture*

The ceremony of Hammūda ibn ‘Alī’s investiture took place on 9 February 1777, following the arrival of the Ottoman *kapıcı* and his reception in great pomp in Tunis. In the light of the information provided by Tunisian sources of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries on this type of celebration,<sup>3</sup> we may reconstruct the formalities of this function as follows.

When all the religious and army dignitaries and officials, and a number of notables had been gathered in the fort’s square of the Bārdū palace, the Ottoman *kapıcı* (designated, in Tunisian sources, as the *qubjī*), made his way to the front row and, after delivering the firmans and the robes of honour to Tunisian officials, took the seat reserved for him. At his entry, all present, including the bey, stood up in deference and remained standing for the rest of the ceremony. First, the *tarjumān* (interpreter) of the dey robed the bey in the sultan’s robe of investiture, a red caftan embroidered with gold and fringed with fur worn by two-*tuğ* pashas, to the sound of the Turkish military band. The dress of honour, conforming to Islamic tradition, was accompanied by a present from the sultan (such as an encrusted dagger, or a sword). The firman of investiture was then read by the *bāsh khūja* (head secretary) of the *dūwān*. It appears from nineteenth-century firmans found in the Tunisian archives (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 340, documents 13 and 39), that this was only a short text, containing the declaration of investiture and general recommendations, i.e.:

to ensure safety and order in the *memleket* (province), protect and safeguard God’s creatures, the *re‘āya*, to strive to put to execution all (the sultan’s) firmans and take the utmost care to avoid trespassing on the limits of justice and committing any infringements against the inhabitants and dwellers in the country.

Gunshots were fired at the end of the ceremony from the Bārdū fortress and from all the other fortresses of the country, for the next three days, as a sign of rejoicing.

*The confirmation of investiture*

The pasha-bey’s investiture was normally renewed every three years (Serres 1925: 87), according to the traditional practice, established

since the reign of sultan Murād III, of three-year mandates for the pashas (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 145) and on the advent of every new sultan. Hammūda Pasha's investiture was thus renewed – belatedly – in 1795 by Selīm III, and was also probably renewed on the enthroning of Selīm's two successors: Mustafa IV (in 1807) and Maḥmūd II (in 1808). The application for the renewal of investiture necessitated the sending of the usual presents, with a new petition of support by the *ḍiwān*, probably formulated in similar terms to the second paragraph of the petition mentioned above:

Declare that your servant, . . . Pasha-Bey, following the example of his father and his grandfather, has always obeyed the orders and the will of the *Sultān al-mu'azzam* and acted zealously to fulfil the noble Caliph's satisfaction in managing the affairs of the victorious *ocak*, that he is administering the country in the best way, protecting the poor and taking care of the *ra'iya* and dwellers in the *eyālet*, and that we all are content and happy with his deeds and actions.

(Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 346, documents 3 and 3 bis)

It appears that the drafting of the firmans of renewal of investiture in Istanbul took place in the first days of the month of *Shawwāl*.<sup>4</sup> A new robe of investiture might also be sent to the bey: on such occasions, a ceremony was held in Istanbul before the departure of the *kapıcı* of the Porte to Tunis, at which the *kapı kāhyası* donned the caftan destined for the bey.<sup>5</sup>

## Titles, emblems of power and privileges

### *Titles of the pasha-bey*

Ḥammūda Pasha was designated by a variety of Ottoman official titles:

- The title 'pasha-bey', in Ottoman spelling, following his name, was engraved at the centre of the beylical seals,<sup>6</sup> and was also used in treaties signed with Christian powers (Rousseau 1985: 504, 526, 529, etc.).

- The Turkish title ‘beylerbey’ and its Arabic equivalent ‘*amīr al-umarāʾ*’ recur in the following invariable opening paragraph of the firmans addressed to the bey:

*Emīr el-ümerā el-kirām, kebir al-kuberā el fiḥām, zuʾl-qadri veʾl-iḥtirām, šāhibul-ʾizz veʾl-iḥtišām, al-muḥtaṣṣ bi-mazīd ināyet el-melik el-aʾlā, ḥāllan Tūnus beğlerbeğisi (X) Paşa, dāma iqbāluh.*

(Lord of the illustrious Lords, greatest of the great in their glory, recipient of consideration and reverence, full of glory and munificence, distinguished by the special solicitude of the Highest King (God), presently beylerbey of Tunis, (X) Pasha, may his prosperity long last.)

(Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 340, documents 13 and 29)<sup>7</sup>

- A third title, ‘*mīrmīrān*’, representing the Persianized form of ‘*amīr al-umarāʾ*’, was also commonly used in official documents (Hugon 1913: 83). These three titles designated pashas of the rank of two *tuğs* in the Ottoman administrative titula-ture. We may therefore wonder about the use of the title of ‘*wazīr*’ by the historian Ibn Abīʾl-Ḍiyāf, twice, in references to Ḥammūda Pasha (Ibn Abīʾl-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 28, 83). We know that the title ‘*vezīr*’, in the Ottoman Empire, applied to pashas of three *tuğs*, and that, according to some historians, most provincial governors, particularly in the Arab provinces, were granted a third *tuğ* during the eighteenth century (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 141). There is, however, nothing that suggests that Ḥammūda Pasha had also received that honour, especially as such an event would have been widely advertised and reported by contemporary authors, as was the case when Muḥammad Bey (1787–95) was granted a second *tuğ* (Ibn Abīʾl-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 63). We may therefore consider the use of the title ‘*wazīr*’ in a literary source such as Ibn Abīʾl-Ḍiyāf’s chronicle, as laudatory exaggeration, or as an ambiguous play on the original Arabic meaning of that word, i.e. ‘assistant, adviser’ (of the Ottoman grand vizier).
- Finally, the Tunisian pasha-beys were also designated by two other Ottoman titles relating to pashas. The first was: ‘*šāhib kursī*’, meaning: ‘the one holding possession of (the highest office)’ (see Rousseau 1985: 499, 504, 514; Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz 1970: 45).<sup>8</sup> This title was accompanied by the denomination

of the Regency either as ‘*Tūnis al-maḥrūsa*’ (Tunis the well-guarded), or as ‘*memleket Ifriqiya*’.<sup>9</sup> The bey was also designated as ‘*wālī*’ (Bayram no date: 120), an Arabic term meaning ‘governor’, the use of which had become widespread in the eighteenth century in the Ottoman Empire (Ott.: *vāli*).

Among his own subjects, the Tunisian bey was designated by a variety of other appellations. Literary sources call him ‘*sultān al-‘aṣr*’, which meant ‘the ruler of the time’ (Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz 1970: 42). He was called by his servants and the people at large: ‘*sīdna*’ (i.e. ‘our master’, from the Arabic ‘*sayyid*’), corresponding to the half-Turkish half-Arabic ‘*efendīna*’, used in Egypt. And, in the *lingua franca* used in *mamlūk* and renegade circles of the Regency, which consisted of a mixture of French and Italian, sprinkled with Arabic and Turkish words, he was ‘*il padrone*’ (Pückler-Muskau 1989: 175).

### *Emblems of power and privileges*

The emblems and marks of distinction held by Ḥammūda Pasha in the Regency were:

- The flags and banners (in Arabic: *‘alam*, *band*, *ṣanjaq*): Ottoman banners were essential symbols of the pashas’ military and civil authority in provinces. Ḥammūda Pasha, thus, had a banner that constituted his exclusive emblem and was displayed on parades, at feasts and ceremonies, and during *maḥalla* expeditions (Hugon 1913: 93; Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 24). Various other banners were displayed from the Tunisian forts and state vessels. Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf has recorded that, in 1795, as the Swedish ship carrying the delegation sent by Hammūda to Istanbul entered the Bosphorus straits, an officer was sent by the *kapudan pasha*, demanding that the Tunisian flag flying over it be taken down. The bey’s envoy, Ṣāḥib al-Ṭābī’ refused, declaring that this would be an insufferable affront to inflict on a Muslim banner under Christian eyes – an argument that, according to the author, won the day (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 28). Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf’s probably deliberately vague account of the incident suggests that the issue of flags was a source of conflicts between the beys and the Porte, but doesn’t enlighten us further.
- The *tugs*: the Tunisian bey, like all provincial pashas, was preceded, in solemn ceremonies, by two officers bearing long

shafts carrying the *tuğs* corresponding to his rank (Hugon 1913: 81). Surprisingly, there is no mention in Tunisian sources of the Ottoman period to this emblem of beylical power which was, it seems, called ‘the Turkish *şanjaq*’ and which may be seen in some twentieth-century photographs of beylical processions (Bey 2002: 101).

- The signets and seals: Ḥammūda Pasha, according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, ‘used his father’s seal and signet until the latter’s death, out of respect for him’ (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 178). This may suggest that the Husaynids wanted, or were allowed, to maintain, in the eyes of their subjects, the pretence that ‘Alī Bey was ruling for life. All the seals and signets used by Ḥammūda Pasha, in any case, corresponded to his status of two-*tuğ* pasha. The seals, in particular, were of various sizes and shapes, round, oval or eight-sided. On the outer band of some of the larger ones were inscribed two verses from the poem ‘*Al-Burdab*’, mentioned above, on the respect of the *sharī’a* by the ruler. Hugon has noted that the same verses were inscribed on the seal of Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha of Egypt (Hugon 1913: 42).
- The military music band (*nawba*): there was a Turkish band in the Bārdū beylical palace, which played several times a day, including at dawn and nightfall. Military *nawbas* also accompanied *maḥallas* and troops on campaign (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 39; Raymond 1994: II, 81).
- The pasha’s seat (*al-kursī*): in the mid-eighteenth century, the arrogant – and eventually ill-fated – ‘Alī Pasha had sat on a throne of unduly majestic proportions (in addition to arrogating to himself exclusively the privilege of wearing cashmere shawls).<sup>10</sup> After 1756, Muḥammad Bey replaced that *kursī* by a simpler one, which local craftsmen carved from walnut wood (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: V, 24–5), thus giving the keynote of a more subdued attitude, that characterized Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī’s scions. For public occasions and ceremonies in the Bārdū palace, Ḥammūda Pasha also had a second *kursī* carved from the teeth of a whale that had been stranded on the Tunisian shore, and which was made on the orders of ‘Alī Bey by a French craftsman (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 177; V, 25). It should be noted that, in North African folklore, fish stand as symbols of fertility and luck.
- The four-wheeled carriage (*al-karrūṣa*, from the Italian ‘*carrozza*’): it was Ḥammūda’s exclusive privilege to ride a closed four-wheel carriage, although, according to Ibn Abī'l-

- Ḍiyāf, he never exercised it, declaring that these carriages were more suitable for women (MacGill 1815: 101; Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 39). The pasha-bey's *karrūṣa* in the Regency probably corresponded to the closed boats (Ott.: *koculu kayık*) that only the pashas were allowed to use on river journeys in Cairo, Buda, or Baghdad, for instance (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 153).
- The pasha's fur (*al-farwa*): the wearing of a caftan fringed with fur was a privilege which the pasha shared with three other dignitaries in the Regency: the dey, the Hanefite *bāsh mufti* (holder of the highest religious honour in the Regency) and the *bāsh khūja* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 122).
  - The veil (*ḥijāb*): Islamic rulers, including the Hafsid and the Ottoman sultans, following a tradition of Persian origin, might hide themselves from the sight of their ministers and subjects by sitting behind a veil or partition (Chelhod 1971; Brunschvig 1947: II, 29). This usage is also noted by a source on Ḥammūda Pasha (Ibn Salāmā 1850?: 37).

### The household of Ḥammūda Pasha

The first pashas appointed in Tunis, like those of the Egyptian province, had resided in a house situated inside the citadel that surrounded the capital (Raymond 1989: 346). In the seventeenth century, the *dār al-bāshā*, or *dār al-khilāfa*, to which the *dūwān* of the *jund* was attached, was transferred to the heart of the city (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 200, 293). In the eighteenth century, the Husaynid pasha-beys kept their residence in the palace of Bārdū, which the first beys of the Regency had inherited from the Hafsid sultans, and which was situated a few miles west of the capital, not far from the starting point of the *maḥalla* (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 294). The household of Ḥammūda Pasha in that palace, like that of other provincial *wālīs*, was modelled on the household of the sultan, and the more modest one of the grand vizier in Istanbul, as far as etiquette permitted it.<sup>11</sup> Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf has stressed the bey's strict control over the expenses of the palace, as well as his unostentatiousness and the simplicity of his demeanour during the court audiences that he held there (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 76, 81). This behaviour conformed to the stipulations of the central Ottoman government to provincial *wālīs* at that period. The Porte, in the context of its administrative reforms programme, was then striving to restore the simplicity and austerity of the first epoch of

the Empire among its officials and agents, and had, in particular, edicted sumptuary laws to fight the financial excesses of some pashas and their ceremonial extravagance (Aksan 1998).

*The inside and the outside services of the beylical household*

In the Tunisian beylical household, the harem, guarded by black and white eunuchs, composed the women's section of the palace. The rest of the household was divided between the inside and the outside service. The inside service included, first, the young pages designated as the *muchachi del camera* (in Arabic: *al-ṣighār*, i.e. the little boys), in charge of the private chambers of the bey. The *muchachi*, in Ḥammūda Pasha's time, were six young slave-boys captured during corsair raids on the coasts of Italy (Raymond 1994: II, 80); they were supervised by the *bāsh qāzāq*, whose prerogatives will be studied below in more detail. Concerning the other servants of the inside service, a list of them, designated in the *lingua franca* in current use in the government circles of the Regency, is provided by a European source of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī's time (Pococke 1772: I, 314–16). It is worth reproducing this list here, if only to stress how faithfully the Tunisian beylical household was copied on the imperial model, although the household of Ḥammūda Pasha may have been of a smaller size than his grandfather's, given the policy of austerity followed by this bey:

- two officers in charge of the bey's wardrobe and clothing, the first, serving the bey in his palace, called '*il bashau guarda robe*', and the second, called '*il bashau guarda robe del campo*', to serve him during *maḥalla* expeditions (corresponding, respectively, to the *çokadār ağa* and to the *comesūy başı* of the sultan) (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 342, 337);
- the *kaffeji*, to serve the bey's coffee (corresponding to the sultan's *kahveci başı*) (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 344);
- the *guarda fanali*, for providing adequate lighting (corresponding to the *mum başı*) (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 336);
- the *guarda hamam*, or guardian of the baths (corresponding to the *hammāmcı başı*) (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 337);
- the *guarda banda* and the *guarda letto* responsible for the supply of water (corresponding to the *su kullukcu* and the *ibrikdār ağası*) (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 336, 342).



As for the outside service of the beylical household, we may include in it, starting from the periphery, servants in charge of the various tasks for the maintenance of the different sections of the palace, such as the cleaners, cooks, stable-boys and supervisors, gardeners, etc., and a small number of distinguished representatives of the learned profession, serving as teachers for the religious education of the princes and *mamlūks*, and as *imāms* for the mosque attached to the palace. More importantly, the outside service included a variety of bodyguards, ceremony masters and couriers, whose number was probably strictly determined by the protocolary stipulations set out by the Porte, taking into consideration the rank held by the pashas of Tunis in the hierarchy of Ottoman provincial governors. These officers, chosen for their imposing statures and looks and sumptuously attired in Ottoman costume, attended the bey during processions or at the justice audiences that he held daily in a hall of the Bārdū palace, and during which he examined a variety of criminal cases, including the death penalty, which could only be pronounced by him.<sup>12</sup> Among these officers were:

- the *shāṭirs* (Ott.: *şatır*) or footmen, wearing red and silver striped costumes (Bayram no date: I, part two, 131–2): In the Ottoman Empire, two-*tuğ* pashas were entitled to have six unmounted horses led before them and were accompanied by four of these footmen (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 153);
- the *abyāk* (only mentioned in the plural form in sources, from the Turkish *peyk*): in Istanbul, the *peyks* were one of the guard corps attached to the sultan, and a number of provincial pashas were also entitled to have them (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 87, 153). The Tunisian *abyāk* are mentioned in sources, together with the *shāṭirs*, in descriptions of the pasha's retinue on the occasion of the departure of the *maḥalla* or in the bey's tribunal (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 303; Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1925: 211; Pückler-Muskau 1989: 177; Bayram no date: I, part two, 131);
- the *shūlāqs*, corresponding to the Ottoman *şolaks*, who formed guard units attached to the sultans and to provincial pashas;<sup>13</sup>
- the *shāwishes al-salām* (Ott.: *çavuş*): as was the case for their counterparts in the service of the sultan and the grand vizier in Istanbul (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 349), these *shāwishes* officiated in the bey's tribunal and acted as masters of ceremonies. They wore red *shāshiyas* (fez hats) adorned with ostrich

feathers, with silver discs hanging on their foreheads, and held tall copper canes in their hands. They were commanded by the *bāsh shāwish* (Bayram no date: I, part two, 121; Pückler-Muskau 1989: 159).

- the *ruṣāṣā al-bawwāba* corresponded to another group of ceremony masters in the sultan's household, i.e. the *kapıcı başıs* (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 355), both denominations meaning 'head door-keepers'. They were headed by the *bāsh bawwāb* (first head door-keeper) and served in particular in the bey's tribunal (Bayram no date: I, part two, 131).

The gates of the Bārdū palace were guarded by 25-men units representing the various formations of the Tunisian army. The study, among these, of three prestigious cavalry corps: the *ṣubāyḥīs* of Tunis, the *ḥānbas* and the *mamlūks*, due to their particular link to the beylical household and to the Tunisian central administration, whose offices were situated within the precincts of the Bārdū palace, may appropriately be included in this section of our chapter.

### *The ṣubāyḥīs of Tunis and the ḥānbas*

The *ṣubāyḥīs* of Tunis and the *ḥānbas* were organized in very similar ways. Each of the two corps was divided into two sections, a Turkish and an Arab one (Raymond 1994: II, 11, 84–5). In addition to participating regularly in the beylical *maḥallas*, these cavalymen were employed for various administrative functions, and particularly that of couriers in the service of the various departments of the Tunisian government. There was, however, in that regard, a distinction between the Turkish and the Arab sections of both corps. The Turkish *ṣubāyḥīs* and *ḥānbas*, it seems, belonged to the beylical household (and were therefore specifically in the *khidma*, i.e. service, of the bey). Their Arab counterparts, whom Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf describes as 'the cavalry of the *mamlaka* i.e. province (from the Ottoman: *memleket*)' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: IV, 30), were in the service of the central administration of the Regency, whose offices were also situated in the grounds of the Bārdū palace.<sup>14</sup> All these cavalymen were entitled to receive from the persons or bodies to whom they communicated administrative and judicial decisions a specific payment, called the '*khidma*', which represented an appreciable bonus to the salaries of the lower and middle-ranking among them in particular (Raymond 1994: II, 61–2).

The corps of the *ṣubāyḥis* of Tunis, who drew their denomination from the Turkish '*sipābi*', meaning: 'cavalryman', had existed from the beginning of Ottoman rule in the province. The Turkish *ṣubāyḥis*, who had probably been part of the first *jund* set up in Tunis in the period following its conquest, had constituted, in the seventeenth century, a prestigious cavalry elite. Their *āgha*, who played an important role at the end of that century and during the very first years of the eighteenth, lost all influence when the corps was attached to the beylical household in the time of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī. In the eighteenth century, they served as couriers between the beylical administration and the *diwān*, and guarded the inner gate of the Bārdū palace. As for the Arab *ṣubāyḥis* of Tunis, who guarded the outer gate of the Bārdū palace, they constituted the first regiment of Arab *ṣubāyḥis* of the province, created in the first stages of Ottoman rule in Tunis, half a century before the regiments of Bāja, al-Kāf and Qayrawān were set up under the rule of Ḥammūda ibn Murād Bey (1631–66) (Raymond 1994: II, 84).

The more prestigious *ḥānbas*, who guarded the second gate of the Bārdū palace were a later creation than the *ṣubāyḥis*. The denomination '*ḥānba*' probably originated from the Turkish '*cānbāz*' (i.e. 'soul-stakers'), designating special assault units in Ottoman Muslim *rāiyya* contingents and who seem to have been set up on the model of the *serden geçtis* (i.e. 'head-riskers') units of the Istanbul janissary corps. By the end of the seventeenth century, the *cānbāz* often formed the personal guard of beylerbeys and beys across the Empire (Gökbilgin 1965). The *ḥānbas* of the Tunisian beys, indeed, came into existence at the same period and quickly rose to power and military prestige in the Regency. (Unlike them, however, the corps of the deylical *ḥānbas*, whose creation can be more precisely dated to the time of Muḥammad Ṭābāq Dey (1677–82), soon sank, like their masters, into obscurity) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 224). Each of the two sections of the beylical *ḥānbas* numbered 100 to 150, and was headed by a *bāsh ḥānba*. These two officers are ranked seventh in Bayram's list of the first 13 government offices of the Regency (see Appendix A, p. 144), with 'slight precedence for the Turkish one over the Arab' (Bayram no date: I, part two, 3). The *ḥānbas* officiated in the tribunal of the bey, in addition to assuming courier duties in communicating the bey's judicial decisions. The highest-ranked among them were granted governorships, especially in tribal areas (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 83). The *ḥānbas* thus seem to have represented the counterpart of the *müteferrikas* of the sultan's household, or his 'noble guard',

also divided into two sections, and whose most deserving members were rewarded with governorships (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 362).

### *The mamlūks of the bey*

The corps of the *mamlūks*, like those of the *ṣubāyḥīs* of Tunis and the *ḥānbas*, had a dual structure. It was divided into two sections of distinctly unequal standing: the Europeans and the Ottomans. The first constituted what was called the group of the *mamlūks* of the entry vestibule (*mamālīk al-saqīfa*), numbering 100, and divided into four *ūḍas* (units) (Raymond 1994: II, 39). Half of its members were kept in Tunis, where one unit was posted on guard in the entry vestibule leading to the palace (hence their name), while the rest acted as couriers for the bey in his court of justice. The other half were sent to provincial garrisons, where they were also employed for administrative courier duties. The European *mamlūks* were commanded by the *bāsh qāzāq* (*'kāzāk'* meaning, in Turkish, 'an aged male slave'), or *bāsh mamlūk*, as he later became more frequently called. This official, who also supervised the young Italian pages of the inside service (who probably formed the 'junior' section of that corps), thus stood as the Tunisian equivalent of the powerful *siḥḍār āga* of the sultan's and the grand vizier's households (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 339). He is ranked eighth in Bayram's list. In Ḥammūda Pasha's time, the *bāsh qāzāq* was a Neapolitan slave, named Mario Stinca. Stinca's functions included those of interpreter and private secretary of the bey, which gave him considerable influence among the consuls of Christian states (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 76).<sup>15</sup>

The rest of the European *mamlūks*, however, enjoyed little official power within the government of the Regency. They are also almost totally absent from Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's account of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule, or his series of bibliographies of Tunisian officials and notables under that bey and his successors (*'tarājim al-āyān'*), which constituted a sort of 'Who's Who' annuary of the Regency) (see Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII and VIII). The low profile of converts from European countries during the period of our concern in the government and army of the Regency stands in clear contrast to the political power they had enjoyed in the first half of the seventeenth century, when Murād the Corsican, having succeeded Ramaḍān Bey at the head of the *maḥalla* in 1613, founded the first beylical dynasty of the Regency, and Uṣṭa Murād, the Genoese, ascended to deylical rank in 1640.

The Ottoman *mamlūks*, who wielded considerable influence within the Tunisian administration, were known as *mamālik al-sarāy*, i.e. the *mamlūks* of the palace – a designation reflecting their more distinguished status compared to the Europeans, relegated to the vestibule. Their group, including the youngest ones still in training, presumably numbered, like that of the Europeans, 100 men, with gaps in that number being periodically filled by new recruitments (Brown 1974: 48). The Ottoman *mamlūks* were bought at a high price, generally in their adolescence, or even at an earlier age, from slave-markets in Istanbul. Like the young *kapı kulus* of Istanbul, who were trained in one of the sultan's palaces, they were boarded and educated in the Bārdū palace itself, and were generally converted there, which earned them the designation of the bey's 'sons' ('*ibn*', pl. '*abnā*').<sup>16</sup> During that period of training, whereas the Italian *muchachi della camera* served as the bey's valets, young Ottoman *mamlūks* were put on armed guard in a room adjoining the bey's own bedroom at night (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 20). Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf stresses that during Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule, the language of communication normally used between the *mamlūks* and the bey was Turkish, implying that this was not the case under the latter's predecessors (and, probably, his successors) (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 20).

The three most important Ottoman *mamlūks* in the government of the Regency in Ḥammūda Pasha's time were Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi', and the older Muṣṭafa Khūja and Sulaymān Kāhiya, who were respectively the bey's guardian of the seal, his former tutor, and his delegate in the *maḥallas*. A study of their origins and prerogatives leads us to a series of observations. First, these officials were born, respectively, in Moldavia, Circassia and Georgia (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 38, 56, 89). Thus, it appears that whereas, during the seventeenth century and most of the eighteenth, the most prominent *mamlūks* in the beylical government came exclusively from Circassia and Georgia, increasing influence was gained, starting from the period of our concern, by *mamlūks* from Rumelia and the western confines of the Empire, such as Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi', under Ḥammūda Pasha, and Muṣṭafa Khaznadār, from Greece, in the mid-nineteenth century. Second, the different origins of these *mamlūks* suggest that Ḥammūda Pasha had been concerned to establish a balanced representation of the various geographical regions of the Empire within his government. Third, the functions of Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi' and of Muṣṭafa Khūja may be considered in the light of a privilege that had been, presumably,

reserved for the Ottoman princes who, in the early period of the Empire, were sent to govern some provinces; these princes, in contrast to other pashas, were entitled to have, among their administrative staff, a *nīṣānci* (guardian of the seal) and a *lala* (tutor), acting as an adviser (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 139). The same concern to restore earlier usages, and more specifically a fundamental, though long-discarded, principle of the *kapı kulu* institution, i.e. bachelorhood, may have dictated the bey's refusal to allow Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābī from marrying (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 97). We note, on the other hand, that Sulaymān Kāhiya and Muṣṭafa Khūja, according to a long-established rule in the Regency, were assimilated into the beylical family by being married to its daughters: the second of them was successively married to two of Ḥammūda Pasha's sisters (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 39). Finally, the particular judicial status of the Ottoman *mamlūks* in the Regency will be studied in another chapter of this book.

### Conclusion: a *kapı kulu* pasha-bey

The strict and precise *étiquette* set out for the bey by the Porte served to codify, as well as limit, symbolically, his power in the Regency. We have seen that the Porte, as in the case of 'Alī Pasha's offensive *kursī*, kept a watchful eye against beylical transgressions in that realm. Furthermore, the legal subordination of the Husaynid pasha-beys to the Porte, underlying the formal and ceremonial aspect of their relationship, was asserted through the periodic renewal of the beys' investiture by the sultan, which implied that the latter could, theoretically, refuse to grant this renewal to a *wālī* whose performance had not been satisfactory.

In the eyes of the Ottoman Porte, therefore, Ḥammūda Pasha was, first and foremost, a *kapı kulu*, son of a *kapı kulu*, and a member of the *kul 'asker* of the province. The scrupulous delivery of the modest salary due to him by the *dūwān*, as to all the janissaries, aimed at stressing this fact (Peyssonnel 1987: 76). There was, in addition, a daily ritual through which the Tunisian pasha-bey publicly acknowledged that he 'ate the sultan's bread', and therefore owed everything to the Ottoman lord's beneficence. The German prince Pückler-Muskau, who visited the Regency towards 1835, thus reports that Muṣṭafa Bey, before going into his court of justice, was handed by the *bāsh khabbāz* (chief baker of the *jund*) four small pieces of bread: 'representing his daily ration, as a soldier

of the powerful sultan . . . The bey kissed the bread, ate a morsel of it, and pronounced with reverence: “May God bestow this blessing on me every day of my life”’ (Pückler-Muskau 1989: 179).

Finally, it is important to stress that two main marks of sovereignty in Islamic jurisprudence remained the exclusive prerogatives of each reigning Ottoman sultan in the Regency: money coined at the mint (*sikka*) of Tunis bore the imprint of his name and the date of his accession to the throne, and the *khutba* (the Friday sermon) in all the mosques of the Regency was preached in his name and included formulas of praise and support for him (Raymond 1994: II, 101). There were also various other occasions for advertising the sultan’s supreme authority over the province and singing his praise. A French visitor to the Regency in the mid-nineteenth century, mentions in particular a daily noon ritual which consisted in heralding ‘the high vertus of the sultan . . . in front of an empty armchair, representing his throne’, (Pellissier 1980: 11), probably taking place in the Bārdū palace. Finally, *zīnas* (city illuminations) and other forms of public rejoicings celebrated each new birth to the sultan and (a rare occurrence in those times) each Ottoman military victory. In 1814, guns were shot from all the fortresses of the Regency on the announcement of the defeat of the Wahhabis (a religious contest movement in the Arab peninsula) and their expulsion from Mekka by the troops of Muḥammad-‘Alī Pasha of Egypt (1805–48), at the service of their sultan (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 60).

## THE ARMY

Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule was a period of intensive military reforms, within the context of the large-scale policy followed by the Ottoman Porte at that period in order to strengthen the military capacities of the Empire in the face of the growing threat of European expansionism. The bey's reforms included, as in the heart of the Empire, important military building works, with the assistance of European experts and engineers. A new gunpowder factory was built in Tunis with the help of French technicians, while naval and fortification works in the harbour of Ḥalq al-Wād were carried out under the supervision of French and Dutch engineers. Several new fortifications were constructed: a few Turkish inscriptions engraved on the gates of several forts in the capital have remained until today, to attest that these forts had been built 'by Ḥammūda Pasha on the orders of Sultan Selīm *Khān*' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 38; Saadaoui 2001: 232–7).

Ḥammūda Pasha's other reforms in the military field also extended to the administrative, financial and logistical organization of his army. These reforms will be mentioned in the context of the description of the different military corps of the Regency, to which this chapter is devoted. As an introduction to this study, however, it is necessary to note here that chronicles and travellers' accounts of the Tunisian Regency from the time of the creation of that *eyālet*, devote a preponderant place to the Hanefite *jund*, whereas all other military forces, although largely superseding them in number, are only mentioned very briefly. This marked bias, it is true, can be explained by the prestige enjoyed by the colourful janissary corps and the significant role it assumed in the political and administrative evolution of the Tunisian province, as in other provinces of the Empire. The imbalance in the documentation available on the different components of the Tunisian army has necessarily



been reflected in the present chapter, divided into two unequal parts devoted, respectively, to the *jund*, and to the *zuwāwa* and tribal cavalry. The conclusion will deal briefly with the structure of the Tunisian army as a whole and the failure of the Turkish rebellion that broke out in the final stage of Ḥammūda Pasha's rule, in 1811.

## The *jund*

### *Composition and sources of recruitment*

The janissaries of Ḥammūda's time, often designated, simply, as the *'asker*, differed from those of the deylical period, in that they were, in their overwhelming majority, Muslim-born. As a consequence of this gradual change in the composition of the *jund*, which will be analysed below, the old dichotomy that had prevailed in the seventeenth century between the Anatolians and the *'azabs*, i.e. the Muslim-born and the converts, had become obsolete. It was replaced by a new one based on the division of their corps into two blocs of equal numerical strength: the janissaries of Ottoman origin, and those of local origin. The former opposition in the respective allegiances of the *sekbans* and the *'azabs* subsisted, however, with the Anatolians placed under the direct authority of the dey, and the locals under that of the bey. It is worth noting that the same evolution was noted at the same period in the Ottoman army in Egypt, with the emergence of an opposition between the 'imperial' and the 'local' janissaries, which relegated to a secondary position the opposition between the *müstahfizāns* and the *'azabs* (Holt 1993). Similarly, in Damascus, a sharp conflict divided the 'true' janissaries and the *yerliyya* (locals) (Raymond 1989: II, 354).

The recruitment of young men from the Ottoman Empire, originating mainly from Anatolia, and, in a smaller proportion, from the Greek archipelago and the Balkan coast, acquired an accelerated and more systematic character during the period of our concern. Ḥammūda Pasha, like other Ottoman provincial governors, had *wakīls* (*chargés d'affaires*) representing him in towns of western and southern Anatolia (Izmīr, Aydin, Sinope), to levy troops in agreement with the authorities in these districts (Mantran 1959: 326). These levies served the interests and policies of the central Ottoman government. First, the employment of bands of armed and unemployed young Anatolians in the *junds* of the Maghrib provinces, in particular, had helped eliminate an import-

ant source of social trouble in the heart of the Empire. Second, as a more specific feature to the period of our concern, the increased recruitment of Greeks and *Arnāuts* (Albanians) into the Tunisian naval forces, led to an important reduction in the number of the European renegade captains who had held sway in the seventeenth century and in the beginning of the eighteenth (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 51; Chérif 1986: I, 171). The systematic concern to curtail the influence of the European renegades in the late eighteenth-century Regency, which has been already noted in our study of the *mamlūk* corps, reflected an increasingly defensive stance of the Ottoman Porte towards the Christian world.

The local section of the *jund* was, in its overwhelming majority, composed of *kulughlis* (Ott.: *kul oğlu*, i.e. the sons of the *kuls*, or janissaries). The emergence of the *kulughlis* within the Tunisian *jund* resulted from the implementation of an Ottoman policy adopted since the end of the sixteenth century in the heart of the Empire, which granted access into the janissary corps to the janissaries' sons (Hale 1994: 7–9). This policy was timidly introduced at first in the Regency but, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the registering of the janissaries' new-born sons on the rolls of the *jund* had already become a general and well-established practice (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 219). Only a proportion of the *kulughlis*, however, was in active service. The rest constituted a reserve force in emergencies, as illustrated by crash recruitment among the Hanefite community by 'Alī Pasha in the face of the impending Algerian invasion in 1756 (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 364).

The local janissaries also included a Malekite minority that had been admitted into the *jund* since the early stages of the Ottoman conquest. Sources provide only rare allusions to this group, constituted by the servants and *protégés* of the bey. These local recruits were, as in the Egyptian Ottoman army (Hathaway 1997: 55), designated as 'tābi' (meaning follower), or 'sarrāj' (from the Ottoman *sarica*, a denomination applying, in other parts of the Empire, to Anatolian mercenaries).<sup>1</sup> The group of the *sarrājs* included, in its upper layers, members of the Andalusian community<sup>2</sup> and urban and tribal notables and, in the inferior ones, orphans from the poorer categories of the population of the capital. The recruitment of this socially disadvantaged Malekite group into the *jund*, which may have started in Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī's time (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 45–6) was intensified in the period of Ḥammūda Pasha, leading to enrolments by guile, if not by force (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 54). It was probably the local equivalent of the

levies carried out among the Anatolian population to man a new corps rival to the janissaries' in Istanbul, the *nizam-i cedit* corps, during the reign of Sultan Selīm III (Aksan 1998). The Tunisian bey, however, was concerned to avoid antagonizing his janissaries: according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, the new Malekite recruits into the *jund* were given a fictitious Turkish ancestry.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, concerning the janissaries' numerical strength in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, all historians have agreed that the *jund*, as a result of this bey's intensive recruitment policy, was considerably larger than in the preceding period (al-Imām 1980: 190; Raymond 1994: II, 15). Statistical information on this subject by sources of the period, however, is very scanty. The assertion, made by a European observer and taken up by contemporary historians, that the number of the Tunisian janissaries rose from 3,000 in the beginning of Ḥammūda's rule to 9,000 in 1807–11, is not confirmed by any other source, and should therefore be considered with some wariness.<sup>4</sup>

#### *The structure of the jund: dārs and jamā'as*

Sources concerning the Tunisian *jund* include a number of descriptions of this corps by chroniclers and foreign travellers. They also include a set of archival documents, among which, in particular, we need to mention a notebook (35 leaves, pages not numbered, 37 cm by 17 cm), presumably produced towards the middle of this century, on the initiative of the 'Direction des archives'. The Notebook, as I shall refer to it in this study, appears to be a copy (probably translated from Turkish into Arabic) of the pay-rolls of the *jund* or, at least surviving fragments of them, under the Tunisian beys, from Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf until Aḥmad Bey (1737–53) (see Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 169, Dossier 895 bis).<sup>5</sup> Comparing these varied, though somewhat patchy, sources, to the findings and results of the considerable research available on the imperial janissary corps has yielded interesting results (see Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 314–28; Unzuṅarşılı 1960, 1965; Bosworth *et al.* 1995). It has revealed, as will be shown below, that the structure of the Tunisian *jund* was, to a remarkable extent, a reproduction of its Istanbul model. Differences between the two corps can be attributed mostly to the compression dictated by the smaller size of the Tunisian *jund*.

There were two kinds of administrative divisions within the Tunisian *jund*. According to the first, the janissaries were classified,

mostly for bookkeeping and accountancy purposes, within units each grouping 20 to 25 janissaries in active service, in addition to an even more important number (30 or more) of pensioners. This unit corresponded to the *orta* (i.e. room), of the Imperial janissary corps. It is sometimes referred to in Tunisian administrative documents, as '*bulūk*' (Ott.: *bölük*, i.e. section), or '*ūda*' (Ott.: '*oda*', also meaning 'room') and, more frequently, particularly in Tunisian literary sources, as '*dār*'. The latter term, meaning 'house' in Arabic, might thus be considered as an approximate local translation of the term '*orta*'. It is of greater relevance, however, to note that the term '*dār*' also belonged to the Turkish language, being derived from the verb '*daralmak*', meaning 'to shrink, reduce', and therefore designated, in the context of the Tunisian *jund*, a unit that constituted a given proportion of the total number of the janissaries. More precisely, bearing in mind the reverence in which the number 40 was held by the Ottomans, we should note that the *dār*, numbering 25 janissaries, represented the fortieth part of a classical Ottoman *ocak* (numbering 1,000). Ḥammūda Pasha and a number of his *mamlūks* were registered in the forty-first *dār* (see Notebook) which means that they were inscribed in the first *dār* of the second main regiment of the *jund*. Each *dār* of the *jund* was designated by a number (as were the *ortas* of the Imperial Janissary corps) or, sometimes, by the name of its commander, and invariably included a *bulūk bāshī* at its head, with his lieutenant or intendant, the *wakīl* (see Notebook).

The second, more important, type of organization of the Tunisian *jund* was based on a functional classification of the janissaries. Above the mass of the *yuldāshes* (Ott.: *yoldaş*, i.e. the rank-and-file infantryman), the *jund* was divided into units of various sizes, each of them gathering a group of officers of the same specialization, ranked according to their internal hierarchy. These units, commonly designated, in Ottoman terminology, by the word *ocak* (which also applied to the whole of the janissary forces, or to large regiments of them), were more frequently called, in Arab provinces, *jamā'as* (meaning, in Arabic, bands, groups) or *ṭā'īfas*.<sup>6</sup> The two largest *jamā'as* in the Tunisian *jund* were those of the *wakīls* and the *bulūk bāshīs*, who, as indicated above, were included in every *dār* listed in the pay-rolls of the janissaries. The officers of the other *jamā'as*, which were of varying sizes, some of them being of not more than half a dozen members, were scattered, with little apparent systematic recurrence, among the various *dārs* (see the Notebook).<sup>7</sup>

The *jamā'as* may be divided into several categories. Leaving aside the privileged *jamā'as* attached to the beylical household, which have already been reviewed in a preceding chapter of this study, i.e. those of the *mamlūks*, Turkish *hānbas*, Turkish *şubāyhis*, *shūlaqs*, *abyāk*, *shātirs*, etc., we may identify, starting from the periphery, first, the *jamā'as* of the *imāms*, of the dervishes (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 219), the *mahtāriyya* (Ott.: 'mehter', i.e. musician), and the *amīns* (heads of various craftsmen's guilds, such as the butchers', the blacksmiths', the tinkers', masons', tailors', etc.). Second, there were *jamā'as* with precise military specializations, such as those of the *re'ises* (the corsair captains, who had lost much of their power during the eighteenth century), the *tubjiyya* (Ott.: *topcu*, i.e. artilleryman), the *bumbājiyya* (bombardiers), in addition to special assault units included in all Ottoman janissary corps, called the *serden geçtis*.<sup>8</sup> The most important military *jamā'as*, however, were those responsible for catering to the sustenance of the janissaries, or entrusted with provost or accountancy functions within the *jund*. Their officers, who bore the same titles as those used in the imperial janissary corps – though slightly modified by local usage, or pronunciation – were, in approximately increasing order of prestige:

- The *saqqā'īs*, or water-carriers (Ott.: *saqqa*) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 202).
- The *wakīls* (intendants), more rarely designated also as the *yamāqs*, or auxiliary cooks (Ott.: *vekil el-ḥarc* and *yamaks*). In the Tunisian *jund*, it appears that the two functions to which these denominations referred were held by one officer,<sup>9</sup> whereas they were held by two different types of officers within the imperial janissary corps.
- The *īshshīs*, i.e. the cooks (Ott.: 'aşçı): These officers, at the bey's death, carried his coffin on their shoulders (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 412; Pückler-Muskau 1989: 159).<sup>10</sup>
- The *shāwishes*, who, like their Ottoman counterparts (the *çavuşes*) carried out provost functions. They were entrusted, in particular, with announcing publicly the day of departure of the *maḥallas* and, at the end of such expeditions, gave the signal of return to Tunis. They also announced the date of payment of wages and marshalled janissaries into the paymaster's presence to collect their dues (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 59, 174, 219, 430).

- The *'alemdārs*, *bayraqdārs* and *sanjaqdārs*. Owing to the close similarity of their appellations ('*alem*', '*bayraq*', and '*sanjaq*' all mean 'a flag', and probably referred, in this context, to military units of different sizes) we may presume that these officers either represented three hierarchical categories within a single *jamā'a*, or constituted three *jamā'as* graduated by increasing order of prestige and entrusted with similar functions. These functions related to the administration and accountancy of the *jund*. The powerful *sanjaqdārs*, or *sanjaqdārs khūjas*, in particular, are described, in sources' accounts of the ceremonies organized periodically for the departure of the *maḥallas*, as surrounding the *āgha*, with the janissaries' flags unfurled above their heads (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 303). We note, moreover, that they are mentioned in the Notebook, together with, or as synonymous with, the *muqāṭā'ājīs*, a denomination applying, in Egypt and Damascus, to the officers responsible for the accountancy of the main army sections. More will be said about the highest-ranking among the *sanjaqdārs*, i.e. the *khūjas* and the *kāhiyas*, in the following section of this study.
- The *ūda bāshīs* corresponding to the *oda başıs* standing at the top of the *orta* hierarchy in the imperial janissary corps, and the *āya bāshīs*, corresponding to the distinguished '*yaya başıs*', of superior ranking to the *oda başıs*).<sup>11</sup> I would suggest that, in the Regency, these officers, who seem to have held a special standing among the janissaries, belonged exclusively to the Anatolian section of the *jund*.
- And, finally, the *bulūk bāshīs* (Ott.: *bölük başı*, also called *çorbacı* in most sections of the imperial janissary corps), whose *jamā'a* gathered all those officers who had reached the last rung on the promotional ladder of the *jamā'as* listed above. The rank of *bulūk bāshī* generally entitled its holder to receiving some appanage, as we shall see in more detail in another section of this chapter. A janissary going through the normal cycle of promotion reached the rank of *bulūk bāshī* at the age of 45, thus attaining, simultaneously, the status of veteran officer. Hence, the *bulūk bāshī* was also designated as *ikhtiyār*.<sup>12</sup> This word of Arabic origin (meaning 'choice, selected'), which came to refer, in Turkish to 'an old person', similarly applied, in the Mashriq provinces, to the influential group of veteran officers who played an important role in the army, and in the political

life of these *eyālets* in general (Holt 1966: 86). The *bulūk bāshīs* were appointed to the posts of high command in the *jund*, which I shall now proceed to describe.

*The khūjas/kāhiyas, the āghas and the dey*

The high ranks of the *sanjaqdārs* were the recruitment base of the *khūjas* (Ott.: *hoca*, meaning ‘teacher’, and applying to a wide range of officers in charge of secretarial duties) and of the *kāhiyas* (Ott.: *kāhiya*, from the Persian *ket-hudā*, meaning ‘intendant, major-domo’). This title applied, in the Ottoman Empire, to janissary high officers, as well as to the important official acting as representative and deputy of the grand vizier (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 60n., 120). The *khūjas* and the *kāhiyas* (who were also called *khūjas*), performed administrative functions at the highest level of the janissary hierarchy. There was always a *khūja* and a *kāhiya* in each of the military garrisons scattered around the Regency, whether in the hinterland (al-Kāf, Qayrawān, Ṭūzur), or in the coastal citadels of Ḥalq al-Wād, Qilibia, Sūsa, Binzart, Ghār al-Milḥ and Ṭabarqa, as well as two high officers from these two groups at the head of the *dīwān*. Their presence as an inseparable couple resulted from the dichotomous structure of the *jund*, divided between Anatolians and *kulughlis*. The *khūjas* were Anatolian officers, holding non-heritable posts, and included among their number the *bāsh khūja* of the *dīwān*, a possible candidate to the post of dey.<sup>13</sup> The *kāhiyas*, on the other hand, seem to have been either *mamlūks* of the bey,<sup>14</sup> or descendants of *mamlūks*, since their posts were inheritable,<sup>15</sup> as was the case for the posts of the *muqātaʿājīs* in Egypt and Damascus (Gibb and Bowen 1950: II, 46n.; Shaw 1962: 338). The *kāhiyas* were thus directly attached to the bey, who represented the highest administrative and fiscal authority in the Tunisian government and army, and who was himself the descendant of a *mamlūk*. They assumed, therefore, both the role devolved to the *kāhiyas* (i.e. intendants) of the Ottoman janissaries, and that devolved to the *kāhiya* (i.e. lieutenant, representative) of the grand vizier.

With the exception of the *dār-al-bashā*, where the *bāsh khūja* enjoyed an important protocolary prestige, the *kāhiyas*’ power and prerogatives were much more considerable than those of the *khūjas*. The main *kāhiyas* of the *jund* were:

- The influential *kāhiya* of Ḥalq al-Wād, the main port of the Regency, close to the capital, which was considerably developed

and extended in Ḥammūda's time. This *kābiya* was, at the same time, the *amīn al-tarsikhāna* (i.e. commissioner in charge of the arsenal) – a post also created during the period of our concern, and which was the exact counterpart of that of the Ottoman *tersāne emini* in Istanbul (Raymond 1994: II, 10). In Bayram's list, where the *amīn al-tarsikhānā* is ranked sixth, the latter's functions are described as those of 'supervision of all affairs related to the Navy' (Bayram no date: I, part two, 2). This official, moreover, was in frequent communication with foreign consuls, and thus shared with the *bāsh qāzāq* of the beylical household prerogatives in the realm of relations with Christian powers. The *amīn al-tarsikhānā*, in Ḥammūda Pasha's time, was Muḥammad Khūja, who was later succeeded to this post by his second son, Maḥmūd (Raymond 1994: II, 153–4).

- The *kābiya* of *dār al-bāshā* in Tunis, ranking thirteenth in Bayram's list of Tunisian government officials, and who represented a counterweight to the influence of the Anatolian *bāsh khūja* in the *dūwān* of the janissaries. The holder of this office in Ḥammūda Pasha's time was Yūsuf Bābūsh, from an influential *kulughli* family in the capital, who was later succeeded by his son Muḥammad (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 150). Besides his accountancy functions in the *dūwān*, this *kābiya* wielded some measure of judicial power in a precisely defined administrative territory extending from the capital to the Majirda valley (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 82).
- The *kābiyas* of the coastal garrisons, who held, as an appanage to their military rank, the post of *āmil*, or *qā'id* (governor) of the towns or cities where their garrisons were based (including the right to collect taxes from the local inhabitants). First among these came the *kābiya* of Ghār al-Milḥ. This *kābiya*, in Ḥammūda Pasha's time, was Aḥmad Khūja, eldest son of Muḥammad Khūja, the *amīn al-tarsikhāna*. Ghār al-Milḥ had been, since the seventeenth century, the most important base of the Tunisian navy, but its decline had started by the period of our concern, owing to the ensiltment of its basin and the increasing importance acquired by the port of Ḥalq al-Wād. Aḥmad Khūja was succeeded in his functions by his son Muḥammad at his death in 1828, or possibly before (Raymond 1994: II, 154–5). Another important *kābiya* was the *kābiya* of Binzart, Muṣṭafa Khūja, a *mamlūk*.



The *āghas* (Ott.: *āga*, meaning: eldest brother) stood at a higher rank in the military hierarchy of the *jund* than the *kbūjas/kābiyas*, but theirs was a mostly protocolary dignity. The two most important Tunisian *āghas* were the *āgha* of the Qasbah citadel in Tunis, who was one of the most frequently elected among candidates to the post of dey in the eighteenth century (Raymond 1960: 134–5), and the *āgha al-kursī*, heading the *dīwān* for six months before being automatically replaced by the eldest *bulūk bāshī* of the *jund*. The first was an Anatolian, whereas the second might be either an Anatolian or a *kulughli*. These two officials rank in the eleventh position in Bayram's list, with 'some precedence given to the *āgha* of the Qasbah' (Bayram no date: I, part two, 3). They were empowered to take decisions in penal and administrative matters concerning the janissaries, after consultations with other officers of the *dīwān*. The *āgha al-kursī*, in addition, settled matters concerning litigations arising from the non-payment of debts in the capital (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 82). There was also an *āgha* appointed at the head of each of the military garrisons of the Regency. These *āghas*, however, were generally appointed as a matter of pure convention to these posts, and were not required to leave the capital (Raymond 1994: II, 85).

Finally, the dey, an Anatolian elected among the group of deys of the *jund*, represented theoretically the supreme authority over that corps. The deylical office, ranking ninth in Muḥammad Bayram's list, kept some honorific prestige. The dey presided over the sessions of the political *dīwān* of Tunis, which had ceased playing any effective political role since the second half of the seventeenth century, and exercised a limited judicial jurisdiction in the capital (Raymond 1994: II, 32–3).

#### *Administrative organization, rights and privileges of the janissaries*

Since the time of 'Alī Pasha (1735–56), efforts to remedy the disorganization and corruption prevailing within the *jund* were initiated, although their results were mostly wrecked during the troubled period that ended his rule. A new series of energetic measures aimed, in particular, at reducing the outrageous swelling in the number of the janissaries, as a result of indiscriminate admissions and other abuses, were implemented by Muḥammad and 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn Beys (1756–77) (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 218–19, 408–10). These reforms, which continued at an accelerated pace in the time

of Ḥammūda Pasha, were carried out through the administrative services of the *dīwān*, whose headquarters were situated in the *dār al-bāshā*, in the centre of the capital. The staff of the *dīwān* was composed of the *āgha al-kursī*, the Anatolian *bāsh khūja* and the *kāhiya*, assisted by teams of *khūjas* and *shāwishes*. The greater administrative efficiency attained by these officers in Ḥammūda Pasha's time is reflected in the two pages of the Notebook concerning that period, displaying a neat and rigorously mathematical division of janissaries into *dārs*.

The janissaries were normally paid every two months (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 409). The *dār al-bāshā* had its own Treasury, fed, in full or in part, by fiscal revenues specifically allocated to the *jund*, in particular the taxes collected in the district of Mātir, in the wheat plains north of the capital (Chérif 1986: II, 103). The few data provided by literary sources show that the wages of the *jund* were kept almost static during the Ottoman period. The starting pay of four *nāşiris* (aspers) for the newly enrolled, for instance, remained unchanged throughout the existence of the janissary corps (Pignon 1956: 311; Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: IV, 34; Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 409). In the time of 'Alī Bey, the pension of the rank-and-file janissaries and of the *āgha māzuls* (retired *āghas*) was slightly increased. At the same period, the daily pay of the *āghas* rose to 29 *nāşiris* (it was 20 *nāşiris* under Yūsuf Dey) (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1970: 296–7). No pay increase is reported in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha.

The pay of each janissary was regularly upgraded every three years (Raymond 1994: II, 15), probably coinciding with his accession to a new grade in the military hierarchy. Furthermore, since the beginning of the Ottoman conquest, the janissaries were entitled to financial bonuses on various occasions, such as the enthronement of a new sultan in Istanbul, or the arrival of a new pasha in the province (Pignon 1956: 311) and, from the eighteenth century on, to celebrate the Ottoman investiture granted to each new pasha-bey. Gifts in cash and kind were also granted by the *dīwān*, the bey and notables to janissaries on religious feasts, particularly money during Ramaḍān (the fasting month), and sheep for the closing day of the pilgrimage season (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 57; Bachrouch 1989: 501, 514).

Janissaries were also entitled to a maximum period of leave of three years, to visit their relatives at home, or for a pilgrimage to Mekka, during which period they were entitled to half of their salary (Pignon 1956: 312); the fact that several deys in the Regency

held the title of *Hāj* (pilgrim), provides evidence of the prestige that could be gained by combining military valour and religious piety. Finally, some security was granted specifically to the corsair fighters against the risks of their profession. Those of them who had been captured by the enemy might be freed against the payment of a ransom by the bey, or against Christian slaves detained in Tunis.<sup>16</sup> They would also receive, on their liberation, the total amount of the salary due to them during their absence. This practice, which had existed since the seventeenth century (Pignon 1956: 312), was also observed in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, as in the case of the bey's interpreter, Ḥassūna al-Mūrālī, whose ship was captured by an English pirate, and who had to spend several years in Britain before returning to the Regency (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 79).

The *dīwān*'s deliberating sessions on administrative and criminal matters were open to all the janissaries, but only the high officers of the corps were entitled to take part in them. Promotion was granted to janissaries on the basis of seniority, although assiduity of service was also probably taken into consideration. Among the Turkish recruits, furthermore, some might have been originally recruited into the *jund* of another Regency before moving to the Tunisian *jund* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 37, 163, 167), and were presumably awarded the rank they had reached in their former post. In judicial litigations involving solely janissaries, the latter were judged and sentenced by their *dīwān* officers. Flogging was a common type of chastisement, whereas serious offences and rebellion were punished by banishment or death.<sup>17</sup> In conflicts between janissaries and Malekites, which involved the jurisdiction of the bey, the need for Ḥammūda to curry favour with the *jund*, especially in the first period of his rule, often meant that the unruly behaviour of the janissaries and their brutalities towards members of the local population remained unpunished, to the latter's grief (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 56–7). We may wonder, however, whether sources have not too complacently dwelt on the rowdiness of janissaries, and whether this type of behaviour – common to all pre-modern armies – did not also characterize the other corps.

In Ḥammūda Pasha's time, five *qishlas* (i.e. European-style barracks) were built, to replace the former cramped *funduqs* (inns) used for the accommodation of janissaries (Saadaoui 2001: 243–6). Married soldiers, on the other hand, kept their right of settling independently in town with their families. Ḥammūda Pasha, in

imitation of the Algerians, also decreed that janissaries living in *qishlas* should each be given four loaves of bread daily (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 39). They were, however, expected to cater for themselves except in periods of duty in remote garrisons. On state galleys, only fresh water and hard biscuit (*bishmāt*) were provided free, and the janissaries would each give a sequin to their *wakīl*, who provided the rest of their board (Pignon 1956: 315). A similar arrangement presumably prevailed on *maḥalla* expeditions.

Janissaries may also have been required to buy their own dress and weapons (Pignon 1956: 317). Seventeenth-century sources have described, in some detail, the spectacular costumes worn by janissary officers, which probably corresponded exactly to those of their counterparts in Istanbul (including ostrich feathers, huge turbans and very large sleeves) (Pignon 1956: 317–18; Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 302–3). In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, the cloth for the janissaries' battling uniforms was imported from Europe (al-Imām 1980: 189). Foreign observers in the Regency at that period were also struck by the considerable gear sported by each janissary, including firearms imported from England and France (al-Imām 1980: 214; Frank and Marcel 1987: 73). A real improvement in the quality of the *jund*'s armament therefore seems to have been accomplished, in comparison to the rifles and muskets used in the seventeenth-century Regency, which were described by European sources as heavy and obsolete (Pignon 1956: 319–20).

The janissaries' pay, with added bonuses, constituting a regular and incremental source of income, however modest, represented a social and economic asset for the Hanefite community in the Regency. Various additional sources of revenue were also available to the common janissaries. It is important to note, before reviewing them, that they did not include the extortion, under a veneer of legality, of various taxes and dues from traders and craftsmen, practised by janissaries in cities such as Cairo and Damascus, and which made them the scourge of the local population there (Holt 1993). This could be explained by the fact that, in Tunis, the Hanefites (who were members of the *jund*) and the Andalusians (another privileged minority in the Regency), formed the largest proportion of the more affluent categories of craftsmen and shopkeepers. The unruliness of the Tunisian janissaries might lead them to acts of theft and robbery, but they would do so without the justification provided by any pseudo-legal sophistry.

A share in the spoils of the corso was provided to those serving on the state galleys, as well as to those who, during their periods

of leave, were offered the possibility to fight on board vessels owned by private corsairs (Pignon 1956: 316). Janissaries, moreover, were also allowed to engage in tradecrafts, besides their military duties (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 39). Thus, at the end of his career, a janissary, if he was endowed with some ingenuity and practical sense, would have been able to amass enough capital to acquire some property, open a shop (the *sūq al-truk*, or Turks' market, in Tunis, was famous for its silk and fabric shops), or invest in the acquisition and equipment of a corsair ship (Pignon 1956: 316–17).

Within the military hierarchy itself, as noted above, access to additional sources of revenue to compensate for the scantiness of army wages, was provided to officers of various rankings. The more lucrative of these appanages or rewards, i.e. the governorships of some coastal districts and tribal governorships were reserved for those officers having some link with the beylical household: the *kābiyas*, who were *mamlūks* or *kulughlis*, the *ḥānbas*, as well as the *ūḍa bāshīs* and *shāwishes* who had served for some time in the bey's tribunal (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 83). The more modest *amānas*, i.e. offices related to the collection of taxes and the administrative regulation of trades and guilds, and the *wikālas*, i.e. the stewardships of mosques, *waqfs* (charitable endowments) and buildings belonging to the state, fell to the share of the Anatolians. A discreetly ironical remark by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf on the granting of these appanages to the *bulūk-bāshīs* in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha – at the expense, he seems to imply, of the Malekites<sup>18</sup> – suggests that these officers were more generously treated, in that regard, under this bey than under his predecessors. We may conclude from this that Ḥammūda Pasha was intent on attracting the loyalties of the Anatolian janissaries, and particularly among them the middle-ranking officers, whose crucial military role had already been acknowledged in European armies.

## The *zuwāwa* and the tribal cavalry

### *The zuwāwa*

The *zuwāwa* forces, described by European travellers to the Regency, as a 'Moorish corps' (Monchicourt 1929: 24–5; Pignon 1961: 144; Peyssonnel 1987: 75), were considered and treated by the Regency's rulers and by society at large as a cheaper replica of the *jund*. They may be considered as the equivalent of the Lāz

tribesmen, from the eastern confines of the Empire, who constituted a lower grade, but sturdy janissary corps. The *zuwāwa* had been recruited among the Berber tribes of that name living in the Kabylia mountains by the first Algerian beylerbeys (Raymond 1994: II, 17). They were among the expedition led by 'Ilij 'Alī Pasha to Tunis in 1570. This official, having conquered the city, left his *mamlūk* Ramaḍān to govern it with two contingents of 800 Turks and 800 *zuwāwa*. When the Spaniards reoccupied Tunis in 1573, the defeated Ottoman troops found shelter in Qayrawān, ruled by Haydar Pasha, and were very probably back in the capital, one year later, under the command of this pasha, who had rallied with other governors from nearby provinces to support Sinān Pasha's army (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 177–8).

The *zuwāwa* were encouraged to come and settle in great numbers in the Tunisian *eyālet*. Supreme authority over their corps, which may have been shared between the bey and the dey in the first half of the seventeenth century,<sup>19</sup> seems to have been monopolized by the bey, presumably after that official had gained political supremacy in the province. From the eighteenth century on, if not earlier, *zuwāwa* soldiers were recruited from among various Berber communities other than those of the Kabylia mountains. Among these were the Gharāba, a tribe of Algerian origin, who were allowed to settle in the region of Binzart in the time of 'Alī Bey (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 454–5; Raymond 1994: II, 18). There were also the Wislātīs, who had been scattered across the Regency, following the defeat of their insurrection against the same bey (Raymond 1994: II, 18).

The *zuwāwa* were divided between infantrymen and cavalymen; they were scattered across the Regency, although their majority was concentrated in the capital. All the *zuwāwa* were registered in rolls, but only a part of them received regular pay, whereas the rest enjoyed a few exemptions and were recruited for exceptional campaigns. Their *ḍwān*, near Bāb Manāra, and their *funduqs*, were situated outside the perimeter of the Madīna, considered as the domain of the janissaries. They held in particular reverence the *marabout* (holy man) Sīdī al-Bashīr, a native of the Zuwāwa region, who died in 1827, and whose main *zāwiya* (mausoleum) was erected at a little distance from their *ḍwān* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 122).

Although data on the subject of the *zuwāwa*'s pay are lacking, these fighters were most probably at a clear disadvantage compared to the janissaries in terms of financial reward: according to an eighteenth-century source, for instance, when Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī

decided to grant a bonus to his men on the eve of a battle, he gave one *sultāni* (piaster) to each janissary, and half a *sultāni* to each *zuwāwa* (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 59). The *zuwāwa*'s pay was also irregularly remitted, leading to the coining of a Tunisian proverb, used to illustrate an underdog's condition: 'like the *zuwāwa* *ʿasker*: foremost for blows, rearmost for pay' (Raymond 1994: II, 18). They laboured, moreover, under a notorious reputation for uncouthness and lack of discipline.<sup>20</sup>

The *zuwāwa*'s hierarchy was modelled on that of the janissary corps, including the ranks of *āgha*, *kāhiya*, *shāwish*, and *bulūk bāshī*. The *kāhiya* of the *zuwāwa*, although he is not included in Bayram's list, was an important official in the beylical government. Sources mention three of these *kāhiyas*, all Malekites: Aḥmad ibn Matīsha, under Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (Chérif 1986: II40), Muḥammad al-Aṣram, under ʿAlī Bey and Ḥammūda Pasha, until his death in 1806 (Raymond 1994: II, 129), and Ḥammūda al-Aṣram, his son (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VIII, 21). It appears that the office of governor-tax collector among various tribes in the Jabal al-Raqba, in the north-western region of the Regency, was an appanage to the post of *kāhiya* of the *zuwāwa* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 49; Chérif 1986: II, 40).

### *The Arab ṣubāyḥis and the mazārgis*

The Arab *ṣubāyḥis*, as already indicated in the preceding chapter of this study, drew their denomination from the Ottoman *sipāhi*, meaning 'cavalryman'. In Ḥammūda Pasha's time, these cavalrymen were, in addition to the regiment of Tunis, which has already been reviewed, divided into three provincial regiments, each numbering, like the first, 500 men (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 85). It is interesting to note that these regiments, in Tunisian sources, are designated by the Ottoman word '*ocak*' in its Arabized form (*wajaq*), whereas this term is not used in reference to the janissary corps in the Regency (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 85). The Arab *ṣubāyḥis* were recruited from among the common tribesmen of the Regency, generally by an agreement between the beylical administration and the *shaykhs* (leaders) of the various tribes, although individual candidatures could also be accepted. They participated regularly in *maḥallas* and acted as the police force of the province. One unit of the Tunis regiment guarded the outer gates of the Bārdū palace (Raymond 1994: II, 85).

The hierarchy of the corps of the Arab *ṣubāyḥis* seems to have been similar to that of the *jund*, including the ranks of *shāwīsh*, *ʿalemdār*, and with a *kbūja*, a *kāhiya* and an *āgha* for each of the four regiments. The *āgha* of the Tunis regiment was, at the same time, *bāsh āgha* of the whole corps. The latter office, probably created in Ḥammūda Pasha's time, and ranked fourth in Bayram's list, was successively held, during that period, by two Hanefites, Ḥasūna Māriya and Ḥasan Khaznadār – which provides evidence of a structural link established between the Arab *ṣubāyḥis* and the *jund* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 43, 100). These officials, however, do not seem to have wielded much influence in the political life the Regency, since they are not mentioned in any account on the period of rule of Ḥammūda Pasha. The *kāhiyas* of the Arab *ṣubāyḥis*, on the other hand, were invariably Malekites. Rajab Abū Nimra, an Arab who had grown up in the service of the beylical household, and Muḥammad al-Khammāsī, originating from a Tripolitan tribe, held that post within the *wajaq* of Tunis, under Ḥammūda Pasha (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 55, 137). The influential *kāhiyas* of the provincial *wajaqs*, who were, at the same time, *qāʿids* of the districts where the latter were garrisoned, will be reviewed in the following chapter of this study on the central and provincial administration of the Regency.

The *ṣubāyḥi* was entitled to a regular, albeit modest, pay (*rātib*), of 33 piasters a year. In the seventeenth century, these annual salaries had been deducted locally from the taxes paid by the population in the provincial districts and paid on the spot to the cavalymen. From Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī's time, and as a result of this bey's centralizing reforms, these amounts were formally disbursed by the central treasury of the Regency (Chérif 1986: II, 96). The beylical government also gave each *ṣubāyḥi* a horse, for which, in the context of Ḥammūda Pasha's reforms, a daily quantity of fodder was provided (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 85). As was the case for the *sipāhis* of the *timar* cavalry in the centre of the Empire, the Tunisian *ṣubāyḥi* had to submit, before each *maḥalla*, to a review of his mount and arms. His name was wiped from the rolls and he had to hand back his horse if he was considered unfit for duty. Finally, the *ṣubāyḥi*, at his death, was normally succeeded by his son.<sup>21</sup>

The *ṣubāyḥis* represented the lower category of the Tunisian regular tribal cavalymen as compared to the *mazārgis*. The latter (who drew their denomination from the Arabic word '*mizraq*', designating the lance carried by these fighters) were recruited



among the group of the *rijāl al-kibār* (the elders), also known as the *jamā'a*, which formed the upper social strata in tribes. The *mazārgis* were settled among their own tribes and performed administrative and judicial functions, assisting in particular the *ʿāmil*, or *qā'id* in his tax-collecting rounds (Raymond 1994: II, 19). They also participated in the beylical *maḥallas* and, like most of the Ottoman *sipāhis*, who were required to bring with them tents and aides (*ghulāms*) during the sultan's campaigns (Deny 1987), brought their own tents and mounts, in addition to an infantry auxiliary for each, called *tarrās* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 85). On the administrative level, their organization was similar to that of the Arab *ṣubāyḥis*: their names were registered in rolls kept by the *bāsh kātib* (the head of the beylical chancery), and they were entitled to a modest pay (Raymond 1994: II, 19).

In spite of similarities in the administrative organization of the two categories of Tunisian tribal cavalymen described above, on the one hand, and that of the Ottoman *sipāhis*, on the other hand, there was a significant difference as concerns their respective sources of revenue. The *timar* system entailed, for the latter, the right to collect taxes from the rural population of the Empire for their own benefit. As for the *ṣubāyḥis* and the *mazārgis*, they were salaried agents of the state serving in the beylical tax-collecting tours. It is interesting here to mention that the historian Mohamed-Hédi Chérif has noted that the term '*thamra*' (plural: '*thimār*'), mentioned in several Arabic administrative documents of the eighteenth-century Regency, refers to a small bonus added to the pay of the *ṣubāyḥi* and the *mazārgi* (Chérif 1986: II, 96 and 111). It seems therefore to have represented the cash equivalent of small privileges traditionally enjoyed by the Ottoman *sipāhi* in the territory under his jurisdiction, such as the right to collect the fruit of wild trees – which may, itself, have been at the origin of the Ottoman term *timar*, since '*thimār*', in Arabic, means 'fruit'!

The *ṣubayḥis* and the *mazārgis*, on the other hand, seem to have shared with the *sipāhis* of the Ottoman Empire the privilege of receiving from the state a plot of land for their own cultivation. Information on these land grants in the Regency is almost totally lacking in sources, except for scattered allusions. The historian Mohamed-Hédi Chérif, in his study of the tribal forces under Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, has, however, noted the 'feudal' character of land tenure by the wealthy *mazārgis* (Chérif 1986: I, 233). Second, it is worth dwelling, in this context, on the use of the term *jibāliyya* by a few eighteenth-century Tunisian sources. This word, which has

so far been translated by historians by its Arabic meaning of 'mountaineers', or 'mountain people', (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 186; Chérif 1986: II, 149) should, rather, be considered as the Arabized form of the Ottoman term '*cebelis*'. The latter were men-at-arms that important *sipāhis*, such as provincial governors, had to bring with them during the military campaigns of the Ottoman Porte, and whom they provided with dress and armament. The *cebelis* were, themselves, an inferior category of *sipāhi*, since they were also granted a small piece of land for their living (Deny 1987). I would therefore suggest that the Tunisian *jibāliyya* belonged to the common *ṣubāyḥis* of the Regency, and included, in particular, the *zuwāwa* cavalrymen, owing to their close link to the bey.

### *The semi-askeri tribes*

A number of tribes in the Regency were given the opportunity of engaging in a fruitful cooperation with the Ottoman administration: in return for providing a number of their horsemen to serve as auxiliaries during *maḥallas* and wars. These tribes were granted various advantages, particularly land for pasture or crop-raising, although they were not exempted from tax-paying. It is important to note that the first two tribes selected for the service of the Ottoman administration, i.e. the Ṭarābulsis and the Drīds, gathered within their midst clans and families from outside the boundaries of the Regency (Tripolitans for the first, Algerians for the second) – thus providing interesting case studies of tribes as military and administrative creations of the Ottoman period of Tunisia. The Ṭarābulsis descended from the contingents sent by Muṣṭafa Pasha from Tripoli to reinforce Sinān Pasha's army in 1574 (Pellissier 1980: 19). The more powerful Drīds had been part of the Shābbiyya religious-military confederation established in the west of the country, which had successfully defied Hafsid authority in the sixteenth century. When Sinān Pasha's army started the siege of the fort of Ḥalq al-Wād, occupied by the Spanish army, the Drīds, led by their *shaykh* 'Abdu'l Ṣamad, came to their assistance (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 191). In the time of Ḥammūda Bey the Muradite, the influence of this *shaykh* declined and the tribe was organized in the service of the bey, under the command of Qā'id Ḥasan (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 236). In this context, we may add to these two semi-askeri tribes, a third one that had, like them, existed since the beginning of the Ottoman conquest and was scattered across the Regency, i.e. the 'tribe' of the *zuwāwa*, gathering Berber-

speaking communities from outside (and, later, from inside) the frontiers of the Regency. In the eighteenth century, a number of local tribes were promoted to a semi-*askeri* status, such as the Jlāṣ, who had supported Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī when he sheltered in Qayrawān for five years after his nephew's seizure of power, the Awlād ʿAun, etc. (Chérif 1986: II, 97).

The semi-*askeri* tribes may be compared to the *yürüks*, or nomads, who had been employed by the first Ottoman sultans in their wars, and who served in rotation (one man out of six) in campaigns (Gibb and Bowen 1950: II, 97). The French officer Pellissier, in the mid-nineteenth century, informs us that, among the Hamāmmas, the proportion of *fursān* (cavalrymen) to the total male adult population was one to five (Pellissier 1980: 128). I would tentatively suggest, furthermore, that the lands conceded to these fighters may have belonged to the category of Ottoman *beneubet timars*, that is to say, lands tilled and exploited in rotation between tribesmen (whereas the *ṣubāyhis* and the *mazārgis* would have been granted lands belonging to the *eṣkunci* category, that is to say, nominal fiefs) (Deny 1987).

### Conclusion: the army of Ḥammūda Pasha

In spite of Hammūda's efforts, the various military corps of the Regency composed an ensemble fraught with weaknesses. The Tunisian army, unwieldy and uncoordinated during wars, had a patchy composition, where relations characterized by long-standing hostility and mistrust prevailed between its heterogeneous elements, in spite of the links established in particular between the *jund* and the *ṣubāyhis*. This structural weakness, however, served the political interests of Ḥammūda Pasha, by isolating the only real menace to his rule, i.e. the Anatolian janissaries. The other army formations, each and separately, owed the bey some measure of allegiance: the *kulughlis*, as rivals of the Anatolians within the *jund*, the Arab *ṣubāyhis* who had been, from the start, exclusively attached to the beylical administration, and the *zuwāwa*, recruited from marginalized communities and devoted to the bey. Thus, the Anatolian janissaries, supporting the toothless deys, stood little chance to win, when they launched their rebellion in 1811.

The uprising, which ended in the killing of a great number of janissaries by the Arab *ṣubāyhis*, was an ironical comment on Ḥammūda's military reforms. These reforms, like those of Sultan

Selīm III, had aimed, in an important measure, at keeping and reinforcing the capacities of the janissary force. Furthermore, perhaps contrary to the central Ottoman government, which a long series of defeats in its confrontations with western armies had made more disillusioned with its janissaries, there was a deeply-anchored conviction among the ruling circles of the Regency, and in the mind of the bey himself, that the Turks formed the only true martial race (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 56–7). Ḥammūda's efforts to ingratiate himself to the janissaries and win their loyalty, however, had only exacerbated the latter's arrogance without treating the deep causes of their opposition to the bey, which have been studied in our analysis of the extension of central Ottoman household conflicts in the Regency.

The idea of a radical reform of the Ottoman armies, through the setting-up of a standing army integrally composed of levies from all the social categories of the country, on the European model, was not an alien idea to government circles in Istanbul at that period. It was probably envisaged as the ultimate outcome of Selīm's military reforms, but the times were not yet ripe for this. In the Regency, recruitments of Anatolian fighters continued after 1811, during the last years of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule and for more than a decade after, under his successors. The gradual dissolution of the Tunisian *jund* only started after 1830, following the 'Auspicious Event' of the elimination of the imperial janissary corps by Sultan Maḥmūd II in 1826.

## CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

### The central administration

The Tunisian central administration, whose offices were situated within the precincts of the Bārdū palace, was divided into two sections: the accountancy (*dīwān al-ḥisbān*) and the chancery (*dīwān al-inshāʾ*). At its head stood the bey, as the counterpart of the grand vizier in the government of the Porte. Next to him came the *ṣāhib al-ṭābiʿ* (guardian of the seal), a *mamlūk*, and the *bāsh kātib* (head secretary), a Malekite, ranking first and second on Bayram's list. Before proceeding to study the powers and prerogatives of these two officials, it is worth commenting on the occasional use, by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, of the term '*wazīr*', in reference to them, or to some of their predecessors (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 165 and III, 13 and 78), particularly in the light of the assertion, by his contemporary, Bayram al-Khāmis, that the Tunisian *wālīs* were not entitled to have *wazīrs* (Bayram no date: I, part two, 6). I have already mentioned in this study, furthermore, that, in the central Ottoman government, the title of *vezīr* applied only to those dignitaries holding three *tuğs* – a rank that even the bey himself had not attained. We should conclude therefore that the term '*wazīr*', whether applied to the bey or to his collaborators, by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, is to be taken in its original Arabic meaning of 'assistant, adviser' and did not correspond to any official administrative reality. It was only in the mid-nineteenth century that the vicissitudes of Ottoman power in the region emboldened Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's patron, Aḥmad Bey (1837–53), to confer that title on one or two officials in his government; the bey, however, was careful not to use it in his correspondence with the Porte (Bayram no date: I, part two, 6).

*The ṣāhib al-ṭābi'*

The *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'* was undoubtedly the most powerful man in Ḥammūda Pasha's government. This official stood as the exact counterpart of the Porte's *nīṣānci* (guardian of the seal), who ranked second in the central Ottoman government, after the grand vizier (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 120–4). We should note, however, that the accession to pre-eminence in the Tunisian government of the *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'* (who was invariably a *mamlūk*) occurred during the period of our concern, since this official is only briefly and infrequently alluded to in sources prior to Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule.

The office was held, under this bey, by Yūsuf Khūja, who had been bought in Istanbul by a wealthy notable from Ṣafāqus, Bakkār al-Jallūli, and was presented by the latter to Ḥammūda Pasha in 1781 (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 89). The promising youth, shortly afterwards, was appointed to the functions of *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'*, and this title was thenceforth used as his patronym (Raymond 1994: II, 12). Like the Ottoman *nīṣānci*, whose functions were not limited to tracing the Sultan's *tuğra* (cipher) on official documents, but extended over various services of the chancery as well as over the accountancy department in the government of the Porte, the affixing of the beylical seal on official documents represented only the smallest part of Yūsuf's duties – albeit a lucrative one, since it was farmed out as an *iltizām*.<sup>1</sup>

Yūsuf's functions, as cursorily described in Bayram's list, included the 'supervision of functionaries and officials in all matters not tackled directly by the bey', which meant in practice that he partook of a large share of the bey's prerogatives in the Regency. The most important missions carried out by Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi' were his embassy to the Porte in 1795, his heading the victorious *maḥalla* against Algiers in 1807 and his leadership of military operations to crush the Turkish rebellion in 1811. His political influence was combined with enormous wealth derived from trade, *iltizāms*, and corso activities: this official armed and launched 98 corso expeditions between 1798 and 1805 (Panzac 1993: 77). Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi' also entirely financed the building of a magnificent mosque in the district of Ḥalfāwīn in Tunis, where he resided in the last years of Ḥammūda's rule. The mosque's inauguration in 1814, in the presence of the bey and all the dignitaries of the Regency, constituted the ultimate consecration of his unrivalled status in the beylical government. At Ḥammūda's death, Yūsuf, upon the formal

solicitation of the *bāsh kātib* Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Aṣram, designated ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Alī as the new bey. The appointment was endorsed by all present (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 91). This unprecedented practice in the Regency was probably based on new prerogatives devolved on the *ṣāhib al-ṭābi‘* at that period.

Finally, we should observe that Yūsuf’s powers in Ḥammūda Pasha’s government had extended, in particular, over the financial domain, where the second authority after the bey was normally that of the *khaznadār*. It is worth dwelling here on the office of the *khaznadār*, which emerged within the Tunisian government in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, following the accession of the beys to political supremacy in the Regency in 1675 – which led the latter to delegate to this official an important part of their original financial functions. The *khaznadār* was deemed by European observers in the mid-eighteenth century to be the most important man in the beylical government (Pococke 1772: I, 314; Rousseau 1985: 122). Under Ḥammūda Pasha, however, the office was left vacant, and the bey himself assumed its functions, with the assistance of the *ṣāhib al-ṭābi‘*. Although, according to Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf, Ḥammūda’s ‘thrif’ had prompted him to adopt that measure (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 92–3), it seems improbable that he could have done so without the agreement of the Ottoman Porte.

### *The bāsh kātib*

The head of the beylical chancery was the *raʿīs al-kuttāb*, often designated by the half-Turkish half-Arabic denomination of *bāsh kātib*. The *bāsh kātib* was one of the most powerful representatives of the Tunisian *makhāzinis*, i.e. the members of the Malekite community employed in the large web of the central and provincial administration of the Regency. The designation of *makhāzinis* derived from the Arabic word ‘*makhzin*’, meaning ‘administration, government’, which had been of current use in the Maghrib in reference to Muslim governments, including the Hafsid one, and which seems to have been re-introduced in the Regency under the Husaynids, after an eclipse of more than a century following the Ottoman conquest. He was the counterpart of the Ottoman *reʿīsül-kuttāb*, who followed the *nīṣānci* in rank and came under the direct supervision of the grand vizier (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 120).

The most important *bāsh kātibs* in the time of ‘Alī Bey and Ḥammūda Pasha belonged to a Qayrawāni family said to be of Yemeni origin, therefore descending from the first Muslim conquerors of Ifriqiya, the al-Aṣrams. The emergence to power of this dynasty of public servants started in 1756, as a reward for the unconditional support given by the brothers Muḥammad and Aḥmad al-Aṣram to the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī, whom they accompanied to Algiers during their long years of exile there. When the Husaynids returned to power in the Regency, Aḥmad was put in charge of the beylical chancery, an office which he kept until well into the period of rule of ‘Alī Bey (while his elder brother Muḥammad was appointed *khūja* of the *zuwāwa*) (Raymond 1994: II, 128–30).

A member of the al-Aṣram family was, again, chosen as *bāsh kātib* by Ḥammūda Pasha, following a vacancy of the post towards the last decade of the eighteenth century. The bey’s choice fell on Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Aṣram, regardless of the generally acknowledged precedence of his more competent cousin Muḥammad, whose father, Aḥmad, had been the powerful *bāsh kātib* of ‘Alī Bey (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 150). Ḥammūda, in imitation of the policy of the Porte towards the Husaynids themselves, had probably aimed at asserting his right to choose any branch of the family for the post and, in addition, introducing rivalries and dissensions within the whole al-Aṣram clan, in order to weaken it.

The *bāsh kātib*’s responsibilities did not only concern the chancery, but extended also to the realm of accountancy. Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf describes him as being ‘at the head of an independent accountancy department’ (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 150).<sup>2</sup> The *bāsh kātib* supervised, in particular, the tax-collection in the al-Jarīd region, south of the Regency, during the winter *maḥalla*, and kept the pay-rolls of the Arab *ṣubāyḥis* and of the *mazārgis*. Finally, the *bāsh kātib* also benefited from various opportunities for acquiring lucrative *iltizāms*, as well as cashing in on his influence among Malekites (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 141). The jurisdiction of the Tunisian *bāsh kātib* in the beylical chancery, however, exclusively concerned its Arabic section and did not extend to the smaller Turkish one, where one or two Turkish secretaries constituted the few representatives of the Hanefites of the *jund* in the central administration. This section handled the correspondence with the Porte, as well as the drafting of treaties signed with Christian powers.



*The Malekite k̄atibs*

The Malekite *k̄atibs* (secretaries) of the beylical administration were generally recruited from among notable families enjoying religious, or semi-religious prestige among the Regency's population. There were often two members of the same family employed in the beylical administration, and their posts were passed on to other relatives. Tunisian sources have provided us with the names of a number of these *k̄atibs*: the Abū Ṣandals, from the capital, in the first half of the seventeenth century (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 238); the Ibn Khalafs (uncle and nephew), descending from Miḥriz ibn Khalaf, the most revered patron saint of Tunis, and Muḥammad Ṣaddām, from Qayrawān, in the time of ʿAlī ibn Murād Bey (1778–83) (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 278, 279); the al-Wislātis (Abu'l Ḥasan, Ibn Ḥasan and ʿAbd al-Laṭīf), who served, respectively, under Murād III, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī and ʿAlī Pasha; Qāsim ibn Ṣulṭāna, from Bāja, al-Ṣaghīr Dāwud, from Nābil, and Muḥammad al-Wazīr al-Andalusī under Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (II, 116); ʿAbdu'l-Raḥmān al-Baqlūṭī (probably from Baqālṭa, a small coastal village in the Sāhil region) under ʿAlī Pasha (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 337); and, in addition to the al-Aṣrams, the Abū ʿAttūrs, from a family of alleged Quaraishi origin settled in Ṣafāqus, under ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn Bey and his successors (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 153). The beys therefore recruited their *k̄atibs* from a wide array of towns and regions in the Regency. This policy was probably motivated by the desire to provide an equitable share, for Malekite notables, in the stock of political influence and in the various sources of revenue to which the staff of the beylical administration had privileged access. The importance of these considerations of domestic policy for the beys suggests that competence did not rank very high among the criteria for the selection of *k̄atibs*. Several scornful allusions in Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's biographies of some *k̄atibs* in Ḥammūda Pasha's time confirm this (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 140, 150).

**The provincial administration**

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, the beys' leadership of the *maḥallas*, which toured a considerable portion of the Regency's territory outside the capital, was a spectacular manifestation of their fiscal and judicial authority over their subjects in provincial districts. During the period of our concern, however, the presence of the bey in these periodic expeditions was no longer a

rule, but an exceptional occurrence. The famous 'maḥalla of the five beys' which included Ḥammūda Pasha with his younger half-brother, his two cousins and his mother, in 1783, was the last one placed under the bey's command (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963-6: III, 13). From then on, the leadership of the *maḥalla* was delegated to the *kāhiya* of the bey (lieutenant, representative), ranking fifth in Bayram's list. The office was held, for most of the period of Ḥammūda Pasha's rule, by Sulaymān, a Circassian *mamlūk*. Following the disastrous outcome of the first military *maḥalla* against Algiers in 1807, commanded by him, Sulaymān was transferred to the post of *kāhiya* of the *dār al-bāshā*, ranking thirteenth in Bayram's list (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963-6: VII, 56).

Next to the bey in the hierarchy of the Tunisian provincial administration came the governors, called the 'āmils (an Arabic term, widely adopted in Ottoman administrative usage) or, even more frequently in local and Maghrib usage, *qā'id*s (meaning, in Arabic, 'leader, commander'). The 'āmils may be divided into three categories: the tribal 'āmils, entrusted with the governorship of tribes, in association with the tribal *shaykhs*; the *kāhiyas*, governing important military districts; and the non-military 'āmils in the rest of the districts of the Regency. In contrast to the first category of 'āmil, whose jurisdiction extended over populations, generally of a nomadic, or semi-nomadic type, the *kāhiyas* and the non-military 'āmils governed well-defined territorial divisions, designated by the Arabic term 'amal', or 'amāla'.<sup>3</sup> Their areas varied greatly, from the vast districts of al-A'rāḍ and al-Waṭan al-Qibli, to the small 'amālas into which the Majirda plain in the north-west and the al-Jarīd region in the south-west, were broken up. The number of these 'amālas seems to have been much the same throughout the Ottoman period, so that we may presume, on the basis of nineteenth-century sources, that it was about 20 during the period of Ḥammūda Pasha (Kraïem 1973: I, 183). In the light of the striking similarity that has been observed between the military organization of the Regency and that of the heart of the Empire, a more detailed study of the Tunisian 'amālas to be reviewed in parallel with the 24 administrative divisions of the Rumelian province, in particular, might be an interesting area for future research.

### *Tribal 'āmils and shaykhs*

The numerical and military importance of tribes in Tunisian society led to the creation and the development of the corps of tribal 'āmils.

This category of *āmils* represents a local version of the Ottoman *çeri başıs* who, in the early period of the Empire, had been *sipāhi* officers rewarded by the grant of *ziāmets*, later evolving, in their greatest number, into *mīrī çeri başıs* paid by the treasury. Like these Ottoman officers, who led the *sipāhis* during the sultan's campaigns, the tribal *āmils* in the Regency commanded units of *mazārgīs* and other tribal cavalymen during the bey's *maḥallas*. Sources also state that they were assisted in carrying out their functions by the *huwādīks* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 15). Although no information has been provided on the latter's origins and functions, we should note that the term '*huwādīk*' originates from the Bulgarian word '*haydud*', meaning 'shepherd' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 15n.), which suggests a similarity between this tribal police force and the Ottoman feudal *çeri sürüçüs* (i.e. herd-drivers), who enrolled and policed the *sipāhis* on campaigns (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 51).

The number of tribal *āmils*, which had always been superior to that of the territorial *āmils*, was increased under Ḥammūda Pasha (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 86). They were mostly recruited from among the *ūḍa bāshīs* and the *shāwishes* who had served in the bey's tribunal, as well as from the Turkish and Arab *ḥānbas* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 83, 86).<sup>4</sup> In addition to their salary from the *diwān*, they received large quantities of food and agricultural products. They were, in addition, like their Ottoman counterparts, entrusted with collecting fines imposed by the government on offenders and received a ten per cent commission on the amount collected. Finally, the *ḍīfa* (i.e. welcome present) representing a sum of money paid by the tribesmen, in varying amounts proportional to the level of wealth of each family, on the *qā'id*'s assumption of office, and the *wahba*, consisting of yearly gifts in cash or kind, more or less subtly extorted from them, constituted two bonuses for these agents of the Ottoman administration (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 15).

A small number of tribal governorships in the Regency had been held by dynasties of tribal *āmils*, whose origins dated back to the time of Ḥammūda Bey the Muradite (1635–61). The Awlād Ḥasan, whose eponymous forefather had been a *mamlūk* of Ḥusayn Bey (himself a *mamlūk* of the bey Murād I), were the main representatives of these dynasties, maybe even their sole survivors. The descendants of *Qā'id* Ḥasan played an important role in the political life of the Regency under the last Muradites. One of them, Farḥāt, was executed on the order of Ramaḍān Bey for having assisted the Algerians against Muḥammad Bey in 1694 (Ibn Abī'l-

Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 68). An eighteenth-century source informs us that they monopolized the leadership of various divisions of the powerful Drīd tribe (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 296–7). The Awlād Ḥasan are mentioned in the Notebook of the *jund* in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha; the colourful Sulṭān Ḥosnī was one of the most influential members of the clan at that period (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 56–7).

The dynasty of the Awlād Ḥasan illustrates an important objective pursued by the Ottoman administration in the rural regions of the Empire. Like the Turkic *sipāhis*, who were made to settle among the rural Christian population in Rumelia, the Hanefite *ʿāmils*, in the Regency, shared the roughness of tribal life with their Malekite constituencies and cemented paternalistic links with the latter, in particular through marriage alliances. The political vicissitudes of the second half of the seventeenth century, however, probably resulted in the disorganization and decay of provincial administration and in the neglect of these objectives. The administrative reforms of Ḥammūda Pasha aimed at a return to the pristine vigour of the institution of tribal governors; this bey, according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, imposed on *ʿāmils* the obligation to remain among their tribes (or in their districts) all the year round (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 85). The author was, thus, contrasting this commitment to duty with the casualness of the following period, when *ʿāmils* tended to spend most of the year in the capital and visited their constituencies once a year for tax-collection (Pellissier 1980: 14).

The most important governorships of the tribal country were those of the semi-*askeri* tribes, foremost among whom was the Drīd tribe, divided into numerous communities, each led by a *qā'id*. The military organization of tribes was also seen as a means towards their settling, or at least towards controlling their displacements, with the aim, eventually, of ensuring the agricultural development of the province – two objectives in which the Porte had achieved a measure of success, at least initially, in its Arab provinces (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 267). The Drīd tribe owned large areas of lands across the Regency, whereas an important proportion of the Ṭarābulsis, who enjoyed less prestige and wealth, were employed as sharecroppers in the estates of the Majirda plain (Pellissier 1980: 19). Finally, the increase in the number of Arab *ṣubāyḥis* and *mazārgis* during the eighteenth century (Chérif 1986: II, 97), by leading to an increase in the number of land concessions to tribesmen, contributed to settling them with their families and

clans. In this context, *ʿāmil*s were required to take on the role of headmasters or civic missionaries in striving to promote the development of agricultural activities among their tribes. Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf, speaking of the *ʿāmil* of the Awlād 'Aun in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, describes the efforts of this Turkish *ḥānba* to instil the values of work and industriousness among the tribesmen, and thus increase their wealth (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 83–4).

Still in the context of efforts to extend the cultivable area of the province, these *ʿāmil*s (as well as the other categories of *ʿāmil*s in the Regency), like all provincial governors and *sipāhis* in the Empire, were granted plots of land, generally carved out of some hitherto untilled territory. Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf reports that the *ʿāmil* of the Awlād 'Aun employed his tribesmen in reclaiming the land owned by him, against a fair reward (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 83–4). The author's aim was probably to contrast the integrity of Ḥammūda's agents with the exactions of their successors of the mid-nineteenth century, who obliged the local population to provide free labour on their lands.<sup>5</sup>

Tribal *ʿāmil*s had a more limited role as concerns the fiscal organization of the countryside. In regions difficult to access or in frontier districts, where tribes enjoyed considerable independence, it was sometimes necessary for the *ʿāmil* to await the passage of the *maḥalla* in order to secure the dispatching of an armed unit to collect the symbolical amount due from them. In other cases, his role seems to have been limited to handing to the bey of the *maḥalla* the amount of taxes owed by the tribe and previously delivered to him by its *shaykh*.

The *shaykhs*, who assumed an important role in the Ottoman administrative structure in the rural country, were the endogenous leaders of the tribes. No rule of heredity governed the transmission of the title of *shaykh*, although it was often monopolized by members of the same family, whose predominance was generally based upon wealth resulting from, or combined with, religious prestige derived from the family's lineage connected to a revered *marabout*. The *shaykh*'s relative power, however, was closely negotiated with his peers from other influential families or clans forming the *jamā'a* (i.e. council, group), or the *rijāl kibār* (the elders) of the tribe, including its *mazārgis*.

The importance of the *shaykhs* as intermediaries between the central government and the tribes had already been acknowledged by successive ruling dynasties in North Africa. In the eighteenth-century Regency, and even before, the acknowledgement of their

authority went hand in hand with an increasing tendency to insert tribal *shaykhs* more closely into the beylical administrative structure, within the context of a general Ottoman policy aimed at promoting and using to the government's advantage the power of the local *āyān* (notables). Since the time of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, each new *shaykh*, on the death of his predecessor, had to pay the central administration a due, called *ṭarīq al-mashyakh*, in addition to sending a petition attesting to the tribe's choice, for final endorsement by the bey (Chérif 1986: I, 211). We should note in this regard that, during the eighteenth century, controlling the appointment of the *āyān* and exacting payment for it, became a well-established administrative usage throughout the Empire (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 257).

In addition to being free to rule in many cases according to the custom of the tribe, the *shaykhs* fulfilled an important fiscal role. They had a predominant voice as concerns the sharing among the members of the tribe of the amount of tax to be paid to the bey of the *maḥalla*, fixed through negotiations with the beylical administration. Tribal *shaykhs* often held the *iltizāms* of beylical domains in the countryside, or were sometimes appointed as governors in small rural districts (Chérif 1986: II, 190). The emergence and consolidation of dynasties of tribal notables, such as the Sʿbūʿīs among the Jlāš tribe, or the Qazzūms among the Frāshīsh, was an important social phenomenon in the late eighteenth-century Regency (Chérif 1986: II, 191).

### *The provincial kāhiyas*

Among the territorial *ʿāmil*s of the Regency, a small number, in addition to a relatively limited judicial jurisdiction in *qānūn* matters and to their fiscal responsibilities (which consisted in collecting a number of taxes from the population in coordination with the *maḥalla*), assumed an important military role. These *ʿāmil*s were designated as the *kāhiyas* of their districts. The three Hanefite *kāhiyas* governing the small coastal districts surrounding the three main naval bases of Binzart, Ghār al-Milḥ and Ḥalq al-Wād, originating from the *mamlūk* corps, or descending from *mamlūks* have already been reviewed in the preceding chapter of this study. There were, in addition, three Malekite *kāhiyas* governing the districts of Qayrawān, al-Kāf and al-Aʿrāḍ, lying on the route of the *maḥalla*. The first two of these officials had under their authority the Arab *ṣubāyḥi* force stationed in their districts, whereas the

*kāhiyas* of al-Aʿrāḍ commanded an important semi-regular tribal cavalry force (*fursān al-Aʿrāḍ*). These *kāhiyas* corresponded to a particular category of Ottoman *sipāhi* commanders ranking immediately beneath the *sancak beğis*, i.e. the *alay beğis*, who were chosen from among local feudatories and given insignia of authority, such as drums and flags (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 51).<sup>6</sup> We may presume that there was a hierarchical relation between the *kāhiyas* and the tribal *ʿāmils*, as between the *çeri-başıs* and the *alay-beyis* in the heart of the Ottoman Empire, although no indication of this is provided by sources. I shall now proceed to describe briefly the main characteristics of the three districts mentioned above, and to identify, where provided by sources, the names of some of their *kāhiyas* before, and during the period of our concern:

- Qayrawān: this town had been the main Islamic stronghold in North Africa at the beginning of the Arab conquest of the region, as well as the seat of the first Ottoman government in what was to become the Tunisian *eyālet*. The governorship of Qayrawān seems to have always been entrusted to Malekites. Sources mention the tribal *shaykh* ʿAlī al-Ḥannāshī, father-in-law of Ḥammūda Bey the Muradite in the seventeenth century (Ibn Abīʿl Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 36), and ʿĀmir Bey, the Malekite half-brother of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 148). In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, the governor of Qayrawān was ʿUmar al-Murābiṭ, a native of that city, who had followed the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī into exile in Algiers, and who was a *sarrāj* (a follower of the bey, admitted into the *jund*). Ibn Abīʿl Ḍiyāf informs us that this official was appointed to lead the pilgrimage caravan, ‘which gave him great prestige’ (Ibn Abīʿl Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 47). When ʿUmar al-Murābiṭ reached an advanced age, he was succeeded in his post by his own son. The father was required, as ʿAlī Bey had done with Ḥammūda, to supervise and counsel the juvenile *kāhiya* (Ibn Abīʿl Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 47).
- al-Kāf: this town, on the western frontier of the Regency, represented a crucial post for its defence against Algerian invasions. Sources have provided the names of two of its *ʿāmils* in the first half of the eighteenth century, both of whom were relatives of the bey of the time: Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf’s brother, who was appointed on the eve of the war against Algiers in 1705 (Ibn Abīʿl Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 83), and al-Ghazālī, the maternal uncle of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, in the aftermath of the insurrection

that broke out in the city of al-Kāf in 1728 (Chérif 1986: II, 82).

- The al-A'rāḍ district, contiguous to the Tripolitan frontier: this district stretched over almost two-fifths of the surface of the country. Its main town was Gābis, and it was mostly the territory of the innumerable divisions of the Warghama tribe. Husayn ibn 'Alī was governor of al-A'rāḍ under the last Muradite beys (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 86). The prerogatives of his office at that period included the right of pronouncing the death sentence on criminals (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 86). The suppression of this prerogative in the eighteenth century illustrates the evolution towards an increased monopolization of judicial power in the Regency by the beys (Chérif 1986: I, 216–19). The governorship of the district was later held by Rajab ibn Māmī, a *mamlūk*, and Aḥmad ibn Maṭīshā, a Malekite officer, in the time of 'Alī Pasha (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 283, 339), by Ismā'īl Kāhiya, a *mamlūk*, in the time of 'Alī Bey (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 13), and by 'Alī al-Jazīrī (a Hanefite officer) and the Jirbī merchant notable Ḥ'mīda ibn 'Ayyād under Ḥammūda Pasha (Ibn Abī'l Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 37, 103).

### *Territorial non-military 'āmils*

The non-military districts covered the North of the Regency, as well as the Waṭan al-Qibli (Cap Bon), the Sāḥil region on the eastern coast, and the oases region of al-Jarīd. The non-military *'āmils* exercised mainly a fiscal jurisdiction, added to a modest judicial one. This jurisdiction was generally limited to the settled Malekite population of their districts. They had little to do with several ethnic or religious communities scattered over the Regency's territory, who had their own *qāids*, *shaykhs*, or *kāhiyas*, as was the case for the Jews, the Jirbīs (many of whom emigrated from their island to settle as petty tradesmen in towns), the Andalusians, the *zuwāwa*, etc. Similarly, tribes living permanently, or for part of the year, in a given territorial district, might be placed under the authority of a tribal *'āmil*. In the larger districts, the territorial *'āmils* had *khalīfas* (an Arabic word meaning 'representative, or delegate', which was more used in that context, than its Turkish synonym: '*kāhiya*') to represent them in regions lying far from the main urban entre. These *'āmils* belonged to the most important Malekite *afyān* (notable) families, whose members often held



several governorships and *iltizāms*, and among whom we may mention in particular:

- The al-Jallūlīs: historians have noted the emergence of the economic power of this family from the beginning of the eighteenth century, although Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf indicates that its notable standing dates back to the Hafsid period (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 43). 'Alī ibn Farḥāt al-Jallūlī was *ʿāmil* of the district of Ṣafāqus, situated at the heart of the olive groves of the Regency, in the time of 'Alī Pasha (Chérif 1986: I, 286). Under Ḥammūda Pasha, Bakkār al-Jallūlī and his son Muḥammad (possibly from another branch of the family) were also *ʿāmil*s of that district. They held, moreover, various *iltizāms*, in particular for the collection and exportation of olive oil (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 143; VIII, 71).
- The Ibn 'Ayyāds: this family from Jirba extended its influence over various economic sectors and regions in the Regency. In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, Ḥmīda ibn 'Ayyād was *ʿāmil* of al-A'rāḍ and of Jirba. He exercised his jurisdiction in that island in consultation with ten *shaykhs*, or *muqaddams*, representing the most important families of the island. He was succeeded by his son at these two posts (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 103; Raymond 1994: II, 136).
- The al-Murābiṭs and the Nuwīras: these two families also held governorships and *iltizāms* in the Sāḥil in the second half of the eighteenth century (Chérif 1986: I, 287–8).
- Local rural and tribal families: *shaykhs* and other notables, and their relatives, were often appointed to the governorships of the small districts around the Majirda basin in the north, or in al-Jarīd in the south-west.

Finally, it is fitting to dwell here on an important feature of the office of the Tunisian *ʿāmil*s as a whole, and of the non-military territorial ones in particular, which set them apart from those of many other Ottoman provinces. In Egypt, in particular, the officials corresponding to the Tunisian non-military *ʿāmil*s were called *multazims*, since they obtained their office just like any *iltizām*, i.e. through bidding at a public auction. These *multazims* were entitled to collect and keep for themselves the amount of a number of taxes paid to them by the local population, against the payment of an annual sum to the province's treasury (Shaw 1962: 35). As for the Tunisian *ʿāmil*s, they were, before Ḥammūd Pasha's time,

appointed by the beys, and 'did not have to pay any sum, whether overtly, or secretly, to the state', according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 15). Under Ḥammūda Pasha, a new administrative practice, called the *ittifāq* (meaning: agreement, conciliation) was adopted, which involved secret negotiations that Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābī would carry out on the price of vacant governorships with candidates to the post. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf makes it clear, however, that this still 'had nothing to do with the *iltizām* system' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 16). It appears, furthermore, that the list of taxes with their different amounts to be paid by each rural community in the districts of the Regency to the *ʿāmil*s was prepared in the accountancy department of the Bārdū palace (Hénia 1980: 35–6). We may therefore conclude, even if tentatively, that the *ʿāmil*s of the Tunisian *eyālet* were more similar to the Ottoman *amīns*. The *amīns* were salaried administrative agents entrusted with collecting taxes and remitting their totality to the central, or provincial treasuries across the Empire but, since the end of the sixteenth century, they had increasingly been replaced by *multazims*, as in the Egyptian province, for instance (Shaw 1962: 31–2). In the Regency, therefore, the office of *ʿāmil* was not, primarily, a source of direct revenue to local notables; it served, rather, to confer on the latter a measure of political power that allowed them to consolidate the economic wealth of their families, derived from *iltizāms* and other economic activities.

### *The bey and his ʿāmil*s

This study on Tunisian governorships has revealed the tight control of the bey on the provincial administration of the Regency. First, an important share of territorial governorships, those of a military character, was monopolized by the beylical household: we have seen that the posts of *kāhiyas* were attributed either to the *mamlūks* (or their sons), or to the *sarrājs* of the bey, who represented a local version of *mamlūks*, whereas tribal governorships were generally granted to those officers of the *jund* who had served in the bey's tribunal. The remaining, not inconsiderable, proportion of governorships fell into the share of the Malekite *makhāzinis*, who formed the true *raʿiyya* of the bey. Although these governorships were inheritable, or transmitted between the members of the same family, it was made clear that the *makhāzinis* had no vested interests. Ḥammūda's predecessors, according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, had appointed their *ʿāmil*s, 'acting on (their) own judgement, or on the

advice of (their) entourage' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 15). After the adoption of the *ittifāq* practice by Ḥammūda Pasha, the power of the bey to preserve, or break, the line of family succession for each governorship remained intact. It is interesting, in this regard, to note the difference between the Tunisian *ittifāq* and a similar practice introduced in Egypt at the end of the eighteenth century, under the name '*muṣālaḥa*' (meaning 'conciliation, agreement'). The *muṣālaḥa* ensured that the *iltizāms* of governorships were no longer put to auction at the death of *multazims*, but were legally passed on to their heirs, following secret negotiations between the latter and the *wālī*. This practice, according to S. J. Shaw, strengthened the principle of inheritability of these *iltizāms*, by putting an end to free financial competition for them (Shaw 1962: 38–9). In the Regency, however, where governorships had never been put to auction, the *ittifāq* merely gave the bey a legal pretext for refusing to grant governorships to the heirs of the deceased incumbents, if the latter had aroused his suspicion or dissatisfaction. The aim of the *ittifāq*, in addition to providing a new source of revenue for the beylical treasury, was thus to ensure the zeal, or political meekness of *ʿāmil*s wishing that their descendants should inherit their offices.

Finally, the fact that literary sources on the Regency from the Ottoman conquest until the period of our concern hardly mention incidents or episodes related to financial extortions committed by the *ʿāmil*s against the local populations, encourages the presumption that such a phenomenon must have been less widespread or deeply rooted than in many other provinces of the Empire. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, in particular, stresses the harshness of Ḥammūda Pasha in dealing with dishonest *ʿāmil*s (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 17, 82). There was, however, very probably, a gap between the author's hagiographical account of this bey's rule and the social realities of the period. It should also be noted that Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, on the other hand, states, as concerns tribal *shaykhs*, that though the latter were supposed to act as a counterweight to the Hanefite *ʿāmil*s, their own opportunistic calculations could lead them to cooperate with the latter, rather than hamper their abuses against tribesmen (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 15). According to the historian Mohamed-Hédi Chérif, the increasing number of assaults suffered at the hands of their own kinsmen by the tribal *shaykhs*, as reported in administrative documents from the second half of the eighteenth century, should be seen as a reaction to this alliance of the notables against the *rāiyya* (Chérif 1986: II, 191–2).

### Conclusion: the *mamlūks*, *makhāzinis* and Hanefites

The study of the army and of the administration of the Regency in this chapter and the preceding one has enabled us to roughly evaluate the share held by each of the three social groups represented within these institutions, i.e. the Ottoman *mamlūks*, the *makhāzinis* and the Hanefites, in the stock of wealth and power of the Regency (see also Table 6.1). This concluding section will be devoted to a study of the extent of the judicial jurisdiction of the bey over each of these social groups.

To begin with, the Ottoman *mamlūks*: this administrative elite, placed under the orders of the bey, who was himself the descendant of an Ottoman *mamlūk*, represented a modified version of Rumelian *kapı kulus* sent by the Porte to administer its provinces. In contrast to the European renegades who were the true 'slaves' of the beylical household, the Ottoman *mamlūks* therefore remained, to an important extent, under the jurisdiction of the Porte, and enjoyed an important judicial privilege in the Regency. First, they were immune from the risk of having their property confiscated by the beys, whereas the wealth of those of them who died without leaving an heir or who had transgressed the Porte's interests accrued, not to the beylical treasury, but to the central treasury in Istanbul. Thus, Yūnis Bey, 'Alī Pasha's eldest son and designated heir (and therefore a *kapı kulu*, or *mamlūk* of the sultan), spent the last years of his life as a prisoner of the dey of Algiers, where he had escaped after the failure of the janissary revolt fomented by him in 1752; at the news of his death, the Porte claimed his property from the Algerian government (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963-6: II, 142).

Security for the lives of the *mamlūks* was also guaranteed, even if they had incurred the bey's serious dissatisfaction. Mustāfa Khūja,

Table 6.1 Statistics on the most influential *mamlūks*, *makhāzinis* and Hanefites of Ḥammūda Pasha's time, based on Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's *Tarājim al a'yān* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963-6: VII and VIII)

Social group	Central administration	Provincial administration and army	Other activities (trade, etc.)
<i>Mamlūks</i>	3	6	0
<i>Makhāzinis</i>	1	7	8
Hanefites	1	11	4

having, at some stage, fallen into disgrace, was allowed to leave the country on the pretext of a pilgrimage to Mekka, before being readmitted in Ḥammūda Pasha's government shortly after 'Alī Bey's death (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 38–9; Rousseau 1985: 190–1). At the same period, Ismā'īl Kāhiya, another Circassian *mamlūk* and son-in-law of 'Alī Bey, and a youthful rival of Ḥammūda Pasha, was subtly persuaded, through common acquaintances and relatives in the Bārdū Palace, to leave Tunis (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 14). Ismā'īl Kāhiya pursued outside the Regency a distinguished career in the Ottoman administration, first in Egypt, where he was promoted to the rank of bey, then in Istanbul, and finally in Damascus where he was appointed as pasha (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 14).

*Mamlūks*, however, could be deprived of their status by the bey himself, who might choose, on his accession to office, to release his predecessor's *mamlūks*, according to a practice commonly observed in provincial Ottoman households, and particularly in Egypt. 'Uthmān Bey, in the period following Ḥammūda Pasha's death, and on the advice of the *bāsh kātib* Muḥammad al-Aṣram, exercised this right in order to rid himself of the too powerful Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi'. Yūsuf, unlike many others, did not leave the Regency, although his release meant the loss of his status of *mamlūk*, and therefore of his office of guardian of the seal, and his relegation to the status of a *makhāzini*. Owing to his still considerable influence, the former *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'* was appointed to the post of *khaznadār*, which was not restricted to *mamlūks*, and was, occasionally, attributed to Malekites, and to members of the *jund*.<sup>7</sup> Yūsuf's murder, a few months later, on the orders of Maḥmūd Bey, therefore did not constitute a violation of the immunity enjoyed by the Ottoman *mamlūks* in the Regency.<sup>8</sup>

In contrast to the Ottoman *mamlūks*, the *makhāzini*s, whether *askeris* or non-*askeris*, remained the *ra'iyya* of the bey. Those of them suspected of foul play or of treason incurred the full impact of his wrath. Several *makhāzini*s were executed, or had their wealth confiscated as a consequence of the conflict between Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī and 'Alī Pasha (Chérif 1986: II, 83–4; Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 220, 226). In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, Yūnis ibn Yūnis, a Jirbi merchant, with connections in Istanbul, also had the greatest part of his wealth confiscated (Chérif 1977: 124). The growing influence of the Malekites in the government, and probably also a whiff of the winds of social change in the Ottoman Empire, however, seem to have caused the beginning of rumblings among the ranks

of the *makhāzinis* against the harshness of their judicial status. Thus, Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf reports that Rajab ibn 'Ayyād, of an influential local Malekite family in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, was asked by a *qāḍi* (judge) to hand over promptly full payment of a stated sum before any implementation of the terms of a contract signed by him and was not allowed to pledge one of his properties as security of payment. Rajab bowed down to the judgment and wryly congratulated the *qāḍi* on his wisdom, adding that, indeed, the *makhāzinis*, having no security for their very lives, could provide no valid guarantee of any sort (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VI, 37–8).

Finally, the Hanefites, until the last quarter of the seventeenth century, had been exclusively under the judicial jurisdiction of the dey and the *ḍiwān*; from then on, they were gradually transferred to the bey's jurisdiction. The *ḍiwān* was, to a large extent, responsible for settling legal issues concerning the janissaries, although the bey exercised ruthlessly his prerogatives in cases of military treason: hence the execution of the dey Qāra Burnālī in 1808 and of the Turkish rebels in 1811. Political and military considerations, on the other hand, led Ḥammūda Pasha to turn a blind eye on the exactions of the *ʿasker* against the local population. It is also probable that the bey's court judgments were less harsh on *kulughlis* than on Malekites. A few decades later, however, following the elimination of the janissary corps in 1830, the difference between the Tunisian Malekites and Hanefites in the judicial realm was almost completely eliminated. It survived in a small point of etiquette: whereas Malekite plaintiffs, in the tribunal, were firmly held at a distance from the bey by the Arab *bāsh ḥānba*, who acted as their spokesman, the Hanefites stood at a closer distance, by the side of the Turkish *bāsh ḥānba* (Bayram no date: I, part two, 131).

## THE REVENUES OF THE BEYLICAL TREASURY

### The accountancy department and the treasury

The accountancy department in the central administration (*dūwān al-ḥisbān*) appears to have been a reduced version of the offices headed by the *bāsh defterdār* in the government of the Porte in Istanbul, as it has been drawn out by contemporary research on the Ottoman Empire.<sup>1</sup> In the light of this research, and based on the succinct information provided by Tunisian sources on the beylical accountancy department, as well as on the findings of the preceding chapters of this research, I shall attempt here to identify at least a number of the services forming that department, placed under the supreme jurisdiction of the bey as grand vizier-cum-*bāsh defterdār*, and bearing in mind the absence of the *khaznadār* from the government of Hammūda Pasha:

- first, the computation and collection of land taxes fell within the province of the bey and the *bāsh kātib*;
- second, the secretariat of the *ṣāhib al-ṭābiʿ* was responsible for renting tax-farms and for collecting the income resulting from the *ittifāq* with new governors. (In Istanbul, the registration of tax-farms was entrusted to a specific department of the *bāsh defterdār*'s office);
- third, collection of the profits of the various institutions dedicated to the keeping up of the Islamic holy places in Mekka and Jerusalem (*awqāf al-ḥaramayn*), which devolved, in Istanbul, on a particular division of the *defterdār*'s office, was the exclusive responsibility of the bey himself (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 86);

- fourth, escheated and unreclaimed property of the Malekite *ra'īyya*, as in the case of persons who had died without leaving an heir, was placed under the responsibility of an official designated as the *baytu'l-mālji* (Monchicourt 1929: 28–9).<sup>2</sup> The unreclaimed property of Hanefites went to the treasury of the *jund* (Hénia 1980: 257);
- and, finally, we should note that the beylical administration, like the central government in Istanbul (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 128), provided for the possibility of receiving and settling claims of a financial nature between the state and private persons. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf thus informs us that the *wakīl* appointed by the bey to represent him in such cases, 'as under his father and grandfather', (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 87) had to appear before the *majlis al-sharī* (religious tribunal), either as defendant or as plaintiff, and 'was treated on an equal footing to the adverse party' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 87).

The treasury of the Regency was composed of two sections, on the model of the *khazāna 'āmira* in Istanbul, which included the *mūrī treasury*, which was the repository of revenues for current expenditure, and the inner one, stored in the harem of the sultan's palace (Orhonlu 1978). In Tunis, the main treasury, or *bayt al-māl*, probably situated in the Bārdū palace grounds, was kept under the supervision of an *āgha* commanding a guard unit.<sup>3</sup> The inner treasury, to which Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf refers as Ḥammūda Pasha's 'treasure' (*kanz*), was deposited in the *ghurfa* (underground room) of the Bārdū palace and placed under the custody of a *mamlūk* officer.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, we should recall that the Tunisian treasury, unlike that of the Mashriq provinces, did not send an annual contribution to Istanbul. This exemption was, I would suggest, justified by the fact that the Regency and its two neighbours carried out military service for the sultan through waging corso campaigns against his enemies. Presents (the *hadiyya*) were, however, sent periodically to Istanbul, as a sign of allegiance from the beys of the Tunisian *eyālet mümtāze* to Istanbul.<sup>5</sup> The *hadiyya*, as already indicated in this study, was composed of natural products and exotic animals from the countryside and the desert of the Regency, craftware from its villages, towns and cities, as well as goods bought in cash, such as precious stones.



## Taxation in the rural and tribal country

### *The tribes and the maḥallas*

In coastal regions, in the rich plains covering areas of the north and centre, and in the oases of al-Jarīd, settled peasant communities could be surveyed and taxed regularly by the beylical administration. There was, however, a considerable proportion of nomadic, or semi-nomadic tribes among the Tunisian rural population, which contributed to an important degree in forging the character of the fiscal policy of the beys. Beduins, if taxed too heavily, could easily emigrate to the neighbouring Regencies: the 1628 agreement between Algiers and Tunis even provided for the possibility for tribes to emigrate from each one of these provinces and place themselves under the jurisdiction of the other (Rousseau 1985: 45). Dissatisfied tribes, moreover, were armed groups that could easily be tempted to side with a contender for beylical power. The issue of the legality of taxes from an Islamic point of view, in this regard, remained a sensitive one with the tribes. The *ʿurfi* nature of many of these taxes (which meant they had been promulgated on the strength of the secular authority of the sultan and independently of the stipulations of the *sharīʿa*), had sometimes constituted righteous pretexts for tribal dissidence: thus, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Sulaymān ibn Ramaḍān had led an important rebellion against Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf, claiming that he would impose only *sharī* taxes (i.e. those stipulated in the Quran) on the *raʿiyya*, if he took power (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 81).

All these considerations dissuaded the beys from exacting heavy taxes from their rural population. Fiscal documents of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries thus reveal that various reductions or waivers (locally designated as *tark*, and *tāyih*) of the amount of taxes owed by tribes, as well as postponements of the payment of a proportion of the taxes to the following year (*muwakkhar*), were frequently conceded (Hénia 1980: 305). A number of tribes, furthermore, particularly the poorest or those living in the frontier districts of the Regency were almost exempted from any fiscal payments, except for a symbolical sum (Pellissier 1980: 45, 183). We shall see, however, that the beys had at their disposal the whole array of the Ottoman *sharī* and *ʿurfi* taxes. In periods of strong beylical power, these taxes, more particularly when dealing with wayward tribes, could be strictly exacted.

The bi-annual fiscal expeditions of the beys in the rural and tribal country were the winter *maḥalla*, which started in December, sweeping across the centre to the south, and lasting for almost two months, and the summer *maḥalla*, sent to the northern part of the country in July or August, after the grain harvest had been completed, and which lasted about one month. From the last *maḥalla*, a column, led by the *khūja* of the *zuwāwa*, would be detached and sent to collect taxes in the north-west of the province, with the specific purpose of financing the pay of that corps (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 436; Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 49). It seems therefore reasonable to assume that the role of each of the other two more important expeditions was also to supply the necessary funds for specific corps of the army. I would suggest, in this regard, that the proceeds of the winter *maḥalla* provided for the pay of the *ṣubāyḥis* (mainly concentrated in the centre and south). Those of the summer *maḥalla*, on the other hand, would have been reserved for the janissaries – a presumption supported by the fact that the taxes of the district of Māṭir (in the north of the Regency) were remitted, in their greatest proportion, to the treasury of the *dār al-bāsha* (Chérif 1986: I, 208).

It was the duty of the *kātibs* in the Bārdū accountancy department to draft, every year, the lists with the amounts of the various taxes to be paid by each tribal or rural community in the Regency to the annual *maḥalla* or to the *ʿāmilis*. These lists have provided the archival basis for an interesting body of research by Tunisian historians on the fiscality of the Regency. Contemporary historiography has divided the taxes and dues paid by the Tunisian population, into two types: ‘ordinary’ and ‘extraordinary’. The following study in the Regency will show that these taxes and dues fit perfectly into the established official Ottoman classification, based on four main categories of impositions (Inalcik 1965b).

### *Taxes on land and agricultural production*

The main *sharʿī* tax paid by the rural *rāʿiyya* in the Ottoman Empire was the *ʿushr*, or tithes. In many provinces this proportion was raised to more than one-tenth of their agricultural production, but this does not seem to have been the case in the Regency. The beys, indeed, were concerned to stress to their *rāʿiyya* that the *ʿushr* was one and the same as the Islamic *zakāt*, i.e. the tenth of the crops representing the share apportioned to the state by the

sharī'a (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: IV, 44, 45).<sup>6</sup> The *'usbr* was imposed on the harvests of wheat and barley, and, in the south, on the harvest of dates (Bachrouch 1972: 132).

The second tax paid by Ottoman peasants was an *'urfī* one, called the *çift resmi*, which was a fixed due calculated according to the quantity and quality of land in their holdings. Various sources provide evidence that this tax was imposed on the arable lands of the Regency, such as those of the Majirda Valley, which were, according to the eighteenth-century French traveller Peyssonnel, regularly surveyed by the beys for fiscal purposes (Peyssonnel 1987: 158). The measure adopted for these surveys was the *māshiya*, which corresponded exactly to the Ottoman *çift* (see Appendix B).

There were also several other *'urfī* dues paid by the Tunisian rural population, on sheep, camels and oxen, as well as on food products, such as *d'hān* (sheep's grease), or honey (Bachrouch 1972: 132; Hénia 1980: 34). Just as, in the core provinces of the Ottoman Empire, handicrafts and small industries practised by landless peasants were taxed (Inalcik 1994: 147), so were Tunisian handicraft products, such as those of the al-Jarīd towns and villages (Hénia 1980: 34). Finally, in the Sāḥil region exclusively, a tax called the *qānūn* – a clear indication of its *'urfī* nature – was imposed on olive trees (4 *nāṣiris* each). This tax, however, concerned only the trees that had been planted before the rule of 'Uthmān Dey; those planted after that period were exempted from imposition, so that, in the Ottoman period, according to Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, 'the blessed tree prospered and multiplied in that region' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 130).

The payment of the *sharī* tithes was made in kind. It is also possible that other dues, such as the *çift resmi* and dues on pastoral activities, normally collected in cash, were sometimes converted into kind, in view of the lack of cash among the rural population in the Regency. The *maḥalla*, with its logistical capacities, offered the possibility of transporting large quantities of cereals and other goods from the countryside in order to sell them in city markets. The role of the Drīd tribe in transporting wheat to the south and bringing dates from there is well known (Raymond 1994: II, 17).

### Khidmas and 'ādas

Many fees and contributions were paid by the rural population, not to the treasury, but to various army members and officials,

especially during the *maḥallas*. These fees and contributions, designated by the Arabic terms of *khidmas* (in Ottoman usage: *khidmet*) and *ādas* (in Ottoman usage: *adet*), were paid on the strength of the Sultan's *urfī* authority. The *khidmas* (i.e. services) have already been mentioned in this study, as being remunerations which the bey's couriers were entitled to receive from those to whom they communicated government orders. In the context of the *maḥalla*, the *khidmas* were payments made by the rural population to members of the *jund* or to the *ṣubāyḥīs* for specific tasks carried out by them during these fiscal expeditions, or to the *mazārgīs* during the tax-collecting tours made by *qā'id*s in their districts. The *khidmas* of wheat, of barley, of dates, of camels (Bachrouh 1972: 134; Hénia 1980: 35) were thus presumably paid to officers responsible for the assessment and collection of taxes in cash imposed on these goods and animals, or for the transport of these commodities, if taxes were paid in kind. The Drīd tribe also received a *khidma* from communities in the al-Jarīd region for the transport of dates, but this sum was negotiated directly between the communities and the tribe's leaders, and was not included in the government's fiscal assessment.

*Ādas*, meaning, in Arabic, 'habit', or 'custom', referred, in Ottoman usage, to sums paid by the population to cover expenses or obligations traditionally assumed by the treasury. On *ādas*, S. J. Shaw informs us that, in Egypt:

Many expenditures were made by the Treasury to secure food and other material for the *Dīwān* and the Citadel, to feed the *Vāli* and principal officers, to provide food for the poor on special occasions. Many of these were special expenditures, made in one or two years, and then abandoned. Others became permanent obligations of the Treasury.

(Shaw 1962: 232)

Among dues falling in this particular category, sources on the Regency mention, for instance, an *āda* of the *khābā'* (tents) for the acquisition and maintenance of the tents of the *maḥalla* (Bachrouh 1972: 131). There were also *ādas* paid for the personal benefit of members of the *maḥalla*. The list of these officials and officers during the winter *maḥalla* in the al-Jarīd, in fiscal documents of the eighteenth century, for instance, included, besides the bey, the *qā'id*,

the *kāhiya*, the *kātib*, as well as the *shāwish* and the *saqqāḥ* (Hénia 1980: 35–6). Some of these *ʿādas* were allocated to officials dead a long time ago (e.g. Jaʿfar Kāhiya and Ṣaghīr ibn Ṣandal) (Hénia 1980: 35–6): we may presume that, as in Egypt, these payments were remitted to the descendants of the said officials. Finally, *ʿādas* were also paid to some categories of the *rāiyya* population, for instance, to the descendants of holy men: thus, the *zāwiya* (religious foundation) of the Abū ʿAttūr family, in Ṣafāqus, received ‘from the government an *ʿāda* of oil, wheat and money’ (Ibn Abīʿl-Diyāf 1963–6: VII, 53).

*Khidmas* and *ʿādas* were included in the list of taxes collected by the *maḥalla*, with their beneficiaries, or their specific uses, clearly indicated (Hénia 1980: 35–6n.). In the case of taxes collected by *ʿāmil*s in provincial districts, the latter, or his agents, would pay these fees and bonuses out of the proceeds of taxes he had collected to the entitled person, bearing an assignment to that effect. The assignment, called ‘*havale*’ (Ar.: *ḥawwāla*) in the usual Ottoman terminology (Gerber 1993), was designated, in the Regency, by the ubiquitous word of *tidhkira* (Ott.: *tezkere*, i.e. note) (Chérif 1986: I, 194; II, 89).

The *khidmas* and *ʿādas*, often paid in kind, complemented the scanty salaries of the *ʿaskeris*. These additional sources of revenue to the military represented, in the last resort, a solution to the currency problems and shortages of specie that affected the Tunisian treasury (Chérif 1986: II, 84), and prevented any substantial increase in the army salaries. These problems, although it has been argued that they were not characterized with the severity and permanence described by traditional Ottomanist historiography, were common to the imperial and provincial treasuries throughout the Empire (Pamuk 2000: xix).

### *Other taxes and dues imposed on the rāiyya*

There were taxes and dues that applied to the whole of the Tunisian *rāiyya*, although their bulk was paid by the rural population, which formed the majority of the inhabitants of the Regency. These impositions, paid in cash to the treasury, fell into two categories. The first corresponded to the Ottoman *ʿavariz-bedels* (although these terms were not used in the Tunisian administrative terminology). The *ʿavariz* (from the Arabic: *ʿawārid*, i.e. temporary, exceptional, circumstances) related to certain services which Ottoman subjects

had to provide freely to the state, initially only in emergencies, and for which *bedels* (from the Arabic: *badal*), i.e. cash substitutes, were often paid (Inalcik 1965b). Subsequently, a number of these taxes acquired a regular and permanent character. Among these, sources on the Regency mention, for instance, a tax imposed, since ʿUthmān Dey’s time, on town-dwellers and tribesmen alike, as a contribution to the pay of the *jund* (Ibn Abī’l-Diyāf 1963–6: IV, 46), which was probably the local equivalent of the Ottoman ‘imperial army’, or ‘war-time substitute’ (converted, in periods of peace, into ‘peace-time substitute’). There was also the *diyāfa* (i.e. welcoming feast) of the pasha, which may be considered as the equivalent of the ‘travel substitute’ paid by the sultan’s subjects in lieu of providing accommodation to a visiting high-ranking official. In the Regency, as in the heart of the Empire, the tax had to be paid, whether the official designated effectively visited the region concerned or not (Chérif 1986: II, 127).

The second category of taxes were levied only in special cases. These taxes, called in the Ottoman terminology, the *bād-i hawā* or *ṭayyārāt*, included dues paid while recovering runaway slaves, cattle, etc., as well as fines, penalizing acts of political dissidence or marauding (Inalcik 1965b). Fines represented a form of penalization that was imposed with increased rigour from the reign of ʿAlī Pasha on – whereas the other types of taxes showed no increase, at least until the end of Ḥammūda Pasha’s rule (Hénia 1980: 292; Chérif 1986: II, 185). They were designated by the Arabic word *gharāma* (which had also passed into Ottoman usage), or were referred to, in the local language, by the term *khṭiyya*, which may be understood as meaning ‘fault, sin’, (from the Arabic: *khaṭīʿa*), or ‘written note’ (from the Arabic: *khaṭṭa*, to write). The *ʿamils*, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, were traditionally entitled to one-tenth of each *gharāma* imposed by them. We may also include within this category of financial penalizing the *diyya*, which was often imposed collectively on a tribe, or on a town district, for a murder committed by one, or several, of their members. A proportion of the *diyya*, assessed by the Ottoman administration, was paid to the latter, whereas the rest went to the relatives of the victim (Ibn Ṭāhir 1995: 45–97). Finally, the wealth of notables and other subjects of the bey, in towns and countryside alike, could be appropriated by the treasury in circumstances of an exceptional nature, i.e. by the confiscation of the properties of those accused of dissidence or rebellion.

## *Iltizāms* and other sources of revenue for the beylical treasury

### *The iltizāms*

The leases for the *iltizāms*, in addition to the amounts of the *ittifāqs* paid by new governors, represented revenues paid to the treasury by rich Malekites and government officials. The *iltizāms*, commonly designated as *lizmas* in the Regency, were granted on the same terms as in the rest of the Empire, i.e. as the result of a public auction and in return for the payment of an annual fixed sum to the treasury. In the rural districts of the Regency, *iltizāms* were granted for the exploitation of the beylical *hanshīrs*. In the cities and ports, they were related to the collection of a wide array of taxes and dues imposed on various goods and economic activities. They included, in particular:

- an *iltizām* designated as *lizmat al-rommāna* (from the French ‘(balance) romaine’, i.e. the Roman scales) (Bachrouch 1972: 133), probably corresponding to the *kaḥan* tax that was paid, in the Ottoman Empire, on products weighed in the public warehouses (Gibb and Bowen 1950: II, 7);
- another called *lizmat-al-sūq* (of the market): the price of this *iltizām* in the capital was paid directly to the *dār al-basha* (Chérif 1986: II, 190). Although its denomination does not tell us which staples or goods were thus taxed, I would suggest that this *iltizām* concerned the grain market;
- *iltizāms*, respectively, for the weighing of silver and gold (Bachrouch 1972: 133);
- and a multitude of others, attached to various professions and economic activities, such as those of attending ladies at marriages, prostitutes (the last being held by the *mizwār*, who was also entrusted with regulating the activities of this profession), wool-weavers, prison-wardens, etc. (Bachrouch 1972: 133; Raymond 1994: II, 107).

It should be noted, however, that there is no mention in Tunisian sources of any taxes paid for the practise of the most prestigious handicrafts and branches of commerce in the cities during the eighteenth century. These activities, particularly in the capital, were generally reserved to the Turks and to a Malekite minority. The Andalusians, in particular, monopolized, in Tunis, the manufac-

turing of the *shāshbiyyās*, or red woollen caps marketed throughout the Empire. It is possible, therefore, that exemption from taxation on industry and commerce depended not on the activity itself but on the social category practising it. To the opposite, in small towns and villages, as in the al-Jarīd region, for instance, products of handicraft activity were taxed (Hénia 1980: 34).

Finally, customs duties were a consequent source of revenue for the beylical treasury. Taxes on imports (*gumrug*) were held as an *iltizām* by Maḥmūd al-Jallūlī, a notable from Şafāqus, in Ḥammūda Pasha's time (Raymond 1994: II, 146). Export duties, on the other hand, seem to have been collected directly by the treasury from the traders, who, upon submitting their goods for assessment of the quantity and value of goods to be exported, were provided with a *tidhkira* on which they had to pay the percentage due (Chérif 1986: II, 89).<sup>7</sup> The rate of imposition, as in the rest of the Empire, was of three per cent for products exported or imported from Christian countries that had signed Capitulation agreements with the Porte, such as France, England, and a number of Italian states – to which were probably added various other customary charges which, as in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, would raise it to about ten per cent of the goods' value (Mc Gowan 1994: 728). Customs duties were between 8 per cent and 11 per cent *ad valorem* for products from Christian countries that had not signed Capitulation agreements with the Porte.

### *Economic relations with the Christian world and the corso*

In addition to customs duties, various revenues accrued to the beylical treasury as a consequence of economic agreements and exchange established between the beys and Christian interests. First, a number of *iltizāms* in the Regency had been granted by the Tunisian government to European concerns since the seventeenth century. These *iltizāms* concerned specific products that were the same as those on which an exclusive monopoly was held, in the heart of the Empire, by the central Ottoman government (Inalcik 1965b; Inan 1976: 75). They included:

- The *iltizām* of leathers and waxes, which were sent from all regions of the Regency to the *dār al-jild* in the capital; it was granted to a Leghornese company, with some form of control



exercised by a government official (Chérif 1986: I, 206). The company had, in return, to supply commodities from Europe, including wax for the Bārdū palace, and, in the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, the cloth required for army wear (MacGill 1815: 177).

- The *iltizām* for the exploiting of salt in the region of Zarzīs, granted to a Genoese group (Chérif 1986: II, 118).
- The *iltizām* for tuna and coral-fishing, which had been traditionally held by French companies since the seventeenth century. A conflict over the terms of its renewal, however, was partly at the origin of the war between France and Tunis in 1770 under ʿAlī Bey (Rousseau 1985: 170–85). Under Ḥammūda Pasha, French fishermen had to share their previously exclusive fishing rights with other foreign, particularly Italian, concerns. Attempts by the French consul to initiate negotiations aimed at the signature of an agreement for the renewing of the concession to his country from 1806 on were defeated by the bey's prevarications and achieved no result (Rousseau 1985: 355–62).
- The *iltizām* for making and selling wine.
- And, presumably, the *iltizām* for the production of sodas, since this product was also monopolized by the beylical state (Monchicourt 1929: 24).

Second, trade with Europe, favoured, for a time, by the international conjuncture and the new position of Britain in the Mediterranean, was increasingly controlled by the bey. Wheat, the main exported goods to Europe, both through the Compagnie d'Afrique in Cap Nègre (until its disappearance at the end of the eighteenth century) and through European traders, had, indeed, already been largely monopolized by the beys. In addition to the surpluses of tithes, quantities of grain for sale to Europe were secured by the latter through the practice of the *mushtarā* (meaning bought goods), known, in Ottoman usage, as the *ishtira* (Faroqhi 1994: 535). This practice, consisting in buying from the rural population at the normal local price, was implemented by Ḥammūda Pasha during years of abundant harvest (Chérif 1986: II, 188). Sources, on the other hand, stress that, under this bey, as under his father ʿAlī Bey, a more exploitative method of acquisition of grain by the Ottoman administration (known as the *'sürsat'* in Ottoman terminology), and which consisted in buying the grain crop in advance from peasants at a very low price, was abrogated (İbn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz 1970: 366;

Chérif 1986: II, 188). The trade of grain with Europe was discontinued in years of bad harvests, as happened in 1805 and in the following years (MacGill 1815: 134)<sup>8</sup>.

Third, during the period of rule of Ḥammūda Pasha, the corso, especially during the years from 1798 to 1805 provided, through the marketing of spoils and the redemption of captives, a considerable source of revenue for the Tunisian treasury. If the state corsairs succeeded in capturing an enemy ship, the bey was entitled to the vessel and half of the goods and slaves that it contained. In the case of corso expeditions carried out by private vessels, the bey was entitled to 12.5 per cent of the goods and to one slave out of eight (Sebag 2001: 12–13). Finally, as an indirect consequence of the corso, we should include the presents (often, on the bey's demand, in the form of military equipment) and sums of money offered to the bey and to his assistants by those Christian states that had not signed capitulatory agreements with the Porte (such as Norway, the United States, Spain), as guarantees against corsair threats to their trade. The decline of the corso from 1805, added to other economic difficulties, resulting in particular from the problems to which trade with Europe was also confronted a few years later, combined to create a difficult economic conjuncture in the last years of Ḥammūda Pasha's rule.

### Conclusion

The almost total absence of the *timar* system and the relatively limited development of the *iltizām* system ensured the control of the beylical treasury on the main sources of fiscal revenues in the Regency. It reflected the influence of the Ottoman *kapı kulu* political ideal, based on a strong centralized state served by a salaried army and administration. Furthermore, as a result of the power of the beys in the fiscal realm, the latter were able to implement a taxation policy that would antagonise their subject populations as little as possible. Thus, it appears that the financial leniency that characterized the Ottoman administration in its heyday, but which was, according to historians of the Empire, abandoned after that as a result of economic difficulties and rampant corruption, still prevailed in the Regency at the end of the eighteenth century. Among the Husaynids, 'Alī Bey, in particular, was able, thanks to the considerable income derived from a favourable European trade conjuncture, to display a much-praised fiscal moderation (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 172).

Changes in the beylical fiscal policies, however, were already slowly under way during Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule. First, the adoption of the *ittifāq* for granting governorships could only induce the *ʿāmil*s to exact payments with greater severity from the *raʿiyya*, in order to repay themselves. Second, we may presume that the economic difficulties to which Tunisian trade was confronted, starting from the first decade of the nineteenth century, the heavy cost of reforms and the increased strength of the army, led the bey to tighten his fiscal control of the countryside – although Ḥammūda Pasha seems to have abided by limits that were ruthlessly transgressed by his successors.

## CONCLUSION

### The evolution of the Tunisian government from 1574 to 1814

In September 1574, the corsair-*kapudan pasha* 'Ilij Alī, with a small naval force, had accompanied the Ottoman troops sent for the conquest of Tunis under the command of the grand vizier Sinān Pasha. The expedition had thus included the original cores of the three main foci of power in the government of the new Tunisian *eyālet* that came into existence two months later: the janissaries, in their majority Muslim-born Anatolians, the corsairs, predominantly converts from Rumelia and from European countries, and the representatives of the Porte. The two most prominent officials within the latter group were the pasha, who was the supreme delegate of the sultan in Tunis, and the bey, in charge of the administrative and accountancy affairs of the province, and linked to the administration of the grand vizier.

The combination of the three *ʿaskeri* groups mentioned above constituted a distinctive feature, not only of the Tunisian provincial government, but also of those of the neighbouring provinces of Algiers and Tripoli, created earlier in the sixteenth century. There was, however, a difference in the circumstances that led to the creation of the last of the *ğarp ocakları* of the Porte, compared to its two older sisters: whereas the latter had been added to the sultan's dominions thanks to the victories scored by the corsairs fighting under the sultan's banner in the Maghrib, Tunis had been conquered by an official Ottoman expedition headed by the grand vizier. This fact enhanced the legitimacy of the rights of the Porte over that province, and gave particular leverage to its two main representatives there over the corsairs and the Anatolian janissaries. The small but fairly prosperous Tunisian *eyālet*, centred around the capital of the former Hafsid sultanate appears, indeed, to have been selected as the child and client of the Porte in the Maghrib region. Thence, the administrative organization of the new province, which

## CONCLUSION

was supervised by Sinān Pasha, was, in many of its aspects, a close replica of the central provinces of the Porte – a feature that it was to preserve during the whole of the Ottoman period. Owing to this particular bond between province and centre, the changes that affected the nature and structure of the Tunisian government from the conquest to the end of our period of concern were linked, to an important extent, to the policies of the Porte and to the evolution of the household conflicts within the central Ottoman state. At the local level, these changes reflected new balances of power between the corsairs, the janissaries and the representatives of the Porte in Tunis, or within the composition of each of these groups, as well as between the Regency and Algiers.

Considered from this dual perspective, the political and administrative evolution of the Tunisian *eyālet* may be divided into four stages.<sup>1</sup> During the first stage, extending from 1574 until 1591, the Porte proceeded to establish firmly its authority in Tunis, with the widening and almost definitive delimitation of the frontiers of the province and the elimination of the partial suzerainty exercised by the Algerian beylerbeys, before setting up a system of decentralized rule in its Maghrib territories. The second period extends from the turn of the seventeenth century, from the instauration of deylical rule until the establishment of official beylical supremacy in 1675. Several changes within the *‘askeri* structure of the province occurred during that period, first among which we should mention the considerable reduction in the prerogatives of the pasha, reduced to a mainly protocolary role. This development seems to point, at the central level, to a weakening of the sultan’s household, which benefited, or at least did not affect the position of the grand vizier’s household.<sup>2</sup> Other important local factors contributed more clearly to the rise of the beys and to the transition from a deylical regime to beylical rule, resulting from the constant weakening of the Anatolians. The latter, who stood as the local representatives of the Turkish *sipāhis* within the Ottoman state, had, since the creation of the Tunisian province, been deprived of the financial autonomy enjoyed by their central counterparts, due to the almost total absence of the *timar* system there. From the end of the sixteenth century on, moreover, they were, first, confronted to the rise of the *‘azabs*, then of the *kulughlis* (as a result of the implementation of central policies concerning the janissaries) within the *jund*. Furthermore, the Malekites, placed under the jurisdiction of the bey, soon emerged as an increasingly powerful economic and military force in the province. Finally, the development of the corso,

## CONCLUSION

which was the prime vocation assigned to the *ğarp ocakları* as defenders of the western frontier of the Empire, led to the gaining of considerable political influence by the European renegades, whether corsair captains or *mamlūks*. The renegades were allied, and even fused with beylical power during that period, since the founder of the first beylical dynasty in the Regency, Murād, was of European origin. The third stage, extending from 1675 until 1702, was marked by conflicts in the Regency, and between the Regency and its neighbours. Several changes in the Tunisian formula of government, attempted through the active involvement, or the support, of the Porte, or of the most influential factions within it, during that confused period, such as: establishing a beylical diumvirate, increasing the power of the pasha (the Muhammad al-Ḥāfī episode) and of the dey, failed.

Finally, the fourth stage, extending from 1702 to 1814, may be divided into two periods. In the first period, ending by 1763, with the quenching of Ismaīl ibn Yūnis's revolt by 'Alī Bey, which marked the final triumph of the Husaymid dynasty, household conflicts, resulting in wars and rebellions, strongly persisted, whether at the regional level or within the Regency. This stage, nonetheless, saw the emergence of many important developments affecting the government of the Regency and reflecting changes at the central level. Foremost among them we should mention the fusion between the functions of bey and pasha in Tunis, which had started in 1703 – although the two functions were dissociated again, for reasons dictated by the local political conjuncture, from 1705 until towards 1740 – and suggests the establishment of a stronger coordination between the households of the sultan and the grand vizier in Istanbul.<sup>3</sup> This evolution was reflected in an increasing centralization and strengthening of beylical power, which made the fundamental opposition between the Rumelian bey and the Anatolian dey an increasingly unequal one.<sup>4</sup> Second, it is important to note the weakening of the European renegades within the government of the Regency, which had already started since the end of the seventeenth century, due to the slackening of the corso, as a direct consequence of the peace treaties signed by the Porte with a number of Christian countries. The weakening of the renegades seems to have been also part of a systematic policy of the Ottoman Porte against the frontier culture of which these renegades were a crucial element, and the danger represented by European influence on the Tunisian government. The prestigious status attached to converts was, thenceforth, limited to those originating

## CONCLUSION

from the Empire: by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Muradite beys, of renegade origin, were eliminated, and were succeeded by the Husaynids, descending from an Ottoman *mamlūk*.

The trends described above were intensified and accelerated in the second period, and particularly under the rule of Ḥammūda Pasha (1777–1814), under the impact of the reforms policy adopted by the Porte, closely copied in the Regency. The weakening of the renegades, which led to their marginalization within the army and government, and, with them, the weakening of the frontier culture went in parallel with the assertion of the Turkish language as the administrative language in one part, at least, of Ḥammūda Pasha's government. Furthermore, the growing awareness that the corso was drawing to an end – in spite of a temporary regain of its activity at the turn of the nineteenth century – also led to reforming the Tunisian navy, in the context of the military reforms implemented in the Empire. As concerns the Anatolians, their increased emigration to the Regency suggests a will to intensify and accelerate the mixing of populations within the Empire. The Anatolians, however, although they were allocated a share in the stock of power and wealth provided by the Tunisian administration, resented being systematically excluded from the most lucrative and influential positions in that institution. These posts were reserved for the Ottoman *mamlūks* and the Malekite *sarrājs* of the beylical household, and to some *makhāzinis*, who thus constituted particularly privileged groups within the Regency's government – as was the case, though possibly to a lesser degree, for the *kapı kulus* and other servants of the sultan's household in the central Ottoman government (Kunt 1983: 250).

Finally, one of the main achievements of Ḥammūda Pasha's period of rule was the elimination of the partial suzerainty exercised by Algiers on Tunis since 1756, and which had, for a time, thwarted the relationship between the bey and the Porte at the end of the eighteenth century. The evolution of the Algerian government from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century had been radically different from that of the Tunisian one. Algiers, which had been the starting-point for the conquest of the Maghrib by the Muslim corsairs, beginning with the prestigious Khayr al-Dīn, remained the stronghold of these naval fighters even after the decline of the corso, and managed to preserve, at least in part, its strong connection with the central admiralty – a centre of frequent dissidence from the authority of the Porte. Furthermore, the deylical regime established in 1670 in that province (where it

## CONCLUSION

continued until the French occupation of Algiers in 1830) was underlain by the power of the Anatolians in the province. These fighters continued to emigrate in great numbers to Algiers, and, in contrast to their Tunisian neighbours, managed to block access to their ranks by the *kulughlis*. The corsair–Anatolian regime, which managed, in 1756, to impose the restoration of the former Algerian domination over Tunis, drew its strength from its alliance with other forces, which formed, at the central level and across the Empire, a strong coalition against Selīm III and his reforms policy at the end of the eighteenth century. The defeat of the Algerians by Ḥammūda Pasha’s army in 1807 marked, for the Porte, an important step on the way to subduing traditional centres of opposition to its authority. Nothing definitive, however, had been achieved, as attested by the 1811 Turkish uprising in Tunis.



## APPENDIX A

### Bayram's ranking list of government offices in the Regency

#### *The wālī (pasha-bey)*

- 1 the *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'* (guardian of the seal)
- 2 the *ra'īs al-kuttāb*, or *bāsh kātib* (head of the chancery)
- 3 the *khaznadār* (head treasurer)
- 4 the *bāsh āgha* of the *Arab ṣubāyḥis*
- 5 the *kāhiya* (main lieutenant) of the bey
- 6 the *amīn al-tarsikhāna* (commissioner in charge of the arsenal)
- 7 the two *bāsh ḥānbas*
- 8 the *bāsh qāzāq*, or *bāsh mamlūk*
- 9 the dey
- 10 the *shaykh al-madīna* (mayor of Tunis)
- 11 the *āgha* of the Qasbah and the *āgha al-kursi*
- 12 the *ra'īs majlis al-tijāra* (head of the guilds)
- 13 the *kāhiya* of the *dār al-bāshā*

This list of 13 military and administrative offices in the Regency, probably copied from an Ottoman *salnāme* – the *salnāmes* being statistical and descriptive yearbooks issued by the Porte, containing, in particular, official statistical and administrative information on the various provinces of the Empire – is included in the *Ṣafwat al-itibār*, written around 1860–5, by the Tunisian scholar Muḥammad Bayram al-Khāmis. The list has also often been used by contemporary historians in their studies of the government of pre-colonial Tunisia, particularly from the mid-nineteenth century. The review of the main offices in Ḥammūda Pasha's government, made in this study, shows, however, that the ranking order provided by Bayram's list may also be considered as applicable to the period of our concern. Furthermore, based, among other things, on the fact that this list is headed by the *ṣāhib al-ṭābi'*, who only acceded to political supremacy at the beginning of Ḥammūda Pasha's rule, we may infer that this ranking order for the main office-holders in the Tunisian government was inaugurated at that period.

## APPENDIX B

### Rural land tenure and taxation in the Ottoman Empire and in the Regency

The division of the arable lands of Rumelia, with their immense wheat-growing plains, and of those of many regions in Anatolia, by the central administration, was based on the unit called *çift* (Djurdev 1960; Yapp 1987: 19–22; Inalcik 1994: 121–31). This term, of Persian origin, and meaning ‘a pair of oxen’, designated the measure of land that could be cultivated by this animal force during one season, and, by extension, a farm or estate whose boundaries were defined by that measure (*çiftlik*). The surface covered by a *çiftlik*, however, varied according to each area and the fertility of the soil, and might thus range from five to 15 hectares.

There were two main categories of *çiftliks*, according to the type of tenure under which they were held. The privileged category was that of the *muqāṭāʿalu çiftliks*, which enjoyed various exemptions from taxes. They included, first, the *ʿaskeri çiftliks*, given to *sipāhis* for their own cultivation, or granted to the semi-*ʿaskeri* tribes, such as the *yayas* and *müsellems*. Many of them were set up on land that had been abandoned for a long time, or had never been cultivated before (*mawāt*), and the Ottoman government, anxious to increase the area of arable lands and to develop agricultural activities in the Empire, encouraged their multiplication (Inalcik 1994: 121–31). Those who exploited them were, in conformity with the Islamic tradition, granted the privilege of enjoying full proprietary rights over them (*mulk*). The other type of *muqāṭāʿalu çiftlik* were those rented by the government to village communities, urbanites or rich peasants, who held these lands as *iltizāms*, paying in return for them tithes or sums agreed upon with the treasury. All the *muqāṭāʿalu çiftliks*, with the exception of those belonging

to the *yayas* and *müsellems*, were generally not directly cultivated by their tenants, but were left to the care of wage-labourers and sharecroppers.

The second, and statistically more important, category of *çiftliks* was constituted by the *râiyya çiftliks*, cultivated by peasants under the terms of what was called a *tapu* contract. This contract imposed on the peasant the duty of tilling the land and paying taxes on it, while granting him, in return, the right to transmit his *çiftlik* to his descendants, or to transfer his cultivation rights to another peasant. Many of these *çiftliks*, in the early period of the Empire, constituted part of the 'prebendal' territories of *sipâhis*, on which they were entitled to collect the taxes paid by peasants. After the decline of the feudal system, the landholder, in the majority of cases, was the state itself. Taxes paid by peasants for the *râiyya çiftliks* thus became the main source of revenue for the Ottoman central treasury. A debate is going on, in Ottoman historiography, about the nature and evolution of this *çiftlik*. Halil İnalcık, in particular, has contested the thesis held by some on the gradual fragmentation of *çiftliks* between the successive descendants of the original *tapu* holders. He insists on the Ottoman government's efforts to prevent this land fragmentation, concluding that, although some peasant households might live off two *çiftliks* or half a *çiftlik*, 'normal-sized *râiyyet çiftliks* typically made up the state-owned lands throughout Asia Minor and the Balkans' (İnalcık 1994: 148).

The main elements of the Ottoman land tenure system described above were rigorously replicated, under a different terminology, in the Tunisian Regency. The close similarity between the two systems is illustrated, first of all, by the perfect linguistic correspondence between the Ottoman word '*çiftlik*', and the Arabic word '*māshīya*', used in the Regency. The term '*māshīya*', originally meaning 'cattle', came to designate 'the surface of land that (could) be tilled by a plough'. This surface which, as in the rest of the Empire, varied according to regions and to the quality of the soil, might extend between eight and 12, or more, hectares, in the Regency (Dozy 1881). The term *māshīya* was also used to designate, by extension, tax-imposable estates delimited by that measure, and on which different taxation rates were imposed. Fiscal documents from the Muradite period distinguish between three types of *māshīya*: *ʿarbī* (lands cultivated by the Arabs, or Beduins), *mulk al-baldīyya* (lands owned by rich Malekites from the capital), or *mulk al-atrāk* (owned by the Turks) (Bachrouch 1972: 130).

In common usage, however, the cereal-growing estates in particular were designated by the term '*hanshīr*', which appears to be a joining together of two Turkish words, distorted by the local pronunciation: '*hāne*', or '*hāne*' (place) and '*çift*'. The *hanshīrs* were divided, like the *çifts*, into various categories. There were, first, those corresponding to the '*askeri çiftliks*', such as the *hanshīr* offered by Aḥmad Bey (1837–53) to the *muftī* (supreme religious dignitary in the Regency) Ibrāhīm al-Riyāḥī (Pellissier 1980: 195), according to the conditions defined for the granting of waste lands for cultivation to private individuals in the Ottoman Empire. The land granted, on a tax-exemption basis, to the powerful Abū Ghānim tribe in the first stages of the Ottoman conquest was also, presumably, of a similar nature (Pellissier 1980: 181). These *hanshīrs* carved out of previously untilled and unexploited land seem to have been common in the Regency, thence the coining of the verb '*hanshara*', meaning: 'to let a garden, or orchard, go to waste' (Marçais and Guiga 1960–1: II, 4191, quoted by Valensi 1977: 177).

There were other privileged *hanshīrs*, cultivated by *khammāsa*, or sharecroppers, and which paid only minimal taxes. Among them were those owned by rich families of Ottoman (also, of Malekite) origin in the fertile Majirda valley, or the *hanshīr* that 'Uthmān Dey had seized and appropriated to himself in the Sāhil, after driving away from there the tribe of the Mathālīth (Poncet 1960: 138). These *hanshīrs* lay in lands that had been tilled and cultivated since before the Ottoman conquest. In the case of the last of them, at least, the land had been abandoned, or alleged to be so, after the forced departure of its original occupiers, and therefore was considered to be waste land. The amalgamation between abandoned lands and waste land would have thus constituted a legal loophole that enabled some new Ottoman occupiers of Tunisian lands to enjoy full proprietary rights on them. It seems, however, that the illegality of the appropriation of 'Uthmān Dey's *hanshīr*, or at least of its subsequent tenure by his descendants, was ulteriorly raised by the beylical government, since in 1724, the dey's granddaughter, 'Azīza 'Uthmāna, resorted to an expedient for averting the danger of confiscation by turning the land into a *waqf* (or, in common Maghrib usage, a *ḥabs*, or *ḥabūs*) (Poncet 1960: 147–8). This practice, dating from early Islamic times, consisted in dedicating the usufruct of a land to charitable work, while guaranteeing, in return, that it should remain in the ultimate possession of the descendants of the original owner. The number of *waqfs* increased considerably

in North Africa during the Ottoman period, as in the other Arab provinces (Yapp 1987: 19–20). There were also the *hansbîrs* of the bey, which were of two types. Some, such as the *hansbîr* of Wislātiyya, were cultivated by sharecroppers, while others were conceded as *iltizām* to *shaykhs*, tribal communities, or officials. Among these I would mention the *hansbîr* of Siliāna.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, lands cultivated by tribes, especially in the wheat-growing region traversed by the *maḥalla* (which were probably those designated in fiscal documents as the *māshiya ʿarbī* lands, mentioned above), corresponded to the *rāiyya çiftliks*. We may presume that the collective mode of ownership and land exploitation by tribes ensured that no fragmentation of these *māshiyas* took place. In the case of nomadic tribes living solely by cattle-rearing, they probably also had some rights over the pasture land used by them, in return for the payment of dues, as was the case in the core provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

In addition to the *māshya*, used for wheat-growing lands, other measures were adopted for landholdings, according to the type of crops cultivated, and even according to regions. Thus, the *marjaʿ*, which was only applied, according to Bachrouh, in the Sāhil region, and which applied in particular to olive or almond groves, is described in an archival document as ‘measured by means of the rope known as the rope of the *dāwān*, measuring 50 Arab elbow-lengths’ (Bachrouh 1972: 132; Valensi 1977: 180). In this context also, the term ‘*jidār*’, designating small plots of land in the oases of the al-Jarīd region, deserves some attention. The word occurs in particular in a contract stipulating the transfer of a *jidār* from one individual to another, which has been studied by Abdelhamid Hénia (Hénia 1980: 65–6). The contract is formulated in fairly similar terms to another, quoted by Inalcik, on a similar transaction concerning a *tapu çiftlik* in the heart of the Empire (Inalcik 1994: 109). In both texts, it appears clearly that the transfer was not a sale, and that it implied a transfer of the duty of paying the taxes attached to the land.<sup>2</sup> From this, we may conclude that the *jidārs* were a variety of small-sized *rāiyya çiftliks*. Concerning the etymology of the word ‘*jidār*’, I would therefore suggest that it was constituted by joining together of ‘*jī*’, which represented the local distortion ‘*çift*’, and ‘*dār*’, which I have defined, in an earlier chapter of this study, as the fortieth part of a whole.<sup>3</sup> The measure encompassed by a *jidār* would stand in that ratio compared to the *māshiya-çiftlik*.

In the heart of the Ottoman Empire, the *çiftlik* underlay the *çift-hāne* system, which constituted the basis of the Ottoman taxation

system of the *ra'iyya* peasant population. According to Inalcik, the *çift-hāne* was: 'a combination of three elements: fields forming a certain unit workable by a team of oxen and used to grow grains; the family household which provided labour; and a team of oxen as tractation power' (Inalcik 1994: 146).

In the Tunisian Regency, the system of *zamālas* established among tribes appears to be the local equivalent of the Ottoman *çift-hānes*. Abdelhamid Hénia thus offers the following definition of the *zamāla*, which includes the three elements listed by Inalcik in his definition of *çift-hānes*: land, household and ploughing team (or cattle): 'a fiscal unit aiming at bringing under the same common denominator taxable items of varied kinds: men, households (*bayts*), cattle (10 cows, or 50 sheep), arable land (1 or 2 *māshiyas*)' (Hénia 1980: 75).

The *zamālas* were not equally taxed across the country, which implies that there were different categories of tribes classified according to their degree of wealth, just as, in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, the population was divided into three groups: rich, middling and poor, for taxation purposes.

# NOTES

## SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY ON OTTOMAN TUNISIA

- 1 A number of these sources have been used for this research. See, for instance, Du Castel 1628; MacGill 1811; Béranger 1979; Pellissier 1980; Frank and Marcel 1987; Peyssonnel 1987; Pückler-Muskau 1989.
- 2 On these, and other studies by this author, see Pignon 1965: 29–35.
- 3 Note C.-A. Julien's warning that Rousseau should be read with 'great caution' (Julien 1952: 350).
- 4 The preface to Hugon's book was written by Gabrielle Alapetite, who was the French *résident-général* in Tunis from 1894 to 1900.
- 5 In spite of its title, Serres' study deals much more with the diplomatic rivalry between France and Britain in the North African region at that period than with the policy of the Ottoman Porte.
- 6 Several articles by Mantran reflect this concern to study the links between the Tunisian Regency (and the Maghrib provinces as a whole) and the Ottoman Empire (see Mantran 1957, 1959, 1965).
- 7 This author states that Tunisian historiography has expounded an interpretative theory on the Ottoman period of Tunisia, centred on the concept of political autonomy and of a dominating social group, adding: 'If we exclude the – rather far-fetched – assumption that totally new sources might be discovered one day . . ., we may assert that our knowledge of that period has reached a limit' (Bachrouh 1987: 78–9).

## 1 FROM THE CONQUEST TO DEYLICAL RULE (1574–1647)

- 1 Tales of these profanities included: tying the horses of Spanish soldiers to the pillars of the Zitūna mosque, throwing into the streets the book-cases of that venerable institution, and profaning the tomb of the most revered holy man in Tunis, Sidī Mihriz ibn Khalaf, who then appeared in a dream to Sultan Selim I, urging him to conquer Tunis (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 175–6, 178).
- 2 Ibn Abī Dīnār thus mentions that Khayr al-Dīn, during his brief period of rule in Tunis, exiled a well-known religious personality of that city

- (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 163). The same author also states that ‘Ilij ‘Alī’s troops, after being driven out of Tunis in 1572, sought shelter in the small coastal town of Ḥammāmāt, but were denied it by the local population. Later they went back to the town and took their revenge on its inhabitants (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 177). These critical mentions, however brief, contrast with the author’s hagiographic account of Sinān Pasha’s military expedition, aimed at stressing the impeccable Ottoman credentials of the grand vizier.
- 3 ‘Sinān Pasha appointed some local notables to sit in the *dīwān*, to win their hearts’ (Ibn Abī’l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 27).
  - 4 On that period, sources tell us succinctly that, before the rule of ‘Uthmān Dey, which started towards 1598, Ibrāhīm Rūdeslī and Mūsā precariously held the deylcate for one year each (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 200–1).
  - 5 See the description of the corps of deys by the Venetian dragoman Salvalo in 1625: ‘[Le dey] marche avec une suite de quarante à cinquante hommes, tous aimés et tous aspirant au même grade’ (Grandchamp 1967: II, 482). The number of 40 deys within the *jund*, which had risen, at that period, to 4,000, confirms the assertion by al-Wazīr, mentioned above, that each dey commanded 100 janisaries.
  - 6 The value of the presents sent to the main officials in the Regency – such as those sent by the consuls and magistrates of Marseilles in 1629 – ranged according to that hierarchy (Bachrouch 1977: 47).
  - 7 Following the 1524 uprising in Egypt, the grand vizier Ibrāhīm Pasha paid a visit to the province and promulgated a new *qānūnnāme* (Holt 1968: 81).
  - 8 Mention of the Tunisian *‘azabs* can be found in two eighteenth-century sources: in Ibn Yūsuf’s chronicle (Ibn Yūsuf 1998: 31), and in a popular dirge expressing, according to some, the complaint of the Wislātīs of the brutalities to which they were subjected by the *ḥānbas* (guard) of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī in 1728, in punishment for their support of ‘Alī Pasha (Chérif 1986: I, 67, note 288).
  - 9 The pasha and the *dīwān* were, thus, the signatories of a treaty signed between the Regency and France in 1665 (Rousseau 1985: 480).
  - 10 The assistance was discontinued after two years, according to al-Wazīr, ‘because it was too heavy a burden on this Muslim population of limited means’ (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 408).
  - 11 Some sources confirm that the island was an appanage of the sultan’s mother (Chérif 1986: I, 154).
  - 12 See p. 46, p. 55 and p. 56.
  - 13 This official, in the Ottoman Empire, was called the Surveyor (Inalcik 1994: 135–8).
  - 14 There was also, at the same period, an increase in the number of Egyptian beys, which rose from 12 to 30, then to 40 (Winter 1992: 48).
  - 15 ‘[Before Ramaḍān’s permanent appointment at the head of the *maḥalla*], different successive military commanders obtained the *iltizām* of the *maḥalla*, which created great confusion’ (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 227).



## 2 HOUSEHOLD POLITICS AND BEYLICAL RULE (1631–1777)

- 1 'Alī Huwwa, the first of these *tarjumāns*, according to Ibn Abī Dīnār, 'had nurtured the vain hope of obtaining the leadership of the *maḥalla*' (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 213). The author adds that Huwwa had enjoyed the protection of the pasha, although it is impossible to know whether he was referring, by that designation, to Ḥammūda Bey himself (who obtained the title of pasha at some stage), or to a pasha sent by the Porte (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 213). On the second *tarjumān*, the French consul in Tunis wrote to his government in 1666:

Le Pacha reigning avait attiré le Dey à son parti, et, s'étant plaint à lui d'un ancien truchement, disant qu'il était l'espion (de Ḥammūda Bey), le Dey lui avait permis de le mettre aux arrêts, de le spolier de tous ses biens et ensuite de le faire pendre, ce qui avait si fort surpris le vieux pacha (i.e. Ḥammūda Bey) qu'on croit qu'il en est mort d'appréhension.

(quoted by Bachrouch 1977: 171)

- 2 This dey was a former corsair captain (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 433). His relation to the bey confirms my previous suggestion about the links between the corsairs and the *'azabs*, to which the beys belonged. In addition to this, the fact that he was deposed by the *diwān* may be seen as evidence that his appointment to the deylicate had contravened Ottoman legality, as has been also suggested in the preceding chapter of this study.
- 3 Ṭābāq was also a former corsair (al-Wazīr 1985: II, 462). On his appointment to the deylicate by 'Alī Bey and his entering the capital, Ibn Abī Dīnār perfidiously remarks that 'some looked askance at him, while others saw in him the signs of authentic authority' (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 224).
- 4 Baqtāsh Dey was succeeded by 'Alī Re'is (1686–94), who was the last corsair-dey of the Regency.
- 5 Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf was the first among the rulers of the Maghrib regencies to obtain the title of pasha. The second was the Algerian dey in 1710, and the third was Aḥmad Qaramanli, founder of the first beylical dynasty in Tripoli in 1712.
- 6 See pp. 54–8.
- 7 It should also be noted that, at the same period, the post of *āgha* could also lead to the deylical title. This was the case for the *āgha* Deli Muḥammad (1699–1701) who had assisted Murād III in taking power (Ibn Abī'l-Diyāf 1963–6: 272), and received the title of dey, but was later deposed for trying to increase his authority in the Regency (Raymond 1960: 134), and for Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf who became both bey and dey.
- 8 See the name of this *qā'id* in the list of the members of 'Alī ibn Murād's household, in Box 2.1.
- 9 This led to the signing of a peace treaty between the Regency and Austrian representatives, accompanied by two *kapıcıs*. The provisions of the treaty applied to all Austrian subjects, 'Germans, inhabitants of

- the Austrian Netherlands, of the Atlantic coast, of the Sicilian, Neapolitan, Calabrese territories and their dependencies, of Fiume and Trieste, along the Adriatic sea, and all the others, whatever their nation or creed' (Rousseau 1985: 107).
- 10 On the economic difficulties of that period, which he attributes to an 'unfavourable Mediterranean conjuncture', see Chérif 1986: II, 11–12. According to the historian J. Parry, on the other hand '[from 1719 on, under the reign of Sultan Aḥmad III], there is reason to believe that the Empire had already entered a new cycle of inflation. At Cairo . . . there were serious disturbances in 1721' (Parry 1976: 216). We should also note that, in 1730, the deteriorating economic conditions in Istanbul were an important factor in the bloody revolt led by Patrona Halil, which resulted in the resignation of Sultan Aḥmad III in favour of his nephew Maḥmūd I – which sheds a striking light on 'Alī Pasha's victory in the Regency in 1735.
- 11 The historian Charles Roux has reported this information, on the basis of reports sent by a French military expert, named Tringano, to his government (Roux 1932: 274–80).

### 3 THE WARS AND ALLIANCES OF ḤAMMŪDA PASHA

- 1 This issue reflected concerns that were contemporary to Aḥmad ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's time, since in 1835, the Tunisian government had applied to the Porte to get the appointment of a member of the Husaynid family at the head of the Tripoli administration. The application was turned down (Raymond 1994: II, 89–90).
- 2 In the meanwhile, the Porte preserved its official neutrality towards the two Regencies. In a firman dated November 1807, the Sultan exhorted the rulers of Algiers and Tunis to put a stop to their quarrels and turn, instead, to holy war against the Infidels (Chater 1984: 36n.).
- 3 This dey was forced to drink poison (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 50). This was, according to some sources, the mode of execution of Djezā'irli Pasha in 1791 (Mordtmann-Kuran 1971).
- 4 See, for instance, Chérif 1977: 121.
- 5 See a letter sent by the French *chargé d'affaires* in Tunis, Billon, to his government on 28 August 1810: 'Le gouvernement tunisien est devenu tout à fait marchand. Il fait enlever aux enchères publiques tous les marchés qui sont à sa convenance et il essaie d'intimider les concurrents' (Plantet 1893: III, 489).
- 6 André Raymond, in a very interesting article, has studied the origins and occupations of the Tunisian and Maghrib communities established in Cairo in the eighteenth century (Raymond 1959: 335–71).

### 4 THE PASHA-BEY OF TUNIS

- 1 The original text of the petition, written in Turkish (document 3), is accompanied by a translation into Arabic, written at a later period (document 3 bis).

- 2 A document in the Tunisian government archives (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 349, document 1) gives a list of the presents sent by Hammūda Pasha on the occasion of the 1795 embassy to Istanbul, with their beneficiaries. The latter, 34 in number, include the sultan, the grand vizier, the *shaykh al-islām* (the main Islamic religious authority in Istanbul), the *kapudan pasha*, the sultan's sword-bearer, the representative of the *āgha* of the sultan's mother, the bearer of the sultan's caftan and the stables supervisor.
- 3 See in particular the description of 'Alī Bey's ceremony of investiture in 'Abd al 'Azīz 1970: 46. See also descriptions of the ceremonies of investiture or reconfirmation of investiture for Hammūda Pasha, Maḥmūd Bey (1815–24) and Ḥusayn Bey (1824–35) in Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 177; III, 122, 156, 179.
- 4 The firmans of renewal of investiture addressed in the nineteenth century to Maḥmūd Bey and Ḥusayn Bey (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 340, documents 13 and 29), as well as a letter from the grand vizier announcing the sending of a firman of renewal of investiture to Mustāfa Bey (1835–7) (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 343, document 3) are all dated from the beginning of *Shawwāl*.
- 5 This detail is mentioned in the letter from the grand vizier, mentioned in the note above.
- 6 See the study of the signets and seals of the Husaynid beys in Hugon 1913: 25–53.
- 7 The opening formula of the firmans has also been studied by Mantran (Mantran 1957: 343).
- 8 The title '*ṣāhib (kursī)*', used in particular in treaties signed with France by 'Alī Bey and Hammūda Pasha, has been translated in these treaties as 'Seigneur et Possesseur (de Tunis la bien-gardée)' (Rousseau 1985: 499, 504).
- 9 The denomination of Ifrīqiya, originating from the name 'Africa' given by the Romans to their colony on Carthaginian soil, was preserved under subsequent rules, including the Ottoman administration, who used it in reference to the Tunisian *eyālet*. In a treaty signed with France in 1830, the expression '*ṣāhib memleket Ifrīqiya*', designating Ḥusayn Bey has been translated, pompously (and wrongly) as 'maître du royaume d'Afrique' (Rousseau 1985: 514).
- 10 Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, describing 'Alī Pasha's seat, uses the adjective '*kisrāwī*', from the Persian '*khusrū*', meaning sultan (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 28), whereas Ibn Yūsuf informs us that it was brought 'from the land of the Christians' (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 227).
- 11 Gibb and Bowen have provided an invaluable detailed description of the sultan's household, followed by a briefer one of the grand vizier's (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 328–64).
- 12 For a description of the bey's court of justice, see Bayram no date: I, part two, 131–3.
- 13 The *shūlāqs* are mentioned in a seventeenth-century European source, where they are designated as 'la garde du vice-roi, ou Solachis' (Grandchamp 1937: II, 481).

- 14 The suggestion I make concerning the difference between the Turkish and the Arab sections of the *ṣubāyhis* and *ḥānbas* is based on information provided by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf: when Aḥmad Bey (1837–53) set up a new army corps, most probably in implementation of the Ottoman *tanẓimāt* of that period, he integrated within that corps the Turkish *ṣubāyhis*, the Turkish *ḥānbas* and the *mamlūks*. The author further states that the Arab *sipāhis* and the Arab *ḥānbas* were not included within the new corps, for 'they (were) the cavalry of the province' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: IV, 30).
- 15 The English traveller Thomas MacGill describes Stinca as 'a spy in the pay of the French' (MacGill 1815: 106).
- 16 This precision is important. It is mentioned, for instance, in the Notebook of the *jund* (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 169, Dossier 895), to which I shall frequently refer in the following chapter of this study, that Ḥammūda Pasha was inscribed in the 41st janissary *dār*, with his 11 sons. This obviously referred to the bey's *mamlūks*, since he only had one son, who died in his infancy. There are several other instances where the *mamlūks* are designated as the beys' sons in sources on the Regency.

## 5 THE ARMY

- 1 The *tābi's* of the bey are mentioned in a few Tunisian sources (e.g. al-Wazīr 1985: II, 505, and the Notebook of the *jund*, contained in Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 169, Dossier 895 bis). As concerns the term '*sarrāj*', we know at least two Malekite officials who were thus denominated in the eighteenth century: Muḥammad al-Wazīr al-Sarrāj al-Andalusī, chronicler and secretary of the bey Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, and 'Alī al-Murābiṭ, governor of Qayrawān in Ḥammūda Pasha's time (Raymond 1994: II, 155).
- 2 Thus, in 1605, M. de Brèves, envoy of the French king to the Regency, mentions 'un régiment d'Andalous grenadins ou tanagrins' (du Castel 1628: 359).
- 3 Cf. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf:

If he (Ḥammūda Pasha) saw a sturdy young man of the populace, he would say to him: 'Your father is a Turk, and he died without registering you in the *jund*, and you and your brothers left it that way, in order to avoid serving in the army.' The young man would answer, 'My Lord, I am the son of So-and-so,' at which the *ḥānba* officers would pretend that he lied and would testify that his father was called Uzun Aḥmad, or Deli Bāsh.

(Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 54)

- 4 Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's account of the period of rule of Ḥammūda Pasha contains one single explicit mention of an increase in the numbers of the Tunisian *jund*: '[In 1809], the bey added 100 *dārs* to the *jund*, numbering 2,500 men' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 50).
- 5 The fact that the pages of the Notebook are not numbered makes it difficult to use it for precise references. Most of the observations drawn

- from it, however, apply to the two pages of that document that relate to the time of Ḥammūda Pasha.
- 6 The term '*jamā'a*', commonly used in Egyptian sources, recurs several times in the Notebook of the *jund*. All other Tunisian sources use it sparingly (it is mentioned once by Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 202), as is also the case for the term '*ṭā'ifa*'.
  - 7 The same observation is made by Shaw concerning the organization of the Egyptian Ottoman army (Shaw 1962: 201).
  - 8 The *serden-geçtis* are mentioned in the petition sent in 1816 by the *dīwān* to the sultan (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 346, document 3).
  - 9 In the Notebook of the *jund*, the lieutenant of the *bulūk bāshī* is designated either as *wakīl* or, less frequently, as *yāmāq*. Note also that Salvago, who visited the Regency in the seventeenth century, mentions these two functions together: 'Le Janissaire, après avoir rempli les fonctions de cuisinier et de dépensier . . .' (Grandchamp 1937: II, 481).
  - 10 An eighteenth-century Tunisian source describes the *īshshīs* as 'an unruly *ṭā'ifa*' (Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz 1974: 375). One of the deys of the Algerian Regency in the time of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī was called 'Ishshī Mustāfa.
  - 11 The Tunisian *āya bāshīs* are mentioned in the petition to the sultan mentioned earlier (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 220, Dossier 346, document 3). They are also described riding in front of their *āgha* by a seventeenth-century source (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 301). Their Ottoman counterparts, the *yaya başıs*, were the unit commanders of the *cema'at* division of the imperial janissary corps. They enjoyed special privileges, such as riding in front of their *āğa* and, when on frontier duty, kept the key of the fortress (Uzunçarşılı 1965).
  - 12 Cf. Ḥammūda Pasha's remark on the *bulūk bāshīs*: 'These people, in the *dīwān*, are called *ikhtiyār*' (quoted by Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 56–7).
  - 13 Aḥmad Khūja Dey and Sha'bān Khūja Dey, in the seventeenth century, were two former *bāsh khūjas* of the *dīwān*.
  - 14 Thus, one of the main *kābiyas* of the Regency, Mustāfa Khūja, is designated in a treaty signed with France as 'the beloved son of Ḥammūda Pasha', which meant that he was his *mamlūk* (Rousseau 1985: 506).
  - 15 See below the list of the main *kābiyas* under Ḥammūda Pasha, and their successors.
  - 16 In 1792, the bey paid the ransoms of four Tunisians enslaved in Cagliari; in 1797, 20 Tunisians were set free against 30 Venetians, and in 1799, 82 Tunisians were set free against 22 Sicilians (Plantet 1898: III, 337, 392, 465).
  - 17 A French officer who visited the Regency in 1734, states: 'Quand on châtie un Turc, on lui donne la bastonnade entre la fontaine du milieu de la salle et le président (du divan). Les courouglis sont bastonnés de l'autre côté, tout près de la fontaine' (La Condamine 1898: 86). As concerns capital punishment for the janissaries, this was carried out by a special method of strangulation in the hands of Christian slaves (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 56–7; Raymond 1994: III, 118–19).

- 18 'The bey almost exclusively reserved the stewardships of religious schools, holy sites, and the *amānas* of guilds for the *bulūk bāshīs*, as if there could be no *amīns* in the land except them' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 57). Note the play on the two meanings of the word '*amīn*' ('steward' and 'honest').
- 19 Thus, in the first half of the seventeenth century, a French source described the *zuwāwa* in Tunis as the dey's own military force (Abun-Nasr 1975: 73, 77). At the same period, the *zuwāwa* cavalymen in provincial districts were under the command of Ḥammūda Bey the Muradite (Ibn Abī Dīnār 1967: 236).
- 20 Cf. Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf's mitigated appraisal of the *zuwāwa*: 'They are (however) alien to civilised ways and sadly lacking in discipline and obedience to their commanders' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: III, 122). Cf. also Ibn Yūsuf, on the distribution of cash bonuses to the *zuwāwa*: 'les khodjas . . . firent l'appel nominal des zouaouas et leur dirent: "Mettez-vous en rang comme les Turcs, sans vous pousser, vous disputer ni vous battre"' (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 60).
- 21 See a letter of application by the named Maḥmūd asking to be admitted into the *subāyhi* corps as a successor to his father (Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 169, Dossier 895, document 102).

## 6 CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

- 1 Ḥammūda ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (a *kātib*), Šāliḥ Būghdīr (an officer of the Arab *subāyhis*) and Qāsim al-Bawwāb (head doorkeeper), were granted this *iltizām* in Ḥammūda Pasha's time (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 90, 145).
- 2 An eighteenth-century source also reports that, in the time of Muḥammad Bey (1756–9), the *bāsh kātib* Aḥmad al-Aṣram was sent forward, at the head of a detachment from the *maḥalla*, 'vested with full powers', to collect taxes in al-Jarīd (Ibn Yūsuf 1978: 404).
- 3 The term '*waṭan*' could also be used to refer to some of these provincial divisions, as in the designations: Waṭan al-Qiblī (the Cap Bon), Waṭan al-Riyāḥ (a tribe whose territory extended south of Ḥammāmāt), or Waṭan al-A'rād (in the south-east of the Regency). As for the word '*sanjaq*', of Ottoman origin, it seems to have fallen into obsolescence after the seventeenth century, becoming restricted to documents of an administrative nature.
- 4 Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf adds, by way of comment: 'Thus, they would have witnessed the complaints of the *ra'iyya* from the '*amīls*, and Ḥammūda's harshness in dealing with the latter' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: 83–4).
- 5 In 1735, a visitor to the Regency reports that peasants were forced to work on the land of the *qā'id* of Ḥammāmāt (Grenville 1835: II, 274).
- 6 Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf thus writes of Ibn 'Ayyād, the governor of al-A'rād: 'Drums were beaten in his presence and flags fluttered above his head' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 103).

- 7 One of the *khaznadārs* of Murād Bey III (1698–1702) was Abu'l Qāsim Aḥmad al-Ḥanafī, i.e. the Hanefite (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: II, 80). Another Hanefite *khaznadār* was Ḥasan Khaznadār, who was appointed to that office for a brief period in 1815, before acceding to the deylcate (Brown 1974: 103). His successor was the the Malekite al-ʿArbī Zarrūq.
- 8 The execution of Shākīr Ṣaḥīb al-Ṭābīʿ on the order of Muṣṭafa Bey in 1837, on the other hand, was a clear violation of the immunity granted to *mamlūks* in the Regency, and illustrates the erosion of the authority of the Porte in the province at that period.

## 7 THE REVENUES OF THE BEYLICAL TREASURY

- 1 Gibb and Bowen's somewhat intricately detailed description of the offices and services of the *bāsh defeterdār's* department, nonetheless, remains to date the most complete one of that section of the central Ottoman government (Gibb and Bowen 1950: I, 127–37).
- 2 This particular group of revenues, in Ottoman usage, were known as the '*bayt al-māl*', whereas this expression, in Arab Islamic governments, applied to the state treasury as a whole. It is therefore necessary, when encountering this expression in Tunisian sources of the Ottoman period, to check which of the two meanings applies to it.
- 3 In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, Muṣṭafa al-Balhawān was, for a time, *āgha* of the *bayt al-māl*. This official 'could, sometimes, be promoted to the deylcal dignity' (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VIII, 80). It should be noted in this regard that, in Cairo, the central treasury of the Egyptian province was guarded by a unit composed of fighters from the *mūstahfiẓān* and the '*azab* regiments (Shaw 1962: 349).
- 4 In the time of Ḥammūda Pasha, the inner treasury was under the custody of Rashīd Khūja, a Georgian *mamlūk* (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: VII, 130).
- 5 On this issue, Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf states: 'This designation (*hadiyya*, i.e. offering, present), was preferred to the term "*adā*" (tribute), which would have evoked in the minds of the local population the *jizya* (tax paid by the non-Muslims)' (quoted by al-Imām 1980: 355).
- 6 Speaking of the '*ushr* on olive oil imposed under Ḥammūda Pasha's successors, Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf states that a higher proportion of olive oil than the legal tenth was sometimes taken from the producers by the tax-collectors, but describes it as being the result of the latter's dishonest practices (Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf 1963–6: IV, 45).
- 7 The detail that only import dues were leased as an *iltizām*, whereas export duties were directly collected by the state is given by a nineteenth-century source (Pellissier 1980: 324).
- 8 Note that Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (1970: 366) has confused the *sūrsat* with the *ishtirā*. This confusion has led M.-H. Chérif to think that there were two kinds of *ishtirā*: the first, whereby fairly reasonable prices were granted to peasants for the wheat bought from them by Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī, the second, of an extortionate nature, practised by ʿAlī Pasha (Chérif 1986: I, 357).

## CONCLUSION

- 1 It is interesting to note that P. M. Holt, in his review of the political history of the Egyptian province, from an internal perspective, has also divided this history into four stages, i.e.: the phase of acquisition (1517–25); the phase of quiescence (1525–86); the phase of internal conflict (1586–1711); and the emergence of locally-based rule (Holt 1968: 79–90).
- 2 We should not omit, in this context, to mention the intervention of a third party from the central government, i.e. the harem, which led to the transferring of the island of Jirba from Tripoli to the Tunisian Regency, since the Tunisians had to pay, from then, a tribute to Istanbul, called *'qaṭī al-wāliḍa'* (tribute to the sultan's mother).
- 3 The attempt to fuse the titles of dey and bey, during the period of rule of Ibrāhīm al-Shārīf was given up after a very short time.
- 4 This led to a striking situation, whereby, in the Regency, as in the heart of the Empire, being Turkish was a handicap. Thus, the Hanefite janisaries, forming the settler class originating from the heart of the Empire, were not allowed the clear economic and political preponderance enjoyed by migrants from the metropole, when North Africa ultimately fell under French rule.

## APPENDIX B

- 1 I would suggest that the name 'Siliāna' drew its origin from the Turkish *'salyāne'*, meaning: 'yearly revenue'.
- 2 In the text of the contract reproduced by Hénia, it is stated that Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Wusūwī, having paid the sum of 56 piasters for the transfer of a *jidār* from Muḥammad ibn al-Hādī al-Wusūwī to himself, also pledges to pay annually (a given sum) representing taxes and dues imposed on that land (*'maḥḍar wa tadḥākīr wa lawāzīmuhā'*). In the contract reproduced by Inalcik, the peasant whose *çiftlik* was transferred to another man, declares that: '[I, named So-and-So] gave the possession of the *çiftlik* . . . to 'Alī . . . on condition that he shall cultivate it and collect its produce and pay the tithes and dues each year, and received from him the *tapu* fee in cash.'
- 3 See p. 91.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## ARCHIVAL SOURCES AND MANUSCRIPTS

- Archives Générales Tunisiennes, Série Histoire, Carton 169, Dossier 895 and 895 bis; Carton 220, Dossier 340, documents 13 and 39; Carton 220, Dossier 343, document 3; Carton 220, Dossier 346, documents 3 and 3 bis.
- Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (1925) *Al-Kitāb al-bāshī*, manuscript no. 1794, Tunisian National Library.
- Ibn Salāma Aḥmad (1850?) *Al-'Iqd al-munaddad fī-akbbār al-mushīr Aḥmad*, manuscript no. 18618, Tunisian National Library.

## BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Abdeselem, A. (1973) *Les historiens tunisiens des dix-septième, dix huitième et dix-neuvième siècles: essai d'histoire culturelle*, Paris: Kliencksieck.
- Abun-Nasr, J. (1975) 'The Beylicat in Seventeenth Century Tunisia', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, VI, 70–93.
- Aksan, V. (1998) 'Selīm III', in C. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W. P. Heinrichs and G. Lecomte (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Anderson, M. S. (1966) *The Eastern Question 1774–1923: A Study in International Relations*, London: Macmillan.
- Bachrouh, T. (1972) 'Sur la fiscalité muradite, présentation d'une source et des premiers résultats d'une enquête en cours', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, LXXIX–LXXX, 125–46.
- (1977) *Formation sociale barbaresque et pouvoir à Tunis au XVIIème siècle*, Tunis: Publications de l'Université.
- (1985) 'Aux origines de l'état tunisien à l'époque turque', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, CXXXI–CXXXII, 49–72.
- (1987) 'L'historiographie tunisienne, 1968–85: l'époque moderne', *Revue de l'Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes*, CLIX, 75–90.
- (1989) *Les élites tunisiennes du pouvoir et de la dévotion: le saint et le prince en Tunisie, contribution à l'étude des groupes sociaux dominants, 1782-1881*, Tunis: Publications de l'Université.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barbour, N. (1969) 'North-West Africa from the Fifteenth to the Nineteenth Century', in F. R. C. Bagley (ed.) *The Muslim World, a Historical Survey* (1960–81), 4 vols, Leiden: E. J. Brill, part III, 76–90.
- Bayram, M. al-Khāmīs (no date) *Şafwa-t al-i'tibār bi-mustawda' al-amşār wa'l-aqtār*, Beirut: Dār Şādir.
- Beckingham, M. (1965) 'Djezā'ir Baħr-i Şafid', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Béranger, N. (1979) *La Régence de Tunis au XVIIème siècle*, edited by P. Sebag, 2nd edn, Paris: Editions de l'Harmattan.
- Bey, M. (2002) *Les beys de Tunis (1705–1957)*, Tunis: Serviced.
- Bosworth, C. E., van Donzel, E., Heinrichs, W. P. and Lecomte, G. (1995) 'orta', in C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W. P. Heinrichs and G. Lecomte (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Boyer, P. (1970) 'Des Pachas Triennaux à la révolution d'Ali Khodja Dey (1571–1817)', *Revue Historique*, CCXLIV, 99–124.
- Brown, L. C. (1974) *Tunisia under Ahmad Bey*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brunschvig, R. (1947) *La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides*, Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Castel, J. du (1628) *Relation des voyages de Monsieur de Brèves, tant en Grèce, en Terre Sainte et Egypte, qu'aux royaumes de Tunis et Alger, ensemble un traité fait en l'an 1605 entre le Roy Henry le Grand et l'Empereur des Turcs et trois discours dudit Sieur*, Paris: imprimé chez Nicolas Gusse.
- Chater, K. (1984) 'Le fait ottoman en Tunisie: mythes et réalité', *Revue d'Histoire Maghrébine*, XXXI–XXXII, 141–8.
- (1984) *Dépendance et mutations pré-coloniales: la Régence de Tunis de 1815 à 1857*, Tunis: Publications de l'Université.
- Chelhod, J. (1971) 'Hidjāb', in B. Lewis, V. L. Ménage, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Chérif, M. -H. (1972) 'Témoignage du "mufti" Qāsim 'Azzūm sur les rapports entre Turcs et autochtones en Tunisie à la fin du XVIème siècle', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, LXXVII–LXXVIII, 39–50.
- (1977) 'H'ammūda Pacha-bey et l'affermissement de l'autonomie tunisienne', in C. -A. Julien (ed.) *Les Africains*, VII, 103–27.
- (1981) 'La déturquisation du pouvoir en Tunisie: classes dirigeantes et société tunisienne de la fin du XVIIème siècle jusqu'à 1881', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, CXVII–CXVIII, 177–97.
- (1986) *Pouvoir et Société dans la Tunisie de H'usayn Bin 'Alī 1705–1740*, Tunis: Publications de l'Université.
- Condamine, La (1898) 'La Condamine, Tunis-Kairouan-Carthage', *Revue Tunisienne*, 71–94.
- Deny, J. (1978) 'timar', in M. T. Houtsma (ed.) *The First Encyclopaedia of Islam*, re-edited, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Djellouli, N. (1995) *Les fortifications côtières ottomanes de la Régence de Tunis (XVIème–XIXème siècles)*, Zaghuan: CEROMDI.
- Djurdev, B. (1960) 'Bosna', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Dozy, R. (1881) *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Faroqhi, S. (1994) 'Decline and Change, 1590–1699', in H. Inalcik with D. Quataert (eds) *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, part II, 411–636.
- Finkel, C. (1988) *The Administration of Warfare: the Ottoman Military Campaigns in Hungary, 1593–1606*, Vienna: VWGO.
- Frank, L. and Marcel, J.-J. (1987) *Histoire de Tunis*, 2nd edn, Tunis: Bouslama.
- Gaid, M. (1974) *Les Turcs en Algérie*, Tunis: Maison Tunisienne de l'Edition.
- Gandolphe, J. (1923 and 1926–7) 'Lettres sur l'histoire politique de la Tunisie de 1728 à 1740', *Revue Tunisienne*, XXXI–XXXIII, I, 209–30; II, 287–303; III, 354–64; IV: 457–83.
- Gerber, H. (1993) 'mukāṭa'a' in C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, J. P. Heinrichs and C. Pellat (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Gibb, H. A. R. and Bowen, H. (1950) *Islamic Society and the West: A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East, Volume One, Parts I and II, Islamic Society in the Eighteenth Century*, many times reprinted, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Gökbilgin, M. T. (1965) 'Djānbazān', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Grandchamp, P. (1920–33) *La France en Tunisie au XVIIème siècle: inventaire des archives du Consulat de France à Tunis*, 10 vols, Tunis: La Rapide.
- (1937) 'Une mission délicate en Barbarie: Jean-Baptiste Salvago, dragoman vénitien à Alger et à Tunis (1625)', *Revue Tunisienne*, XXX–XXXII, 292–322; 471–501.
- (1957) 'Documents concernant la course dans la Régence de Tunis de 1764 à 1769 et de 1783 à 1843', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, IXX–XX, 269–340.
- Grenville, T. (1835) *Excursions in the Mediterranean, Algiers and Tunis*, 2 vols, London: Saunders and Otley.
- Hale, W. (1994) *Turkish Politics and the Military*, London: Cass.
- Hammer von Pürgstall, J. (1840–1844), *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours*, translated by M. Dochez, 3 vols, Paris: Imprimerie de Béhune et Plon.
- Hathaway, J. (1995) 'The Military Household in Ottoman Egypt', *International Journal of Middle-East Studies*, XXVII, i, 39–52.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1995a) 'Marriage Alliances among the Military Households of Ottoman Egypt', *Annales Islamologiques (Hawliyyāt Islāmiyya)*, XXIX, 133–49.
- (1995b) 'The Household of Ḥasan Ağa Bilifiya: an Assessment of Elite Politics in Seventeenth-Century Egypt', *Turcica*, XXVII, 135–52.
- (1997) *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt: the Rise of the Qazdağlıs*, Series: Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hénia, A. (1980) *Le Grīd, ses rapports avec le beylik de 1676 à 1840*, Tunis: Publications de l'Université de Tunis.
- (1997) 'Les terres mortes de la Tunisie utile et les nouvelles stratégies foncières du pouvoir ottoman', *Revue d'Etudes sur la Méditerranée et le Monde Arabe*, LXXIX–LXXX, 127–42.
- Hess, A. C. (1977) 'The Forgotten Frontier: the Ottoman North African Provinces during the Eighteenth Century', in T. Naff and R. Owen (eds) *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, XII, 74–87.
- Heywood, C. (1993) 'A Letter from Cerrāh Mustafa Pasha, Vālī of Tunis, to Sir William Trumbull (A.H. 1099/A.D. 1688)', *British Library Journal*, IX, 218–29.
- Holt, P. M. (1961) 'The Egyptian Beylicate in the Seventeenth Century', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXIV, part II, 135–52.
- (1966) *Egypt and the Fertile Crescent, 1516–1922, a Political History*, London: Longmans.
- (1968) 'The Pattern of Egyptian Political History from 1575 to 1798', in P. Holt (ed.) *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, London: Oxford University Press, 79–90.
- (1982) 'The Last Phase of the Neo-Mamluk Regime in Egypt', in *L'Égypte au XIX<sup>ème</sup> siècle*, Actes du colloque international du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, organisé par R. Mantran à Aix-en-Provence en juin 1979, Paris: CNRS, 145–51.
- (1993) 'Miṣr, the Ottoman Period', in C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W. P. Heinrichs and G. Lecomte (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hughes, T. (1896) *Dictionary of Islam*, London: W. H. Allen.
- Hugon, H. (1913) *Les emblèmes des Beys de Tunis: étude sur les signes de l'autonomie tunisienne*, Paris: Leroux.
- Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, Ḥ. (1970) *Al-Kitāb al-Bāshī, Part I, Qism al-sīra*, edited by Muḥammad Mādūr, Tunis: Société Tunisienne de Diffusion.
- Ibn Abī Dīnār al-Qayrawānī, M. (1967) *Al-Mu'nis fi-akhbār Ifrīqiya wa Tūnis*, Tunis: Al-'Atīqa.
- Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf, A. (1963–6) *It'hāf ahl al-zamān bi-akhbār mulūk Tūnis wa 'Abd al-Amān*, 8 vols, Tunis: Publications du Ministère de la Culture.
- Ibn Ṭāhir, J. (1995) *Al-Fasād wa rad'uhu, al-rad'u al-mālī wa ashkāl al-muqāwama wāl širā' (1705–1840)*, Tunis: Manshūrāt Kulliyyat al-Ādāb.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ibn Yūsuf, M. al-Ṣughayyar (1978) *Al-Mashra' al-malkī fi-salṭanat awlād 'Alī al-Turkī*, translated into French by Victor Serres and Mohammed Lasram (*Chronique Tunisienne*), 2nd edn, Tunis: Bouslama.
- (1998) *Al-Mashra' al-malkī fi-salṭanat awlād 'Alī al-Turkī, al-mujalad al-auwal*, edited by Aḥmad al-Ṭuwīlī, Tunis: Al-Maṭba'a al-'Asriyya.
- al-Imām, R. (1980) *Siyāsāt Ḥammūda Bāshā fi Tūnis*, Tunis: Manshūrāt al-Jāmi'a al-Tūnisiyya.
- Imber, C. (2002) *The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1650*, Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Inalcik, H. (1965a) 'çift', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- (1965b) 'ḍarība', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- (1970) 'Ottoman Heyday and Decline', in P. M. Holt, Ann K. Lambton and B. Lewis (eds) *The Cambridge History of Islam*, Vol. 1A, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323–53.
- (1973) *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300–1600*, translated by C. Imber and N. Itzkowitz, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- (1994) 'The Ottoman State: Economy and Society', in H. Inalcik and D. Quataert (eds) *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, part one, 10–409.
- Inan, A. (1976) *Aperçu général sur l'histoire économique de l'Empire turc ottoman*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Julien, C.-A. (1952) *L'histoire de l'Afrique du Nord, de la conquête arabe à 1830, revised edn, vol. 1: Des origines à la conquête arabe (647 après J.C.), révisée et mise à jour par Christian Courtois; vol. 2: De la conquête arabe à 1830, révisée et mise à jour par Roger Le Tourneau*, 2nd edn, many times reprinted, Paris: Payot.
- Khūja, Ḥ. (1975) *Dhāyl bashā'ir ahl al-īmān bi-futūhāt āl 'Uṭhmān*, edited by Ṭāhir al-Ma'mūrī, Tunis, Tripoli: Al-Matba'a al-'Arabiyya.
- Kraïem, M. (1973) *La Tunisie pré-coloniale*, 2 vols, Tunis: Société Tunisienne de Diffusion.
- Kunt, I. M. (1983) *The Sultan's Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government, 1550–1650*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Laroui, A. (1976) *L'histoire du Maghreb: un essai de synthèse*, Paris: Maspéro.
- MacGill, T. (1815) *Nouveau voyage à Tunis*, translated by L. Ragueneau de la Chesnaye, Paris: L. F. Pancoucke.
- Mc Gowan, B. (1994) 'The Age of the A'yān', in H. Inalcik and D. Quataert *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, part III, 637–758.
- Mantran, R. (1957) 'La titulature des beys de Tunis au dix-neuvième siècle d'après les documents turcs de Dar-el-Bey', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, IX–XX, 341–8.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1959) 'L'évolution des relations entre la Tunisie et l'Empire ottoman du seizième au dix-neuvième siècle: essai de synthèse', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XXVI–XXVII, 319–33.
- (1962) 'Les données de l'histoire moderne et contemporaine de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie: Notes pour une étude approfondie', *Annuaire de L'Afrique du Nord*, I, 243–8.
- (1965) 'Le statut de l'Algérie, de la Tunisie et de la Tripolitaine dans l'Empire Ottoman', in *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Nord Africani*, Facolta di Scienze Politiche, Cagliari, 3–14.
- Médina, G. (1907) 'Les Karamanli de la Tripolitaine et l'occupation temporaire de Tripoli par Ali Boulgour', *Revue Tunisienne*, XIV, 21–32.
- Monchicourt, C. (1929) *Documents historiques sur la Tunisie: relations inédites de Nyssen, Filippi et Caligaris (1788, 1829, 1834)*, Paris: Société d'éditions géographiques, maritimes et coloniales.
- Mordtmann J. H. [Kuran, E.] (1971) 'Djezā'irli Hasan Pasha', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Orhonlu, C. (1978) 'khazine', in E. van Donzel, B. Lewis and C. Pellat (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Ozbaran, S. (1978) 'kapudan pasha', in E. van Donzel, B. Lewis and C. Pellat (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Pamuk, Ş. (2000) *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panzac, D. (1993) 'La Régence de Tunis et la mer à l'époque de Ḥamouda Bāshā (1782–1814)', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, CLXV, 65–84.
- Parry, J. (1976) 'The Successors of Sulaiman (1606–1750)', in J. Parry et al. (eds) *A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 103–32.
- Pellissier de Reynaud, E. (1980) *Description de la Régence de Tunis*, 2nd edn, Tunis: Bouslama.
- Peyssonnel, J.-A. (1987) *Voyage dans les régences de Tunis et d'Alger*, présentation et notes de Lucette Valensi, Paris: La Découverte.
- Pignon, J. (1950) 'La Tunisie turque et husseinite', in A. Basset, L. Bercher, R. Brunschwig et al. (eds) *Initiation à la Tunisie*, Paris: Maisonneuve.
- (1955) 'Osta Moratto Turco Genovese, Dey de Tunis (1637–1640)', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XI, 331–62.
- (1956) 'La milice des Janissaires de Tunis au temps des deys (1590–1650)', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XV, 301–25.
- (1961) 'Un document inédit sur la Tunisie au début du XVIIème siècle', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XXXV, 109–220.
- (1965) 'La vie et l'œuvre de Pierre Grandchamp', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XLIX, 29–35.
- Plantet, E. (1893) *Correspondance des beys de Tunis et des consuls de France avec la Cour, 1517–1830*, 3 vols, Paris: Alcan.
- Pococke, E. (1772) *Voyages en Orient*, translated into French, 2 vols, Paris: Costard.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Poncet, J. (1960) 'Un problème d'histoire rurale: le habous Aziza Othmana du Sahel', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XXX, 137–56.
- Pückler-Muskau, L. von (1989) *Samūlāsū fi-ifrīqiya*, translated into Arabic and edited by Mounir Fendri, Carthage: Bayt al-Ḥikma.
- Quataert, D. (2000) *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rafeq, A. (1966) *The Province of Damascus, 1723–173*, Beirut: Khayats.
- Raymond, A. (1959) 'Tunisiens et maghrébiens au Caire au XVIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XXVI–XXVII, 335–71.
- (1960) 'Une liste des deys de Tunis de 1590 à 1832', *Les Cahiers de Tunisie*, XXXI, 129–36.
- (1989) 'Les provinces arabes (XVI<sup>ème</sup> siècle–XVIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle)', in R. Mantran (ed.) *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, Lille: Fayard, 340–420.
- (ed.) (1994) *Ibn Abī'l-Dīyāf, présent aux hommes de notre temps: chronique des rois de Tunis et du Pacte Fondamental, Chapitres IV et V, édition critique et traduction*, 2 vols, Tunis: Alif.
- Redhouse, J. (1857) *An English and Turkish Dictionary*, London: B. Quaritich.
- Rousseau, A. (1985) *Annales tunisiennes, ou aperçu historique de la Régence de Tunis*, 2nd edn, Tunis: Bouslama.
- Roux, C. (1932) *France et Afrique du Nord avant 1830: les précurseurs de la conquête*, Paris: Félix Lacan.
- Roy, B. (1906) 'Documents sur l'expédition de Tripoli en 1793', *Revue Tunisienne*, XIII, 283–91.
- (1917) 'Deux documents inédits sur l'expédition algérienne de 1628', *Revue Tunisienne*, XXIV, 183–204.
- Saadaoui, A. (2001) *Tunis, ville ottomane: trois siècles d'urbanisme et d'architecture*, Tunis: Centre de Publication Universitaire.
- Samih, A. I. (1969) *Al-Atrāk al-uthmāniyyūn fī ifrīqiya al-shamāliyya*, translated from Turkish into Arabic by 'Abdu'l-Salām Ad'ham, Beirut: Dār Lubnān.
- Sebag, P. (2001) *La course tunisienne au XVIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle*, Tunis: IBLA.
- Serres, J. (1925) *La politique turque en Afrique du Nord sous la Monarchie de juillet 1831-1848*, Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Shaw, S. J. (1962) *Financial and Administrative Organization and Development of Ottoman Egypt, 1757-1798*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Témimi, A. (1983) 'Evolution de l'attitude des autorités de la Régence de Tunis face à l'accueil des Morisques à la lumière d'un nouveau firman du Sultan Ottoman', *Revue d'Histoire Maghrébine*, XX/69–70, 169–80.
- (1995) 'Al-Mulkiyya al-aqāriyya wa niḍām al-zīāmāt wa'l tīmār bi-iyālet Tūnis al-uthmāniyya 1574–1588', *Arab Historical Review for Ottoman Studies*, nos 11–12, 187–209.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. H. (1960), 'bölük', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1965) 'çorbadi', in B. Lewis, C. Pellat and J. Schacht (eds) *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Valensi, L. (1969) *Le Maghreb avant la prise d'Alger, New Edition*, Paris: Maspéro.
- (1977) *Fellahs Tunisiens: l'économie et la vie des campagnes aux XVIIIème et XIXème siècles*, Paris La Haye: Mouton.
- Venture de Paradis, J.-M. (1983) *Les Régences de Tunis et d'Alger*, 2nd edn, Paris: Sindbad.
- al-Wazīr al-Sarrāj al-Andalusī, M. (1985) *Al-Ḥulal al-sundusiyya fī'l akhbār al-tūnisiyya*, 3 vols, Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- Winter, M. (1980) 'Turks, Arabs and Mamluks in the Army of Ottoman Egypt', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde*, LXXII, 97–122.
- (1992) *Egyptian Society under Ottoman Rule 1517–1798*, London: Routledge.
- Yapp, M. (1987) *The Making of the Modern Middle East, 1792–1920*, London, New York: Longman.
- Zouari, A. (1990) *Les relations commerciales entre Sfax et le Levant aux dix-huitième et dix-neuvième siècles*, Tunis: Institut National d'Archéologie et d'Art.



# INDEX

- Abū Ghānim 147  
 accountancy department 126–7  
 ʿāda 131–2  
 administration, Tunisian: central  
     11–12, 108, 110–11; provincial  
     112–22  
 āgha 38, 96, 103  
 āgha al-kursī 96  
 āgha of the Qasbah 96  
 agricultural activities 115–16;  
     taxes on 129–30  
 Aḥmad Bey (1837–55) 108, 155  
     n. 14  
 ʿAlawiyya household 30–2, 36, 39,  
     43  
 alay beğis 118  
 Albanians, recruitment into navy  
     89  
 ʿalemdār 71, 93  
 Algiers Regency 13, 35, 36, 51,  
     54, 68, 142–3; army 34, 42;  
     conflicts with Tunis 18, 37, 40,  
     44, 54, 55, 56–7; corsairs 7, 55,  
     142–3; *coup d'état* in Tunis 36;  
     defiance towards the Porte 50;  
     deys 34, 35, 42, 50, 55, 57;  
     domination in Maghrib 56; loss  
     of revenue 55; supporting  
     Tunisian janissaries 57  
 ʿAlī Barbar Pasha 28  
 ʿAlī Bitshnīn 17  
 ʿAlī Burghul 50–3  
 ʿAlī al-Turkī (father of Ḥusayn ibn  
     ʿAlī) 39, 40, 42  
 ʿamāla 113  
 amāna 100; *see also* amīn  
 ʿāmils 95, 113; beylical control of  
     121–2; designated as *kābiyas*  
     117–19; territorial non-military  
     119–21; tribal 113–16  
 amīn al-tarsikhānā 95  
 amīn 121  
 amīr liwā's (lords of the flags)  
     18–19; *see also* sancak beğis  
 Anatolians 29, 94, 96, 100, 106,  
     107, 140, 142, 143; *khūja* 94;  
     in the Maghrib *junds* 88–90;  
     *see also* sekban  
 Andalusians 99, 134–5  
 appanages 94, 100 *see also*  
     rewards  
 al-A'rād district 117–18, 119  
 army *see* *jund*; semi-ʿaskeri tribes;  
     *ṣubāyḥis*, Arab; *zuwāna* forces  
 Arnāuts *see* Albanians  
 al-Aṣfar, Muḥammad 40  
 ʿaskeri class 6, 9, 14, 46, 132, 139,  
     140  
 aṣlānī 23  
 al-Aṣrams: Aḥmad 111; Hammūda  
     ibn Muḥammad 102;  
     Muḥammad 102, 111;  
     Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad 111;  
     Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad  
     110, 111  
 Austria: peace with 41, 49  
 autonomy thesis xiii, xvi–xviii,  
     xx–xxii  
 Awlād ʿAun 106  
 Awlād Ḥasan 114–15

- āya bāshīs* 93, 156 n. 11  
*āyān* 117, 119–20  
*ʿazab* 13–15, 88, 140, 151 n. 8
- Bābūsh, Yūsuf 95  
 Bachrouh, Taoufik xxi  
 Baghdad 17  
*baīʿa* (allegiance to new ruler) 70–1  
 banners *see* emblems of power  
 Baqtāsh Dey 34, 35  
 Barbarossa *see* Khayr al-Dīn  
 Barbary provinces *see* Maghrib  
   Regencies  
 al-Bashīr, Sīdī 101  
*Bāshīs* 43  
*bāsh hānba* 82, 125  
*bāsh kātib* (head secretary) 108,  
   110–11  
*bāsh mamlūk* *see* *bāsh qāzāq*  
*bāsh qāzāq* 79, 83  
 Bayram 108; Bayram’s list of  
   ranks and offices 82, 83, 95, 96,  
   103, 108, 144  
*bayraqdār* 93  
 Berbers 101  
 beylerbeys 3, 4, 5, 19, 75; Algerian  
   3, 4, 6, 54, 55, 101, 140  
 beylical administration *see*  
   administration  
 beylical households *see* household,  
   beylical  
 beys 18–21, 43, 94; administrative  
   control 121–2; appointments  
   38; authority over *zuwāwa* 101;  
   causes of supremacy 28–30;  
   conflict with deys 10, 27–8, 57;  
   emblems 76–8; fusion with deys  
   37; fusion with pashas 37, 69,  
   141; increasing power 28, 35,  
   41, 44–5, 140–1; as leaders of  
   *maballas* 22; reluctance to tax  
   tribes 128; succession 38–9, 42,  
   69–71; *see also* Egypt; Husaynid  
   beys; household, beylical;  
   households; Muradites beys  
 Binzart 94, 95, 101  
 Bonaparte, Napoleon 65  
 Britain: blockade, France 65;  
   relations with 58, 65; treaties  
   with 16, 62, 63–4
- Brown, Leon Carl xxi  
*bulūk* 91; *see also* *dār*  
*bulūk bāshīs* 9, 10–11, 91, 93
- cavalry: beylical household 81–3;  
   tribal 102–6  
*cebelis* 105  
*çeri başıs* 114, 118  
 Chater, Khélifa xx, 67  
 Chérif, Mohamed-Hédi xix, 104,  
   122  
 Christian converts *see* *mamlüks*  
 Christian world: Ottoman Porte  
   attitude towards 89; protection  
   of Hafsid dynasty 5; relations  
   with 16, 58–9, 65, 95; revenue  
   from 135–7; *see also* Europe  
*çift-hāne* 149  
*çiftlik* 145–8  
 coastal regions *see* *ʿazabs*  
 commerce *see* trade  
 corsairs 3, 4, 14, 41, 98, 137,  
   139–40, 152 nn. 2, 3, 4;  
   Algerian 7, 55, 57, 142–3;  
   French 62–3; treaty  
   transgressions 17; *see also*  
   corso; *reïses*  
 corso 17, 41, 64: development of  
   140–1; end of 64–5, 142;  
   revenues from 137; trade 64–7;  
   *see also* corsairs  
 customs duties *see* revenue,  
   customs duties
- Damascus *see* Syria  
*dār-al-islām* (realm of Islam) 5  
*dār* 8–9, 91; *see also* *orta*;  
   *ūda*  
*defterdār* 19  
 Deli Muḥammad 152 n. 7  
 deputies (of the bey) *see* *kābiyas*  
 Devoize 59–61, 62–3  
 deylical households *see*  
   households, deylical  
 deys 9–11, 14, 29, 34–5, 96;  
   conflicts with the beys 25–8,  
   33–4, 40, 58; declining power  
   of 28–9, 34–5, 41, 96; fusion  
   with beys 37; period of  
   supremacy 15–16; policies

- 15–18; power 12–13, 41;  
suggested origin 9–11; *see also*  
Anatolians; Algiers Regency;  
households, deylical  
*dīwān* 6, 71, 96, 98; Algiers 35;  
petition to the Sultan (1816)  
71–2  
Djanım Pasha 41, 43, 51  
Djezā'irli Pasha, Ḥasan Ghāzī 51,  
55–6  
Djezzār Pasha 66  
Dragut Re'is 3–4  
Drīd 105, 115, 130, 131  
dynasties: beylical *see* beys;  
Husaynids; Muradites
- economic growth 45  
economic policy, Ḥammūda  
Pasha's 65–7  
Edirne Event 37  
Egypt 6, 43, 51; army of 13–14,  
86, 88; *'azabs* 13–15, 88, 140;  
beys 19, 151 n. 14; Djezā'irli's  
expedition 51; households 37,  
43, 124; occupation by  
Bonaparte 59; *qānūnnāme* of  
151 n. 7; trade with 67;  
treasury 131; *see also* Mashriq  
provinces  
embassy to Istanbul, Tunisian  
(1795) 52–3  
emblems of power 19, 76–8  
England *see* Britain  
Europe: trade with 65, 135–6;  
truce with Maghrib Regencies  
62; *see also* individual  
countries  
export duties *see* revenue, customs  
duties  
exports *see* trade  
*eyālet* of the *kapudan pasha* 7  
*eyālet mümtāze* (privileged  
province) 12
- Ferrarese, Māmī 25  
fines *see* taxes  
firman (decree) 28, 36, 45, 50–1,  
52, 72, 154 n. 4; of investiture  
73–5  
fiscal expeditions *see* *maḥalla*  
fiscal organization *see* revenue;  
taxes  
flags *see* emblems of power  
France: conflicts with 45, 59–61;  
diplomacy in Istanbul 52, 62;  
English blockade 65; fishing  
rights 136; invasion of Ṭabarqa  
44; relations with Tunis 58–9,  
62–3; support for *coup d'état*  
68; treaties with Tunis 16–17,  
64  
fratricidal conflict 30–5  
French community in Tunis,  
situation during war 60–1  
frontiers of the Regency 18; *see*  
*also* Maghrib region
- Genoa: trade with 65; negotiations  
over Ṭabarqa 43–4  
Ghār al-Milḥ 95  
Gibraltar, trade with 65  
government, evolution of, in the  
Tunisian *eyālet* 139–43 (*see also*  
administration, Tunisian);  
central Ottoman (*see also*  
Ottoman Porte)  
grain, trade with Europe 136–7  
Grandchamp, Pierre xvi  
grandeess, Ottoman 31  
Greeks, recruitment into navy  
89
- hadiyya* (offerings) 72, 127  
Hafsid dynasty 3–6  
Halil Ḥamid Pasha 55, 66  
Ḥalq al-Wād 94, 105; blockade  
65  
Ḥammūda Pasha 45–6, 49–50, 52,  
53–4, 56, 70, 85, 100;  
administrative reforms 115;  
admiration for Napoleon 62;  
Christian world policy 58–9,  
65–6; economic policy 65–7;  
emblems and privileges 76–8;  
hostility towards Devoize 63;  
investiture and confirmation  
of investiture 71–4; military  
reforms 87, 96–100, 107;  
relations with deys 58;  
succession crisis 67–8; titles

- 74–6; *see also* household, beylical, organization of; pasha-beys
- ḥānbas* (cavalry corps) 81–3, 100, 155 n. 14
- handicraft *see* commerce
- Hanefites 99, 103, 123, 125; judicial status 123–5; *qādis* 6
- hanshīr* 147–8
- harem 18, 79, 127, 159 n. 2
- Hénia, Abdelhamid xxi, 148–9, 159 n. 2 (Appendix)
- hijāb* (veil) 78
- Holland, treaty with Tunis 16
- household, beylical, organization of: austerity measures 78–9; cavalry 81–3; copying the Sultan's household 78; inside service 79–80; outside service 80; *see also* beylical office; beys
- households: 'Alawiyya 30–2, 36, 39, 42, 43; 'Alī al-Turkī's 40; conflicts 25, 27–8, 30–5, 39–43, 56, 57, 141; deylcal 24–8, 57; Husaynid 68; inheritable wives 37; *mamlūks* 24–5; Muḥammadiyya 30, 35, 36, 39, 42, 43; Muradite 10, 29, 30, 31, 32–3, 36, 37–9; policies and tools 26; *see also* Egypt; household, beylical
- Hugon, Henri xvii
- Husaynid beylical dynasty xix–xxi, 68, 69–70, 77, 78, 111
- Husaynid beys (including 'Alī Pasha) (in chronological order): Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī 37–8, 39–43, 57, 59, 66, 69, 77, 79, 89, 101–2, 106, 112, 119, 124; 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī, or 'Alī Pasha 41–2, 43–5, 55, 70, 77, 96, 133; Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn 42, 44, 96; 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn 44–6, 70, 71, 96, 137; Hammūda ibn Husayn (*see* Hammūda Pasha); 'Uthmān ibn 'Alī 67, 124; Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad 68
- Ḥusaynīs* 43
- Ḥusayn Khūja 6
- huwādīks* 114
- Huwwa, 'Alī 152 n. 1
- Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz xiv
- Ibn Abī Dīnār 9–10, 11, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30
- Ibn Abī'l-Ḍiyāf xxiii, 39, 51, 52, 53, 61, 70, 75, 76, 77, 78, 83, 84, 100, 108, 115–16, 122
- Ibn 'Ayyāds: Ḥīmīda 64, 120; Rajab 125
- Ibn Shukr 36, 38
- Ifrīqiya 154 n. 9
- ikhtiyār* 93–4
- 'Ilij 'Alī Pasha 6, 7, 101
- iltizām* (concession for tax-farming) 22, 109, 117, 121–2, 134; European 135–6
- immunity, Ottoman *mamlūks* 123–4
- import duties *see* revenue, customs duties
- Inalcik, Halil 146
- inheritability 21, 70; of *iltizāms* 121–2
- inter-Ottoman trade 66–7
- investiture, Ḥammūda Pasha 71–4
- 'ishshī* (cook) 92, 156 n. 10
- ishtīra*, practice of 136
- Ismā'īl ibn Yūnis 45
- Ismā'īl Kāhiya 124
- Ismā'īl ibn Yūnis 45
- Istanbul *see* Ottoman Porte
- Italy: expeditions against 64; Naples 41, 62, 64; relations with 62; Sardinia 62; Sicily 41, 62, 64; Venice xv, 49–50; Venice/Tunis war 49–50
- ittifāq*, practice of 121, 122
- Jabal Wislāt *see* Wislātīs
- al-Jallūlis 120; Bakkār 109, 120; Maḥmūd 63, 64
- jamā'as* 91–3
- janissaries, Imperial 8, 12, 90, 92, 107
- janissaries of Tunis *see* *jund jibāliyya* 104–5

- jidār* 148, 159 n. 2 (Appendix)  
 Jirba 67, 120; annexation by  
 Tunis 17–18; occupation of  
 51–2  
 Jlās 106  
 Julien, Claude-André xix, xviii  
*jund* 5–6, 106–7; Algerian 54, 55,  
 56; arrogation of *timars* 22–3;  
 barracks 98–9; cavalry 82–3;  
 composition 88–96; dissolution  
 107; Egyptians as models for  
 13–14; evolution 13; Notebook  
 90, 97, 115, 155–6 nn. 5, 6, 9;  
 officers 31; promotion and  
 punishment 98; recruitment  
 88–90; reform 96–7; ties with  
 the Algerian *jund* 57–8;  
 uniforms and armaments 99;  
 uprisings 8, 9–11, 28, 57–8,  
 106–7; wages 97, 99–100, 131,  
 133; *yuldāshes* 11, 91; *see also*  
*deys*
- al-Kāf 117, 118–19  
*kābiyas*: of the bey, main 12, 30,  
 38 (*see also* Ismā'il Kāhiya and  
 Sulymān Kāhiya); of the *dār*  
*al-bāsha* 95, 113; of the Arab  
*ṣubāyhis* 103; Hanefite 94–5,  
 100, 113, 117; Malekite 113,  
 117–19; at the Porte 72  
*kaḥıci*, Ottoman 72–3  
*kaḥı kulus* (slaves of the Porte) 8,  
 19, 22, 25, 85, 123  
*kaḥıdan pashas* 16, 41, 51, 54,  
 55  
*karrūṣa* (carriage) 77–8  
*kātib* (secretary) 112  
*khalıfa* (delegate) 119  
 Khayr al-Dīn 3, 7  
*khaznadār*, office of 110, 124  
*khidma* (service) 131, 132  
*khūja* 93, 94  
 Khūja Dey, Aḥmad 95  
 Knights of St John *see* Malta  
 Küçük Hüsayn 52–3  
*kul'asker* 9, 71  
*kulughli* (son of janissary) 89,  
 106, 140  
*kursi* (pashas' seat) 77
- land: concessions to tribes  
 115–16; grants 104, 106;  
 measurement/taxation 129–30,  
 145–9; *tapu* contracts 146;  
 tenure, rural 145–9; *see also*  
*ṣubāyhis*, Arab; *mazārgis*;  
*zi'amets*, in the Maghrib  
 Leghorn, trade with 65  
*lizma see iltizām*
- Maghrib region: Morocco 56; *see*  
*also* Maghrib Regencies  
 Maghrib Regencies xv, xvi, 3, 4,  
 41, 54, 56, 59–60; assistance in  
 war with France 61; peace with  
 Russia 49; truce with European  
 states 62; wars between the  
 Maghrib Regencies 17–8, 37;  
*see also* Algiers Regency; Tripoli  
 Regency  
*maḥalla* (fiscal expedition) 19–20,  
 104, 112–13, 116, 129–30, 131,  
 132; of the five beys 113  
*makhāzinis* 110, 121, 123; judicial  
 status 124–5  
 Malekites 25–6, 31, 98, 110, 102,  
 103, 115, 118, 125, 127, 140;  
*āyān* families 119–20; growing  
 influence 124–5; in the *jund*  
 89–90; *kātibs* 112; *makhāzinis*  
 110, 121, 123–5  
 Malta 65  
*mamlūks* (Christian converts):  
 European 79, 83; and  
 household policies 20, 23, 24–5,  
 28–9, 31, 35, 39–40, 81; in the  
*jund*, seventeenth century 14;  
 Ottoman 84–5, 94, 109–10,  
 113 (*see also* immunity,  
 Ottoman *mamlūks*)  
 Mantran, Robert xxi–xxii  
*marja'* 148  
 marriage alliances 26, 39, 40, 85,  
 115  
 Marseilles xiii, 65  
*māshiya* 130, 146, 148, 149; *see*  
*also çiftlik*  
 Mashriq provinces 12, 13, 127;  
*see also* Baghdad; Egypt;  
 Palestine; Syria

- Mathālīth 147  
*mazārgis* 103–4, 115; land tenure 104  
 Mezzo Morto, Ḥasan 36, 55  
 military reforms 16, 87, 97, 107;  
*see also* Ḥammūda Pasha  
*mīrmīrān see* Ḥammūda Pasha,  
 titles  
 monopolies *see* trade  
 Morisco refugees 16  
 Morocco 56  
*muchachi* (young pages) 79  
 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī (elder brother  
 of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī) 39, 40, 44  
 Muḥammad ibn Mustāfa 41  
 Muḥammadiyya household 30,  
 35, 36, 39, 43  
*multazims* (tax concession owners)  
 22, 122; *āmils* as 120  
 al-Murābīts 120; ‘Umar 118  
 Muradite household 10, 29, 30,  
 31, 32–3, 36, 37  
 Muradite beys (in chronological  
 order): Murād ‘Kūrsū’, or  
 Murād I 20, 21, 29, 38;  
 Ḥammūda ibn Murād 20, 25,  
 26, 27, 29, 30, 38; Murād ibn  
 Hammūda, or Murād II 27, 28,  
 30, 32, 33, 38; Muḥammad ibn  
 Murād 30, 32–6, 38, 40;  
 Muḥammad al-Ḥafṣī ibn  
 Ḥammūda 28, 30, 32–3; ‘Alī  
 ibn Murād 30, 32–4; Ramaḍān  
 ibn Murād 36, 39, 40, 114;  
 Murād ibn ‘Alī, or Murād III  
 36, 37, 39, 40  
*muṣālaba*, practice of 122  
 Mustāfa Bey (1835–7) 85–6  
 Mustāfa Khūja 59, 84–5, 95,  
 123–4  
*mūstahfiẓān* 13, 88  
 navies xv, 7, 12, 16, 17, 54, 89;  
 trading fleet 64–5; *see also*  
 corsairs  
*nawba* (military music band) 77  
*nīṣānci* (guardian of the seal),  
 office of 109  
 nomad, semi-nomad 128; *see also*  
*yürük*  
 Notebook of the *jund* 90  
 Nuwīras 120  
*ocak* 5, 91; *see also jamā‘as*;  
*wajaq*  
 offices *see* ranks  
*orta* 8, 91  
 Ottoman Empire: central treasury  
 127; government (*see* Ottoman  
 Porte); gunpowder empire 5;  
 land tenure systems (*see* *çiftliks*;  
*tapu* contracts); peace with  
 Austria 41; *yürük* (tribes) 106;  
*see also alay beğis*; *çeri başis*;  
 janissaries, Imperial; *sancak*  
*beğis*; *sekbān*; *sipābis*, Ottoman;  
 sultans, Ottoman; *timars*,  
 Ottoman  
 Ottoman Porte xiii, xv, xvi–xx,  
 xxii, 3, 4, 7, 11–13, 22, 34–5,  
 37, 46, 55; alliance with  
 England 62; beginnings of rule  
 5–8; denouncing abuses 7–8;  
 intervention in Tunis/Algiers  
 wars 28, 40; *kapudan pashas*’  
 role 16; leverage over Tunis  
 139–40; loss of power in  
 Maghrib 68; officials 109–10;  
 policy 18, 37, 51, 66, 78–9;  
 probable role in Algerian  
 invasion of Tunis 55; relations  
 with Maghrib Regencies 36;  
 relations with Tunis 32, 45–6,  
 49–50, 52–4, 58; subordination  
 of Husaynid pasha-beys 85–6;  
 treaty with Britain 62; war with  
 France (1798–1802) 59–61  
 Palestine 66  
 pasha-beys 69–70, 74; Husaynid  
 78; subordination to Ottoman  
 Porte 85–6; *see also* Ḥammūda  
 Pasha  
 pashas 35, 43, 69; fusion with  
 beys 141; granting of title 37;  
 inversion of rank with *serdārs*  
 15; involvement in bey/dey  
 conflict 27  
 pastoral activities 130  
 petition (to the sultan) 71–2

- post-colonial studies xviii  
Pückler-Muskau 85–6
- qādi* 6, 125  
*qā'id* *see* *āmils*  
*qāmūn* (regulations, civil judgements) 28  
Qaramanli dynasty 50–1, 52, 53  
*qaṭī 'al-wālida* (tribute to sultan's mother) 17  
Qayrawān 4, 101, 117, 118  
*qishla* (barracks) 98–9  
*qubṭān* 12, 17
- rā'iyya, rē'āya* 20, 72, 73, 124  
Ramaḍān Bey (first bey of the Regency) 19–20; *mamlūks* of 25  
ranks: Bayram's list 144; hierarchy 38, 118; *see also* titles  
rebellions *see* uprisings  
reforms: administrative 115; janissaries 96–7; military 87, 107  
Regency status *see eyālet mümtāze rē'ises* (corsair captains) 15, 89, 92, 152 nn. 2, 3, 4  
renegades *see mamlūks*, European  
revenue 19–20, 21–3; administration 126–7, 138; customs duties 65–6, 135; from the corso 137; from land tenure 145–6; from trade 136–7; *iltizām* 134–5; *see also maḥalla*; taxes  
rewards 26, 95, 100  
*rijāl al-kibār* (elders) 104  
Rousseau, Alphonse xvi, 61  
Roux, Charles xvi, 153 n. 11  
Russia 61
- ṣāhib al-ṭābi'* (guardian of the seal), office of 108, 109–10  
Ṣafāqus 67, 120, 135  
salaries *see* wages  
Salvago, Jean-Baptiste xv, 151 n. 5  
*sancak beḡis* 18–19  
*sanjaqdārs* 93  
*saqqāji* (water-carrier) 92
- sarrāj* 89, 155 n. 1  
seals, beylical 77, 109  
*sekbān* 8–9, 10, 14, 88  
semantic confusion, sources 23  
semi-*askeri* tribes 105–6, 115; land tenure 145  
*serdār* 15  
*serden geçtis* 71, 92  
Serres, Jean xvii  
servants, beylical household 79–81  
Sha'bān Khūja Dey 26, 27  
Shābbiya religious order 4, 105  
Shalabī Dey, Aḥmad 30  
al-Sharīf Bey-Dey-Pasha, Ibrāhīm 36–7, 38, 40–1  
*shar'i* taxes 129–30  
*shāwishes*: al-salām 80–1; of the *jund* 92, 100  
*shaykhs* 116–17; tribal 122  
signets *see* seals, beylical  
Sinān Pasha 5, 105  
*sipāhis*, Ottoman 21, 104–5  
sources xxii–xxiii; historical xiii–xv; Notebook of the *jund* 90; semantic confusion 23; *see also* research  
Spain 3, 4, 5  
Stinca, Mario 83, 155 n. 15  
*ṣubāyhis*: Arab 81–2, 104, 106, 115, 155 n. 14; Turkish 21, 71, 81–2, 102–5, 106, 155 n. 14, 157 n. 21  
Sulaymān ibn Ramaḍān 128  
Sulaymān Kāhiya 84–5, 113  
sultans, Ottoman: 'Abdu'l-Hamīd II 51, 55; Aḥmad III 153, n. 10; Maḥmūd II 57, 107; Murād III 4; Muṣṭafa IV 57; Selīm I 150 n. 1 (Ch. 1); Selīm III 50, 52, 54, 57, 87, 106–7; Sulaymān xviii, 58  
Syria (Damascus) 8, 20, 66, 67, 99
- Ṭābāq Dey, Muḥammad 33, 152 n. 3  
Ṭabarqa 43–4  
*ṭā'ifas* *see jamā'as*  
*tapu* contracts 146  
Ṭarābulsis 105, 115

- tarjumāns* (interpreters) 25, 73  
 taxes 19, 20, 21–2, 137;  
     categories 129–33; on land  
     145–9; paid to *ʿāmil*s 120–1; on  
     tribes 128–9; *shaykhs*' role 117;  
     *see also maḥalla*; revenue  
*thamra* (pl. *thimār*) 104  
*timars*, Ottoman 21, 22, 23, 104,  
 106  
 titles 69; of the pasha-bey 74–6;  
     *see also* ranks  
 trade: with Christian powers  
     16–17, 65, 135–6; and the  
     corso 64–7; grain 136–7; inter-  
     Ottoman 66–7; monopolies 66;  
     tax exemption 134–5  
 trading fleet, development of 64–5  
 treasury 22, 127, 137  
 treaties: of Amiens 61; with  
     Britain 16, 62, 63–4; with  
     Christian states 16–17, 64  
 tribes: agricultural development  
     115–16, 148; *ʿāmil*s 113–16;  
     military organization 115;  
     semi-*askeri* 105–6, 115, 145;  
     taxation 128–9  
 Tripoli Regency 26, 53;  
     Qaramanli dynasty 50–1, 52,  
     53; trade with 67; warfare  
     against 37  
*tq* 75, 76–7  
 Turkey 107; trade with 67  
  
*ūḍa* 91; *see also dār*  
*ūḍa bāshīs* 93, 100  
 ulama 5  
 uprisings: janissaries 8–11, 58,  
     106–7  
 urban improvements under the  
     deys 16  
*ʿurfī* taxes 128, 130  
*ʿušr* taxes 129–30  
 Usta Murād Genovese Dey 15, 17,  
     25  
  
 ʿUthmān Dey 15, 26, 40, 130;  
     *hanshūr* 147  
  
 Valensi, Lucette xx  
  
 wages: of the *jund* 97, 99–100,  
     131, 133; *ṣubāyḥīs* 103;  
     *zuwāwa* 101–2  
 Wahhabis 86  
*wajaq* 5, 102  
*wakīl*: of the bey 88; of the *jund*  
     92, 99, 156 n. 9; *see also*  
     *wikāla*  
*waqf* (charitable endowment)  
     100  
*waṭan* 157 n. 3  
*wazīr* 75, 108  
 al-Wazīr al-Sarrāj al-Andalusī,  
     Muḥammad xiv, 9–10, 30  
 ‘western hearths’ 4  
*wikāla* 100  
 Wislātīs, Jabal Wislāt 33, 36, 42,  
     45, 101, 112, 151 n. 8  
 wives: alliances 26, 39, 40, 85,  
     115; ‘inheritable’ 37  
  
*yuldāshes see jund*  
 Yūnis ibn ʿAlī 43, 44, 123  
*yürük* (nomad) 106  
 Yūsuf Şāhib al-Ṭābī 52–4,  
     57–9, 64, 68, 84–5, 109–10,  
     124  
 Yūsuf Dey 15, 25–7, 30, 97  
 Yūsuf Khūja *see* Yūsuf Şāhib  
     al-Ṭābī  
  
*zamāla* 149  
*zambaṭūṭ* or *zbanṭūṭ* 14; *see also*  
     *ʿazab*  
*ziʿamets* 21; in the Maghrib 22  
*zīna* (city illuminations) 17, 45,  
     86  
*zuwāwa* forces 100–2, 106, 157  
     nn. 19, 20; *see also* wages