

Algerian-Tunisian Relations During the Eighteenth Century and Their Repercussions for the Political Situation and Systems of Governance in the Two Eyalets

Dr. Zerarka Ali

Department of History, Chérif Bouchoucha University Centre, Aflou, Algeria
zerarka.ali2018@gmail.com

Received: 10/05/2025

Accepted: 24/10/2025

Published: 30/11/2025

Abstract:

Algerian–Tunisian relations in the early modern period underwent numerous political and military transformations, as each of the two eyalets experienced notable developments characterised by distinct historical particularities. At the outset of the eighteenth century, the Husaynid dynasty assumed power in the Eyalet of Tunis. As the latter entered a cycle of conflict over the seat of government, this frequently allowed the Ottoman rulers in Algiers to intervene, often by force, in Tunisian affairs. They also imposed peace on terms that compelled Tunis to pay substantial sums to Algiers and its rulers. Most Algerian interventions in Tunis were prompted by requests from Tunisian rulers seeking support to consolidate their authority. This ongoing conflict between the two eyalets resulted in severe losses across all spheres, draining military capabilities that both eyalets urgently needed to repel the external European threat.

Keywords: Eyalet of Algiers; Eyalet of Tunis; relations; *dayas*; *beys*; system of governance.

1. Introduction:

Most of the states bordering the southern shore of the western Mediterranean basin constituted an extension of Ottoman rule between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. For this reason, both the Eyalet of Algiers and the Eyalet of Tunis witnessed a prominent Ottoman presence, which contributed to the shaping of a system of governance that distinguished each eyalet from the other. Given that Algiers was annexed to the Ottoman Empire in 1519, its rulers held the upper hand in the region; thus, they frequently intervened

in the affairs and systems of governance in the Eyalet of Tunis, which likewise became subordinate to the Sublime Porte after the Ottomans entered it by force in 1574, following a prolonged struggle with the Spaniards. Thereafter, it experienced several phases of rule, including direct rule, such as the period of the Deys (1591–1631), and other forms, such as the rule of the Muradid and Husaynid dynasties, which extended between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Since “Husayn ibn ‘Alī” is considered the first figure to assume power in Tunis in 1705, thereby founding a system of governance that endured for nearly two centuries, it is also evident that his reign and what followed during the eighteenth century witnessed numerous political changes in Tunis in which the rulers of Algiers at that time played a role. Therefore, we may pose the following question: To what extent did the Ottoman rulers of Algiers intervene in the governance of Tunis during the eighteenth century? Moreover, what were its repercussions for the relationship between the two eyalets?

2. The rule of Husayn ibn ‘Alī al-Turkī in Tunis (1705/1735):

2.1. The founding of the Husaynid Ruling Dynasty (1117 AH/1705):

It was named the Husaynid dynasty after its founder, Husayn ibn ‘Alī al-Turkī, who was raised in Tunis and held the post of *kāhiya*, the highest rank in the Tunisian army.¹ He ascended the throne on 10 July 1705, with the endorsement of the *dīwān*.²

The origin of Husayn ibn ‘Alī can be traced to the Greek island of Crete; he was born in 1675. Among the most notable actions of this bey were the preservation of peace between the Eyalet of Tunis and Algiers. A strong concern marked his reign for the country; the urban sphere in Tunis flourished, as he rebuilt Kairouan after the devastation it had suffered during the continuous wars of the seventeenth century. He established security and justice; the economic sphere flourished during his rule, he reduced taxes, and he combated a policy of extravagance.³

2.2. The first confrontation between Husayn ibn ‘Alī and Algiers in 1705

After Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf was defeated and taken captive by the Algerian forces, Bey Husayn assumed power; however, Dey Muṣṭafā remained encamped with his army in the region of al-Kāf, which aroused the indignation of the bey and his dīwān. They convened to consider the matter of the Dey and his army, who had sent a letter to Bey Husayn ibn ‘Alī on 12 Rabī‘ al-Awwal 1117 AH/10 June, in which he set out his intention to conclude peace and stated that he would come in person to Tunis for that purpose. However, Bey Husayn, the members of the dīwān, and the advisers rejected this proposal and affirmed the necessity that Dey Muṣṭafā and his forces leave Tunis.⁴ The dīwān informed Dey Muṣṭafā that there was no point in Algerian entry into Tunis, since the Algerians had apprehended Ibrāhīm al-Sharīf and had accepted the rule of Husayn ibn ‘Alī; they offered him money in exchange for relinquishing the claims, but he refused.⁵

The Dey attempted to persuade the Tunisian government to pursue a peaceful settlement, but Bey Husayn refused on this occasion and demanded compensation for the war's losses. Recognising the failure of peaceful solutions, he prepared for the possibility of an Algerian attack on Tunis.⁶ Dey Muṣṭafā declared war on Tunis and reached it on 28 August 1705.⁷

The war ended, and the battles followed one after another for nearly a month. In the end, the Algerian forces were unable to enter the city. They were compelled to withdraw on 18 Jumādā al-Ūlā 1117 AH/8 December 1705, leaving behind a vast quantity of equipment, which the Tunisian soldiers seized.⁸

3.2. The phase of truce and joint cooperation (1705/1728):

The war ended, and a state of peace prevailed between the two eyalets, opening the way to negotiations. Dey Ḥusayn Khūja (1117 AH/1705)⁹ Accepted the proposals of the Bey of Tunis to provide compensation in return for the losses of the war, and the Algerian forces were evacuated from the town of al-Kāf.¹⁰

After Bey Ḥusayn overcame his opponent, Dey Muḥammad Khūja al-Aṣfar, who had declared rebellion and sought to restore the authority of the deys in Tunis, he failed and met his death, killed on 17 Ramaḍān 1117 AH, corresponding to 1 January 1705. Thus, full

authority passed to Bey Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Turkī. The sultan at the Sublime Porte confirmed him in 1119 AH/1707–1708, and he came to enjoy full powers.¹¹

The peace between Algiers and Tunis lasted approximately 30 years, driven by the internal circumstances of the two countries, especially Algiers, which faced financial crises and the inability of the Dey of Algiers, Ḥusayn Khūja, to pay the soldiers or liberate Oran, which led him to withdraw.¹²

He was succeeded in rule by Dey “Muḥammad Bakdāsh” (1707/1710). The first action undertaken by this Dey was to pay the soldiers’ wages and satisfy them to prepare them for the attack on Oran, which he would liberate in April 1708, expelling the Spaniards from it.¹³ As an expression of loyalty to the Sublime Porte, “Muḥammad Bakdāsh” sent the three golden keys of the city of Oran to the Ottoman caliph.¹⁴

Two years later, in 1710, Dey Bakdāsh was assassinated, and Dey “Dālī Ibrāhīm” succeeded him; however, the soldiers’ resentment and rebellion did not abate, and the new Dey was assassinated after only five months in office.¹⁵

Thereafter, Dey “‘Alī Shāwush” assumed power (1710/1718). With him began the second phase of the rule of the deys, known as the “deys-pashas” (1711/1830), because the deys sought a decree of appointment (firmān) from the Sublime Porte in return for acknowledging the spiritual authority of the Ottoman sultan.¹⁶

Moreover, the rulers of Algiers and Tunis cooperated to confront the rebellious Ḥanānsha tribe, which evaded taxes and shifted its allegiance. They launched military campaigns against it in 1715 and 1724, led by the Bey of Constantine, Būkmiyya, and Bey Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī.¹⁷ The peaceful situation between the two countries endured for a long time, during which each focused on addressing its internal problems and on reconstruction. Would this situation continue, or would it change? If it changed, what were its causes?

Although Bey Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī avoided the error into which the rulers of the Muradid dynasty had fallen by making rule hereditary, thereby putting an end to the struggle over

succession to the throne,¹⁸ he also relied, in implementing his policy, on a government independent of rule in Istanbul, composed of men of religion and saintly figures, and he maintained security through an army drawn from the Arab populace.¹⁹

Despite the success of his measures, Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī committed an error by raising his nephew ‘Alī as his successor, which later led to the division of the Eyalet of Tunis into two rival fronts and opened the door to Algerian intervention after ‘Alī became the commander of the Tunisian army and was responsible for tax collection and for disciplining rebellious tribes.²⁰ The situation remained as it was, and ‘Alī Pasha believed himself to be the sole legitimate heir to his uncle's rule in Tunis. However, circumstances changed suddenly when Bey Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī was blessed with a child in 1710, born to a Genoese concubine who had been taken captive in one of the maritime jihād operations.²¹

‘Alī Pasha felt that his dream of succession had been lost once Muḥammad al-Rashīd, the son of Ḥusayn Bey, acquired the formal role of heir apparent and commander of the army. He therefore began to gather around him his uncle’s enemies and to plan to restore his political standing, even though his position as pasha had become merely honorary.²²

Bey Ḥusayn tightened surveillance over his nephew and placed him under a form of house arrest.²³ “‘Alī Pasha” exploited the opportunity created by his uncle’s absence on one of his expeditions and fled, heading for Jabal Wislāt on 20 February 1728. When his uncle learned of what had occurred, he dispatched “Ibn Munshiyya” at the head of an army to pursue the fugitive; however, it appears that he was complicit with him, for he slowed the army’s advance until ‘Alī Pasha reached the mountain and sought refuge among the Wislātīs. There, a conspiracy was devised between ‘Alī Pasha and the army commander: “Ibn Munshiyya” and some of his soldiers were arrested by the Wislātīs, and certain soldiers were released to convey news of the commander to Ḥusayn Bey, who perceived the deception contrived against him by his nephew and the army commander, who appears to have been the one who assisted ‘Alī Pasha in escaping.²⁴

4.2. The Husaynid Succession Crisis in Tunis (1728):

After ‘Alī Pasha’s flight to Jabal Wislāt and the conspiracy that took place between him and the commander of the army, he decided to launch a campaign in person against his nephew, enlisting the Dūrīd, Awlād Sa‘īd, al-Suwās, al-Mathālīth, Jlāṣ, Awlād ‘Awn, and al-Ka‘ūb tribes.²⁵ His army consisted of forty thousand soldiers. This marked the beginning of the sedition known as the “Husaynid Pashalik Sedition.”²⁶ During the march to Jabal Wislāt, several battles took place between Bey Ḥusayn and the supporters of ‘Alī Pasha, and each time, victories favoured the pashas. Nevertheless, Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī was able to tighten the noose around the mountain’s inhabitants and isolate them from the remaining regions of the country.²⁷

‘Alī Pasha refused to surrender, supported by the inhabitants of the mountain. However, after the failure of attempts at reconciliation and the severe siege imposed by Bey Ḥusayn, which prevented any assistance, the inhabitants were compelled to abandon their principles and betray ‘Alī Pasha.²⁸ He was therefore forced to flee with his son towards the western frontier of the eyalet, and he sought refuge in Algiers in 1729.²⁹

The conflict ended in favour of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī and conditions stabilised, yet he remained anxious about ‘Alī Pasha in Algiers. He therefore made contact with the Dey of Algiers, Kūrdī ‘Abdī, in 1724/1732.³⁰

He requested that he place ‘Alī Pasha under house arrest in Algiers in exchange for paying him 50,000 piastres.³¹ The Dey of Algiers accepted the matter.³² Thus, the way was once again opened for Algiers, in a new phase, to determine whether stability would prevail in the Eyalet of Tunis.

5.2. Algeria’s exploitation of the Pashalik Sedition:

Since ‘Alī Pasha’s arrival in Algiers in 1729, he has spared no effort in attempting to persuade the deys of Algiers to assist them in ascending the seat of rule in Tunis. He failed, and he continued his endeavors until he was able to achieve his aim, benefiting from the following reasons:

Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ceased paying the sums owed to Algiers, considering the people of Tunis more entitled to these monies than he had been paying annually.³³

He did not extend assistance to Algiers in its war with Spain, which reoccupied Oran in 1732.

On the other hand, ‘Alī Pasha’s efforts began to bear fruit, for he succeeded in persuading Bey Būkmiyya (1713/1736), who had previously known him and who, in turn, persuaded Dey Ibrāhīm Khaznājī (1145–1149 AH/1732–1736)³⁴ to attack Tunis and to obtain the monies that ‘Alī Pasha had promised them, estimated at 200,000 écus,³⁵ According to what ‘Azīz Sāmiḥ al-Tur mentioned. Aḥmad Tawfīq al-Madanī, however, states that the sum that ‘Alī Pasha promised the Dey of Algiers amounted to 3,500 francs annually, together with a quantity of wheat,³⁶ in addition to providing guarantees, including that the Algerian army could withdraw in the event of defeat and its subsequent recapture.

In the face of these inducements that ‘Alī Pasha presented to Dey Ibrāhīm Khaznājī, on the one hand, and Bey Ḥusayn’s intransigence, on the other hand, it was decided to dispatch an expedition against Tunis. The expedition set out from Algiers in Dhū al-Ḥijja 1147 AH, corresponding to April–May 1735, under the command of Ḥusayn Bey Būkmiyya and Khūja al-Khaznājī.³⁷ When Ḥusayn heard of the Algerians’ departure to fight him, he mustered his forces. He proceeded to the town of al-Kāf, ordering its evacuation to cut off supplies to the Algerian army. He then returned to Tunis in late Ṣafar 1148 AH, corresponding to Thursday, 21 July 1735. After the arrival of the Algerian army, it encamped near Tunis, and fighting began on 16 Rabī‘ al-Thānī 1148 AH, corresponding to 4 December 1735.³⁸ The Algerian forces launched a sudden attack on Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī’s forces, which were unprepared, and many of them were eliminated.³⁹ The Tunisian forces were defeated, and Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī fled with those who were with him to Kairouan,⁴⁰ leaving behind his provisions, munitions, and troops in the hands of Bey Būkmiyya and ‘Alī Pasha.⁴¹

“Yūnus Bey,” the son of ‘Alī Pasha, hastened towards the city of Tunis, and the news spread rapidly. Bey Būkmiyya installed ‘Alī Pasha on the throne of Tunis on 7 September 1735.

The Algerian army did not leave Tunis until ten days had passed; it remained to observe conditions and then returned to Algiers. Algeria's share was thirty-five horses laden with the cash and monies that 'Alī Pasha granted in return for assistance.⁴²

These circumstances led to fighting between the full brothers of the pasha and the Husaynid factions, and this ordeal did not end until the killing of Bey Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī in 1153 AH/1740, the founder of the Husaynid dynasty's rule in the Eyalet of Tunis since 1705.⁴³

During this phase, Tunis, especially Kairouan, which supported Bey Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, faced tragic conditions. The scarcity of wheat drove the price of a single šā' to sixty riyāls; need compelled people to sell the blood of slaughtered animals, and people ate date stones and palm flour. The wealthy sold everything they possessed, while the poor died. Matters reached the point that people went without food for days. This deteriorating situation was what led the people of Kairouan to abandon Bey Ḥusayn.⁴⁴ As for the sons of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī Muḥammad al-Rashīd, Maḥmūd, and 'Alī, they sought refuge in Algiers; thus, 'Alī Pasha became the unchallenged master of the eyalet.⁴⁵

5.2. The Rule of the Pashas in Tunis (1740/1756):

After 'Alī Pasha became the sole ruler in Tunis, matters settled in his favour. He was inclined towards monopolising authority with his two sons, Yūsuf and Muḥammad, and he became known for issuing legal judgements that, in many instances, amounted to orders of execution, to the point that no one felt secure.⁴⁶ In particular, those who had been supporters of his uncle. His dominance intensified, and his power grew.⁴⁷ Moreover, he oppressed the people by pursuing the policy of al-mushtarā, whereby the state purchased crops from farmers before they ripened at paltry prices and later resold them at exorbitant prices. This led to the bankruptcy of farmers, particularly olive growers.⁴⁸ 'Alī Pasha's policy provoked several rebellions and uprisings, including the January 2015 revolts in 1743 and 1752 and the rebellion of the large Hammāma tribe in 1750. These uprisings resulted in the killing of many people, who began to abandon the regime almost entirely.⁴⁹

His domestic policy did not differ significantly from his foreign policy. His rigid, arrogant character and intense love of grandeur drove him to impose his sovereignty over the areas that Europeans had obtained under the capitulations. He also displayed his exalted status when he compelled the French consul to kiss his hand or declare war on his country.⁵⁰

‘Alī Pasha repudiated the Algerian favour that had brought him to power and refused to pay the annual tribute, which he regarded as an affront to his sovereignty; consequently, a confrontation ensued between him and Algiers.⁵¹

6.2. The Sedition of Yūnus Bey ibn ‘Alī Pasha and the Algerian Intervention:

The familial struggle over the throne returned with Yūnus Bey, the son of ‘Alī Pasha, prompting the father to fear his son's threat.⁵² War broke out among family members, led by ‘Alī Pasha’s two sons, Muḥammad and Sulaymān, against their brother “Yūnus,” who was entrenched in Kairouan. Under pressure from his brothers, he sought the assistance of Ḥasan Bey Būḥank, “Bey of Constantine” (1736/1754).⁵³ The latter was nicknamed ‘Ajashshī,⁵⁴ Perhaps in the hope that he would assist him in his affair in exchange for one hundred thousand riyāls. Bey Ḥasan stipulated that the money be paid before his expeditionary force set out, and they ultimately agreed that he would depart and, upon reaching Tīfāsh on the border and under Algerian jurisdiction, take a quarter of the agreed sum; if he reached Kairouan, he would take fifty thousand riyāls. The Algerian expeditionary force moved towards Tunis until it reached “Tīfāsh,” and Bey Ḥusayn received twenty-five thousand and then returned to Constantine; the reason for his withdrawal is unknown.⁵⁵

Yūnus Bey was unable to continue fighting against his brothers and his father, and he found no one to support him. The war ended with the father's victory and his recovery of power. As for Yūnus Bey, he went to Constantine,⁵⁶ Moreover, a new conflict arose between the sons of ‘Alī Pasha, Muḥammad and Sulaymān. The people and the soldiery inclined towards Sulaymān, which aroused Muḥammad’s envy, and he poisoned his brother and killed him on 22 Ṣafar 1164 AH/8 December 1754.⁵⁷

In the same year, the Dey of Algiers, Ibrāhīm Pasha, dispatched an expeditionary force to support Muḥammad Bey against ‘Alī Pasha. ‘Ajashshī Ḥusayn Bey prepared his force to depart, despite his refusal, since he was a friend of ‘Alī Pasha.⁵⁸ Aḥmad Āghā al-‘Arab joined the Bey of Constantine on their way to Tunis, together with Muḥammad and ‘Alī, the sons of Ḥusayn Bey. Ḥusayn Bey killed him secretly, in execution of the orders of the Dey of Algiers, Ibrāhīm Pasha, who ordered that the matter be handled covertly because of the āghā’s corruption and obstinacy, and then that they return after carrying out the order.⁵⁹

For this reason, in addition to the strong fortifications of the town of al-Kāf and the forces that ‘Alī Pasha had prepared, the expedition's failure in 1754 appears to have been due to this, and Bey Ḥusayn returned to Constantine.⁶⁰

Algeria’s Role in the Restoration of the Husaynid Rule:

3.1. The Elimination of ‘Alī Pasha, 1756:

This phase coincided with the accession of Dey ‘Alī Pasha Maqṣīs in 1754–1756, and with him Bey Ḥusayn Azraq ‘Aynū in 1754–1756.⁶¹ Dey ‘Alī Pasha was the first in Algiers to bear the title of “ruler,” because he monopolised power: no one shared authority with him, and his orders were enforced.⁶² The relationship between Ḥusayn Bey of Constantine and Dey ‘Alī was one of kinship, as the Dey was the bey’s maternal uncle; for this reason, his word carried weight with his uncle.⁶³

At this time, the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī were still refugees in Algiers. They did not hesitate, nor did they spare any effort, in persuading the ruler of Algiers to extend assistance to them in order to recover their father's throne, notwithstanding the rivalry from Yūnus Bey, the son of ‘Alī Pasha, who did not find acceptance with the Dey, who bore him rancour from the days of his participation with his father in the rule of Tunis.⁶⁴ Moreover, Bey Ḥusayn Azraq ‘Aynū treated him as a captive, confiscated all his wealth of gold, weapons, and jewels of no value,⁶⁵ Moreover, deprived him of all his servants.⁶⁶

Dey ‘Alī decided to extend assistance to the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī to recover their lost dominion. He therefore ordered Bey Azraq ‘Aynū to prepare to launch the campaign against Tunis. The letter stated, “The holder of the province of Tunis has reneged, and defects have become apparent in his conditions; it is therefore necessary that we treat him as an enemy, and you must go together with his cousin who resides with you,” meaning Bey ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. “Confront him with sternness: either he fulfils his obligations, or there will befall him what befell his predecessors at our hands.”

The bey prepared and made himself ready, and upon the arrival of the expeditionary force coming from the city of Algiers, he proceeded to Tunis in the company of the sons of Ḥusayn.⁶⁷

The campaign reached the city of Tunis and imposed a tight siege. The two sides exchanged gunfire and artillery; the advantage lay with the troops of Tunis, which were entrenched within the city. However, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, by virtue of his knowledge of his country, was able to carry out a swift assault by which he reversed the balance in his favour.⁶⁸ The outcome of the campaign was the capture of ‘Alī Pasha and his son Muḥammad, their execution, and the installation of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Turkī as Bey of Tunis, thereby recovering his father's throne in 1169 AH/1756.⁶⁹

Results of the campaign:

- ‘Alī Bey fled to Sfax, and Muḥammad entrenched himself in the Bardo Palace, which was besieged by the Algerian forces. This led ‘Alī Bey to negotiate with Bey Ḥusayn and to persuade him to withdraw in exchange for a sum of money collected from donations by the inhabitants of certain Tunisian towns to secure the departure of the Algerian army and avoid the devastation of the country.⁷⁰

The agreement took the following form: the signing of an accord providing for the lifting of the siege imposed on the city of Tunis and the granting of substantial sums of money to the Algerians.⁷¹ In addition, the offering to Dey Azraq ‘Aynū of valuable gifts in the form of horse saddles, artefacts, and precious objects,⁷² in return for the Algerians' demolition of the

fortifications standing in Tunisian territory adjacent to the Algerian border. One of these, located in the town of al-Kāf, was destroyed by the Bey of Constantine. Algeria also received two large shipments of olive oil for lighting mosques. Thus, the Dey of Algiers became the effective master of the two eyalets.⁷³

This ordeal that Tunis experienced on this occasion came to an end, leaving behind a large number of dead, the loss of property, and destruction that affected all the towns lying along the route of the Algerian campaign as far as Tunis, as well as the death of a significant number of its inhabitants. Perhaps its most salient results were the killing of ‘Alī Pasha and the return of the sons of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī to take hold of the reins of power; therefore, the Husaynid–Pashalik sedition came to an end.⁷⁴

Tunis would remain subject to the rule of the Husaynid dynasty from 1756-- 1956, at which point our research concludes at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Would the political arena in Tunis thereby be free of problems? Moreover, what were the challenges of this phase?

3.2. The Accession of the Sons of Ḥusayn to the Throne of Tunis:

3.2.1. The Rule of Muḥammad Bey (1756/1759):

Muḥammad Bey ruled for only three years. His reign was characterised by justice and stability, and he enjoyed a favourable standing. He left his two sons, Ismā‘īl and Maḥmūd, of tender age, and it was agreed that ‘Alī Bey ibn al-Ḥusayn would assume the throne temporarily until they came of age.⁷⁵

3.2.2. The Rule of ‘Alī Bey ibn al-Ḥusayn (1759/1782):

‘Alī Bey consolidated his rule and began preparing his son Ḥammūda for succession. At the same time, danger emerged from Ismā‘īl, the son of Yūnus, the son of ‘Alī Pasha, who rebelled, gathered supporters in the south, won over tribes, and received the support of the governor of Tripoli.⁷⁶ Ismā‘īl formed a large army and wrought destruction in his pursuit of

power, but he failed; he left Tunis for Constantine and then for Algiers, seeking the support of its ruler.⁷⁷

Characteristics of the Policy of ‘Alī Bey ibn al-Ḥusayn:

‘Alī Bey ruled for approximately twenty-four years. His reign was distinguished by peace and stability, together with a policy of conciliation towards the Algerians and compliance with their demands, despite their negative impact on the Tunisian treasury and on economic growth.⁷⁸

‘Alī Pasha exploited stability to strengthen political and economic relations with European states such as Venice and France. Commercial exchanges succeeded with the support of politicians such as Muṣṭafā Khūja and Ḥammūda ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz,⁷⁹ Those who were inclined towards France and its interests in Tunis.⁸⁰

After the succession struggle ended, the internal situation in Tunis stabilised, with the notables entrusted by the government to handle economic matters with the beylik and foreign merchants. Influential social groups also emerged, including scholars, men of religion, rural shaykhs, and certain prominent families that obtained privileges, such as tax exemptions.⁸¹

The period extending from 1756 to 1782 was characterised by Tunis’s complete subjection and dependence upon Algiers.⁸² ‘Alī Pasha drew a lesson from the earlier struggles over the throne and prepared his son Ḥammūda Pasha for succession from an early age, given his competence in administering the affairs of the eyalet, in order to avert the outbreak of wars among brothers after his death.⁸³ Ḥammūda Pasha began to advance through positions in the government of the eyalet, including being entrusted to deputise for his father in considering certain cases brought before the bey’s court,⁸⁴ He then assumed the office of Bey of Tunis.⁸⁵

When ‘Alī Pasha sensed the approach of his death, he persuaded his nephew Maḥmūd Bey to relinquish rule in favour of his son Ḥammūda Pasha, after marrying him to one of his daughters and leveraging the consensus of his ministers; thus, he appointed Ḥammūda as his father’s deputy in the administration of Tunis in 1184 AH/1777.⁸⁶

To confer legitimacy on the appointment decision, he submitted a request to Sultan "Selim III" in Istanbul to confirm it. Indeed, the decree of appointment arrived, carried by the sultan's envoy, and allegiance was pledged to "Ḥammūda Pasha" as heir apparent in the month of Muḥarram 1191 AH, corresponding to 9 February 1777.⁸⁷

‘Alī Pasha died on 18 Jumādā al-Thāniya 1196 AH, corresponding to 30 May 1782, and his son Ḥammūda Pasha assumed power peacefully, despite the apprehension and anxiety that the eyalet had experienced.⁸⁸

After Ḥammūda Pasha assumed rule in Tunis, would he follow the example of his predecessors in his dealings with Algiers?

3.3. Relations during the Reign of Ḥammūda Pasha between Concord and Disagreement: Two Phases:

3.3.1. The phase of conciliation (Concord) (1782–1807):

Ḥammūda Pasha assumed power at a critical juncture in Tunisia's history, having inherited from his father a considerable deficit in the eyalet's treasury. This was due to his father's heavy expenditure on the desire for rule in Tunis, in addition to the sums spent on purchasing peace from Algiers.⁸⁹

Ḥammūda Pasha's policy focused on strengthening the national economy and reinforcing defence against external dangers, with a prominent role for politicians. His reign coincided with that of Ṣāliḥ Bey of Constantine, known for firmness and stability,⁹⁰ which extended from 1711--1792.⁹¹

Ṣāliḥ Bey was in accord with ‘Alī Pasha during the latter's assumption of power in Tunis, owing to the latter's commitment to paying what he owed to Algiers, and each knew the other.⁹² On the other hand, Ḥammūda Pasha was aware of Tunisia's dependence on Algiers not only within the two countries but also externally; this was confirmed by Spain's

stipulation that peace with Tunis could take place only in the presence of Algiers, yet he did not dare to refuse it.⁹³

3.3.4. Border Tribes Threaten the Truce:

In 1783, the truce between the two eyalets nearly turned into war, but Ḥammūda Pasha did not wish to ignite it because of the peace between him and the Republic of Venice.⁹⁴ Was on the verge of collapse. Thus, he did not hasten to declare war on Algiers.⁹⁵ In 1783, a Tunisian tribe entered Algiers, fleeing Ḥassān al-Kabīr's forces during tax collection. Šāliḥ, the Bey of Constantine, agreed with its remaining in Algerian territory, which provoked disagreement between the two sides.⁹⁶ When the tribe settled in Algiers, Šāliḥ Bey sent an emissary to Ḥammūda Pasha with a letter demanding that compensation be paid to the tribe and for the losses caused by Ḥassān al-Kabīr. The sum demanded was large, estimated at 40,000 sikīn.⁹⁷

Ḥammūda Pasha did not give an explicit response to Šāliḥ Bey's demands.⁹⁸ Moreover, a complaint against him was sent to the Dey of Algiers, Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān.⁹⁹

The ruler of Tunis did not wait for the Bey of Algiers' response. He prepared an army and led it towards al-Jarīd and the western frontier to strengthen tribe loyalty; however, he was surprised to find that Šāliḥ Bey had sent officers to greet him and presented him with thoroughbred horses.¹⁰⁰ Ḥammūda Pasha rejoiced at Šāliḥ Bey's proper conduct, yet after the arrival of a letter from Dey ʿUthmān Pasha in support of Constantine, he realised that refusing to pay compensation would lead to war. He was therefore compelled to pay 25,000 sikīn to the Tunisian tribe in June 1784.¹⁰¹

By this action, Ḥammūda Pasha secured the Algerian side and devoted himself to war with the Republic of Venice, which launched several campaigns against Tunis beginning in July 1784, then on 30 October 1785, and then on 12 March 1786, in which Tunis suffered heavy losses.¹⁰²

Algiers regained their dominance over Tunis, and Şāliḥ Bey exploited the migration of several Constantine residents to Tunis in 1787 to level an accusation of incitement against the Bey of Tunis. He declared war and mobilised 6,000 soldiers, while the Eyalet of Tunis began preparations for defence.¹⁰³ Ḥammūda Pasha prepared an army of 2,000 Turkish soldiers, 3,000 Kouloughlis, and tribal forces; however, in the end, he preferred peace out of fear of the Algerians and paid an enormous sum, directing his efforts toward confronting the threat that the Republic of Venice posed to Tunis.¹⁰⁴ Here, the application of the law of the strong over the weak to impose hegemony is clearly evident, as Algiers did in Tunis. Cautious peace between the two eyalets continued for a period. During this time, Şāliḥ Bey was killed by Ḥasan Būḥank on 23 August 1792, after which they sowed discord between him and Dey Ḥassān.¹⁰⁵

3.3.5. The phase of the confrontation (1807–1813):

In 1807, Ḥammūda Pasha refused to fulfil the annual obligations toward Algiers, such as sending ships laden with oil and gifts. He refused to negotiate with the Dey of Algiers and decided to attack Constantine.¹⁰⁶

We have previously indicated that the men of his state played a significant role in this conflict, as Ḥammūda Pasha did not make this decision alone; instead, he consulted with his principal ministers, such as the minister ‘Abd Allāh, who advised him not to enter into this war and preferred that negotiations take place. For his minister, the Keeper of the Seal, he advised him to wage war and not to remain under hegemony.¹⁰⁷

The reasons that drove Ḥammūda Pasha to wage war against the Eyalet of Algiers were numerous: the decision was not taken on the spur of the moment. However, it was the result of prolonged reflection on ridding the country of Algerian influence, which exhausted it economically and politically. For this reason, he began preparing for war by strengthening his defences. He purchased weapons from France and Denmark, including 24 cannons, along with shells and a substantial quantity of gunpowder.¹⁰⁸

At this stage, Muṣṭafā Injlīz, the Bey of Constantine, was present in Tunis after fleeing a death sentence, and he promised Ḥammūda Pasha assistance in winning over the inhabitants of Constantine. Tension also increased when, in 1805, Algiers seized herds of livestock near the border, and the Algerian navy seized Tunisian vessels to compensate for nonpayment of dues.¹⁰⁹

After Bey Ḥammūda Pasha fortified the town of al-Kāf and brought to it large quantities of provisions, war munitions, and foodstuffs especially wheat and barley in order to make it a rear base in the event of defeat and its being besieged by the Algerians, the Bey of Tunis completed his preparations for his campaign and proceeded, accompanied by Muṣṭafā Injlīz, towards the city of Constantine, determined to inflict defeat upon Algiers.¹¹⁰ At this stage, Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ, Bey of Constantine, was the ruler of the city of Constantine in 1221 AH/1805.¹¹¹

The Tunisian campaign reached the outskirts of Constantine, where Ḥasan Bey met it with a small force. His troops were swiftly defeated, and he withdrew into the city, upon which Ḥammūda Pasha's forces imposed a fierce siege that lasted a month and included bombardment with bombs and an intensification of the blockade.¹¹² The siege of Constantine was reinforced by additional forces of 400 soldiers, equipped with many weapons. However, the engagements revealed the weakness of the Tunisian army, and its forces began to scatter after the withdrawal of the Awlād Dūrīd tribe.¹¹³

In late April of the same year, reinforcements arrived from the Dey of Algiers: two armies reached the theatre, the first coming from the city of Algiers and the second from the city of Annaba. The Tunisian forces, whose cohesion had already broken down, were encircled.¹¹⁴ Moreover, took flight, suffering heavy losses estimated at 600 dead. A large number of soldiers were taken captive, and substantial war matériel was left behind. Victory favoured the Algerian forces from the first engagement. The Algerian forces succeeded in lifting the siege of Constantine and restoring security to the city after it had endured an entire month of fear.¹¹⁵ Thus, the Algerian army achieved a great victory over the Tunisian forces, which withdrew. Would the Algerians be satisfied with this victory, or would they seek revenge?

3.5.1. The Engagement of Sirāṭ (1221 AH/1807):

Algiers did not allow this opportunity to pass; it declared war on Tunis and prepared a large expedition under the command of Ḥusayn Bey and the Pasha Āghā Ḥasan, consisting of eighteen thousand soldiers. It advanced towards Tunis in July 1807 and clashed with the Tunisian army, led by Yūsuf Ṣāhib al-Ṭābi', at Wādī Sirāṭ near al-Kāf. Many battles were fought over three days, during which the Algerians initially won.¹¹⁶ However, the former Bey of Constantine, Muṣṭafā Injlīz, by virtue of his prior knowledge of the Algerian forces, played a significant role in the Tunisian forces' steadfastness and in transforming their defeat into victory.¹¹⁷

On the day following the final battle, Ḥusayn Bey withdrew to the city of Constantine, which led to the defeat of the Algerian forces, and the Tunisian forces achieved a victory without difficulty, seizing abundant matériel and large sums of money.¹¹⁸ The outcome of this battle was the breaking of the Algerian army and the subsequent killing of its commander, by order of the Dey of Algiers, following a denunciation by Ḥasan Āghā.¹¹⁹

As for the Tunisian side, Ḥammūda Pasha realised his ambition of dispensing with the payment of monies to Algiers and won the affection of the people of Tunis, who had been exhausted by the war with Algiers and had, during it, lost a vast number of lives and large sums of money that they had been in urgent need of.¹²⁰

3.6. An Algerian Attempt to Recover Its Influence in Tunis:

Tunis represented for Algiers an important additional source of funds, and it was not easy to relinquish. After putting an end to the sedition of Aḥmad Shāwush, the Bey of Constantine known as al-Qabā'īlī, in 1808, Algiers prepared a military expedition. It advanced towards Tunis but failed and returned in June 1808.¹²¹

The confrontations shifted to the sea, as the Algerian navy attacked Tunis under the command of Ra'īs Ḥamīdū, by order of the Dey of Algiers (1809–1815), near the island of

Jerba and the coast of Sousse. The Algerian vessels defeated the Tunisian navy and captured one ship, while the other fled under the command of Captain Muḥammad Ra'īs al-Murālī.¹²²

Naval operations against Tunis continued on several occasions, such as the attack of 1811, led by Ra'īs Ḥamīdū, who attacked Ḥalq al-Wād and the city of Tunis and bombarded it with shells. There was no mention of spoils, from which no successful attack is devoid.¹²³ During this phase, Ḥammūda Pasha was floundering amid internal problems that multiplied during his rule, and he nearly lost power due to the revolt of the Kouloughlis against him.¹²⁴

Ḥammūda Pasha died on 1 Shawwāl 1229 AH, corresponding to 16 September 1814.¹²⁵ However, Algeria's attempts to recover its influence continued until 1817, when peace was concluded between Algiers and Tunis, and Dey 'Alī Khūja (1817/1818) relinquished the financial claims at the beginning of his rule.¹²⁶

Thus, the Algerians' ambitions ended to recover their influence and domination in the Eyalet of Tunis, which had, until recently, been an important additional source of revenue for the Algerian treasury. Although Algerian domination over the rulers of Tunis ended with the reign of Ḥammūda Pasha, the condescending attitude of the rulers of Algiers towards Tunis persisted until the end of Ottoman rule in Algiers. This is shown by the letter of Ḥusayn Bey to the governor of Tunis concerning the arrest of soldiers who had fled to Tunis and their return to Algiers, dated 22 Jumādā al-Thāniya 1233 AH, which included the following: "In the presence of the possessor of felicity, manliness, and dignity, the beloved brother, the most noble, the pasha of exalted rank ... and since our soldiers, as outlined in the written notice, include among them those from the Rūm who have fled in escape to your side ... and since the image of the established order in the time of our ancient predecessors, upon the principles of proper organisation, is that whenever a person from among the people of the way of Algiers is found, having fled or escaped to the regions of Tunis and Tripoli, then, by the requirement of the rule of the odjak and according to the promulgated regulations, they are to be apprehended and delivered to our agents for their return to the victorious odjak ..."¹²⁷

We observe from this letter that Dey Ḥusayn employs expressions that indicate the rulers' view of Tunis, which was always the same about Tunis. He stated that the Bey of Tunis conformed to the system that the predecessors of Dey Ḥusayn had imposed upon Tunis.

Despite the conflicts between Algiers and Tunis, Ḥamdān Khūja indicates that the Algerians intervened in Tunis eleven times and that their interventions aimed to install a ruler loyal to them, not to occupy the country. They upheld the principles of war and the honour of the inhabitants, respected property and the social order, and departed after concluding treaties, even when they most often achieved victory.

4. Conclusion:

From the foregoing, we may draw the following conclusions:

Both the Eyalet of Tunis and the Eyalet of Algiers experienced Ottoman rule during the modern period, and the region witnessed numerous changes in the eighteenth century, manifested in many political and military interventions by the rulers of Algiers in the Eyalet of Tunis.

Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Turkī ruled the Eyalet of Tunis at the beginning of the eighteenth century and established hereditary rule for his family that endured until 1956. Algerian intervention and influence continued throughout the eighteenth century and became more pronounced, especially from 1756–1807, when Tunis and its rulers were under Algerian rule. This caused substantial haemorrhaging of the Tunisian treasury in favour of Algiers.

There were numerous attempts by the authority at the Sublime Porte to resolve the conflict and to call for the unification of efforts in the face of external dangers.

The persistent conflict between the two eyalets provided a favourable environment for movements of rebellion within both, which led the two eyalets into periods of truce to address internal problems and to achieve accomplishments such as the liberation of Oran on two occasions, the last of which was in 1792, in the case of Algiers. Tunis exploited these

periods to address internal affairs and revive its economy, which the ongoing wars had harmed.

Most Algerian interventions in Tunis occurred at the request of its rulers to bolster their authority or to punish rulers who were remiss in paying their taxes. No intention appeared to annex the Eyalet of Tunis or to alter its system; instead, the aim was to reap abundant spoils and to obtain economic privileges and facilities for Algerian rulers, measures that had grave consequences for the Tunisian economy and social life.

The conflict between the two eyalets caused severe losses across all domains. This resulted in the killing of a large number of people and the devastation of several cities, such as al-Kāf, Tunis, and Constantine. It also led to the depletion of military power, which the two eyalets urgently needed to repel the external European threat.

Sources

- Ibn Abi Dhiaf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman bi-Akhbar Muluk Tunis wa Ahd al-Aman*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2, pt. 2. Edited by a committee from the Ministry of Cultural Affairs; revised by Abdelbaki El Hermassi. Tunis: Al Dar Al Arabia Lil Kitab, 2004.
- Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar fi Ajaib al-Tawarikh wa al-Akhbar*. 1st ed. Vol. 2. Edited by Ali El Zaoui and Mohamed Mahfoudh. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1988.
- Ibn El Moufti, Chaouch Hussein Ben Rajab. *Taqyidat Ibn El Moufti fi Tarikh Bachawat al-Jazair wa Ulama'iha*. Study and edition by Fares Kaawan. 1st ed. Algiers: Beit El Hikma Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009.
- Ibn Abdelaziz, Hammouda Ben Mohamed. *Al-Kitab al-Bachi*. Edited by Mohamed Madhoui. Vol. 1. Tunis: Al Dar Al Tounisia Lil Nachr, 1970.
- Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*. Edited and introduced by Abdellah Hammadi. Constantine, Algeria: Dar El Faiz Lil Tiba'a wa al-Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2011.

- Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa fi Hal Dukhoul Etturk Balad Constantine wa Istila'ihim ala Awtaniha*. Edited and introduced by Yahia Bouaziz. Algiers: Diwan al-Matbouat al-Jamiiya, n.d.
- Hamdan Ben Othman Khodja. *Al-Miraa*. Edited and introduced by Mohamed El Arabi Zoubiri. Algiers: Al Charika Al Wataniya Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 1982.
- Ezzahar, Ahmed Chérif. *Moudhakkirat Chérif Ahmed Ezzahar*. Edited by Ahmed Toufik El Madani. Algiers: Al Charika Al Wataniya Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 1974.
- Essghir Ben Youssef. *Al-Machra al-Maliki fi Sultat Awlād Ali Etturki*. Revised and edited by Ahmed Ettouili. 4 vols., vol. 3. Tunis: Al Matbaa Al Asriya, 2009.

References

- Ibn El Khouja, Mohamed. *Safahat min Tarikh Tunis*. 1st ed. Revised and edited by Hammadi Essahli and Djilali Ben El Hadj Yahia. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1986.
- El Imam, Rachad. *Siyassat Hammouda Bacha fi Tunis (1782–1814)*. Tunis: منشورات الجامعة التونسية, 1980.
- Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine fi al-Ahd al-Turki (1792–1833)*. Translated by Saleh Nour; revised and edited by Abderrahmane Chibane. 1st ed. Algiers: Dar Kortoba Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2010.
- Ben Amer, Ahmed. *Tunis Abra Ettarikh: Min Aqdam al-Ossour ila Ilaan al-Joumhouria*. 1st ed. Tunis: n.p., 1960.
- Bouaziz, Yahia. *Al-Mourassalat al-Jazairiya al-Isbaniya fi Archif Ettarikh al-Watani li Madrid (1780–1798)*. Algiers: Dar El Bassair Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009. 79.
- Tablit, Ali. *Erraiss Hamidou, Amirale al-Bahriya al-Jazairiya (1770–1815)*. El Biar, Algiers: منشورات تالة, 2006.
- Djilali, Mohamed Ben Abderrahmane. *Tarikh al-Jazair al-Aam*. 5 vols., vol. 2. Algiers: Dar al-Oumma, 2014.
- Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya min al-Fath al-Arabi hatta Ihtilal Faransa lil Jazair*. 1st ed. Translated by Mohamed Abdelkrim El Wafi. Benghazi, Libya: Manshourat Jamiat Qar Younes, 1992.

- Saidouni, Nacereddine. *Al-Jazair: Mountalaqat wa Afak min Khilal Qadaya wa Mafahim Tarikhiyya*. n.p.: Alam al-Maarifa, 2008.
- Saidouni, Nacereddine. *Al-Nidham al-Mali fi al-Jazair Khilal al-Ahd al-Othmani (1792–1830)*. 1st ed. Algiers: Dar El Bassair, 2012.
- Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis min Oussour ma Qabl Ettarikh ila al-Istiqlal*. 3rd ed. Edited by Mohamed Echaouch and Mohamed Ajina. Tunis: Dar Sarras Lil Nachr, 1993.
- Abdelwahab, Hassan Hosni. *Kholassat Tarikh Tunis*. 3rd ed. Tunis: Dar al-Founoun, 1954.
- Amiraoui, Ahmida. *Alaqat Baylek Echarq al-Jazairi bi Tunis Awakhir al-Ahd al-Othmani wa Bidayat al-Ihtilal al-Faransi*. Algiers: Dar al-Baath, 2002.
- El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Harb al-Thalath Mi'a Sana bayna al-Jazair wa Ispania (1492–1792)*. 3rd ed. Algiers: Al-Mouassassa al-Wataniya lil-Kitab, 1984.
- El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Mohamed Othmane Bacha, Day al-Jazair (1766–1791)*. Algiers: Dar El Bassair Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009.
- Helaili, Hanifi. *Awraq fi Tarikh al-Jazair fi al-Ahd al-Othmani*. 1st ed. Algiers: Dar El Hoda Lil Tiba'a wa al-Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2008.

Theses:

- Souria Hissam. “Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis during the Eighteenth Century.” Master’s thesis in Modern and Contemporary History, Faculty of Human Sciences and Islamic Civilisation, Department of History and Archaeology, University of Oran, 2012–2013.
- El Aayeb, Kawthar. “Algerian–Tunisian Relations during the Period of the Deys (1711–1830).” Master’s thesis in Modern and Contemporary History, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University of El Oued, Algeria, 2013–2014.
- Maida, Kamal. “Tunis’s Relations with Western Mediterranean European States and the Influence of the Navy during the Reign of Hammouda Pacha (1782–1814).” Master’s thesis in Modern History, University Centre of Ghardaia, 2011–2012.

Endnotes:

-
- ¹ Abdelwahab, Hassan Hosni. *Kholassat Tarikh Tunis*. 3rd ed. Tunis: Dar al-Founoun, (1954), 179.
- ² Ben Amer, Ahmed. *Tunis Abra Ettarikh: Min Aqdam al-Ossour ila Ilaan al-Joumhouria*. 1st ed. Tunis: n.p., 1960, 249.
- ³ Abdelwahab, Hassan Hosni. *Kholassat Tarikh Tunis*, 179.
- ⁴ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya min al-Fath al-Arabi hatta Ihtilal Faransa lil Jazair*. Translated by Mohamed Abdelkrim El Wafi. 1st ed. Benghazi, Libya: Manshourat Jamiat Qar Younes, 1992, 163.
- ⁵ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman bi-Akhbar Muluk Tunis wa Ahd al-Aman*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2, pt. 2. Edited by a committee from the Ministry of Cultural Affairs; revised by Abdelbaki El Hermassi. Tunis: Al Dar Al Arabia Lil Kitab, 2004, 88.
- ⁶ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 164.
- ⁷ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 88; see also Abdelwahab, Hassan Hosni. *Kholassat Tarikh Tunis*, 180.
- ⁸ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, 90.
- ⁹ Ibn El Moufti, Chaouch Hussein Ben Rajab. *Taqyidat Ibn El Moufti fi Tarikh Bachawat al-Jazair wa Ulama'iha*. Study and edition by Fares Kaawan. 1st ed. Algiers: Beit El Hikma Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009, 59.
- ¹⁰ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 89.
- ¹¹ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 166.
- ¹² Djilali, Mohamed Ben Abderrahmane. *Tarikh al-Jazair al-Aam*. 5 vols., vol. 2. Algiers: Dar al-Oumma, (2014), 206.
- ¹³ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Harb al-Thalath Mi'a Sana bayna al-Jazair wa Ispania (1492–1792)*. 3rd ed. Algiers: Al Mouassassa al-Wataniya lil Kitab, 1984, 462.
- ¹⁴ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Harb al-Thalath Mi'a Sana*, 465.
- ¹⁵ Djilali, Mohamed Ben Abderrahmane. *Tarikh al-Jazair al-Aam*, vol. 2, 218.
- ¹⁶ Saidouni, Nacereddine. *Al-Jazair: Mountalaqat wa Afak min Khilal Qadaya wa Mafahim Tarikhiyya*. n.p.: Alam al-Maarifa, 2008, 170.
- ¹⁷ Souria Hissam. "Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis during the Eighteenth Century." Master's thesis, University of Oran, 2012–(2013), 42.
- ¹⁸ Souria Hissam. "Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis," 49.
- ¹⁹ Souria Hissam. "Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis," 50.
- ²⁰ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 98.
- ²¹ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, 98–99.
- ²² Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis min Oussour ma Qabl Ettarikh ila al-Istiqlal*. 3rd ed. Edited by Mohamed Echaouch and Mohamed Ajina. Tunis: Dar Sarras Lil Nachr, 1993, 84.
- ²³ Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 85.
- ²⁴ Souria Hissam. "Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis," 53.
- ²⁵ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 176.
- ²⁶ This is the name given to the supporters of Ali Pacha, such as the inhabitants of Jbel Weslat and Awlād Ayyar; the Husaynids were the supporters of Bey Hussein, such as Jlass and Awlād Aoun. See Chérif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 80.
- ²⁷ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 176.
- ²⁸ Souria Hissam. "Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis," 54.
- ²⁹ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 176.
- ³⁰ Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar fi Ajaib al-Tawarikh wa al-Akhbar*. 1st ed. Vol. 2. Edited by Ali El Zaoui and Mohamed Mahfoudh. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1988, 61.

- ³¹ Paistere: an Ottoman currency used in the Maghreb during the Ottoman period. See Saidouni, Nacereddine. *Al-Nidham al-Mali fi al-Jazair Khilal al-Ahd al-Othmani (1792–1830)*. 1st ed. Algiers: Dar El Bassair, 2012, 205.
- ³² Souria Hissam. “Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis during the Eighteenth Century,” 55.
- ³³ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 177.
- ³⁴ Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar*, 62.
- ³⁵ A French coin in the sixteenth century; one gold ecu equals approximately two French livres. Cited in El Aayeb, Kawthar. “Algerian–Tunisian Relations during the Period of the Deys (1711–1830).” Master’s thesis, University of El Oued, Algeria, 2013–2014, 34.
- ³⁶ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Mohamed Othmane Bacha, Day al-Jazair (1766–1791)*. Algiers: Dar El Bassair Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009, 70.
- ³⁷ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa fi Hal Dukhoul Etturk Balad Constantine wa Istila’ihim ala Awtaniha*. Edited and introduced by Yahia Bouaziz. Algiers: Diwan al-Matbouat al-Jamiiya, (n.d.), 54.
- ³⁸ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 111–12.
- ³⁹ Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar*, 72.
- ⁴⁰ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 54.
- ⁴¹ Abdelwahab, Hassan Hosni. *Kholassat Tarikh Tunis*, 150–51.
- ⁴² Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, note, 55.
- ⁴³ Madkish, Mahmoud Ben Omar. *Op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 159.
- ⁴⁴ Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar fi Ajaib al-Tawarikh wa al-Akhbar*. 1st ed. Vol. 2. Edited by Ali El Zaoui and Mohamed Mahfoudh. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1988, 75.
- ⁴⁵ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 185.
- ⁴⁶ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 119.
- ⁴⁷ Mohamed El Baji El Masoudi. *Op. cit.*, p. 123.
- ⁴⁸ Ibn El Khouja, Mohamed. *Safahat min Tarikh Tunis*. 1st ed. Revised and edited by Hammadi Essahli and Djilali Ben El Hadj Yahia. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, (1986), 67–68.
- ⁴⁹ Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 85.
- ⁵⁰ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 186.
- ⁵¹ Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 86.
- ⁵² Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 125.
- ⁵³ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 56.
- ⁵⁴ The word is pronounced with a fatha on the letter ‘ayn and a sukun on the letter shin, and it means “cook” in Turkish. It was among the most important offices of the Ottoman state, as it denoted the supervisor of the kitchens of the Dey’s residence. See Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek (1790–1870). *Tarikh Balad Constantine*. Edited and introduced by Abdellah Hammadi. Constantine, Algeria: Dar El Faiz Lil Tiba’wa al-Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2011, 130.
- ⁵⁵ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, 130.
- ⁵⁶ Essghir Ben Youssef. *Al-Machra al-Maliki fi Sultat Awlad Ali Etturki*, 4 vols., vol. 3, 81.
- ⁵⁷ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 209–10.
- ⁵⁸ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, 131.
- ⁵⁹ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 57.
- ⁶⁰ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, 132.
- ⁶¹ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 57.
- ⁶² Ibn El Moufti, Hussein Ben Rajab. *Nuzhat al-Anzar*, 65.
- ⁶³ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, 134.
- ⁶⁴ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 210.
- ⁶⁵ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, note, 134.
- ⁶⁶ Ben El Attar, Ahmed Ben Mbarek. *Tarikh Balad Constantine*, note, 134–35.
- ⁶⁷ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 59.
- ⁶⁸ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 151–52.
- ⁶⁹ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, 153.
- ⁷⁰ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 154.
- ⁷¹ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Mohamed Othmane Bacha, Day al-Jazair (1766–1791)*, 71.
- ⁷² Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 215.

- ⁷³ Hamdan Ben Othman Khodja. *Al-Miraa*. Edited and introduced by Mohamed El Arabi Zoubiri. Algiers: Al Charika Al Wataniya Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 1982, 164.
- ⁷⁴ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 154.
- ⁷⁵ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, 156 and 159.
- ⁷⁶ Ibn Abdelaziz, Hammouda Ben Mohamed. *Al-Kitab al-Bachi*. Edited by Mohamed Madhoui. Vol. 1. Tunis: Al Dar Al Tounisia Lil Nachr, 1970, 47–48.
- ⁷⁷ Ibn Abdelaziz, Hammouda Ben Mohamed. *Al-Kitab al-Bachi*, 88–89.
- ⁷⁸ Helaili, Hanifi. *Awraq fi Tarikh al-Jazair fi al-Ahd al-Othmani*. 1st ed. Algiers: Dar El Hoda Lil Tiba'a wa al-Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2008, 49.
- ⁷⁹ He was a writer and minister of “Ali Pacha,” the author of *Al-Kitab al-Bachi*. He held the post of Head of the Chancery (Diwan al-Insha) until he died in 1202 AH/1788. See Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, 22–23.
- ⁸⁰ Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 87.
- ⁸¹ Cherif, Mohamed El Hadi. *Tarikh Tunis*, 88.
- ⁸² Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 220.
- ⁸³ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 231.
- ⁸⁴ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 82–83.
- ⁸⁵ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 290–93.
- ⁸⁶ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 33.
- ⁸⁷ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 213–14.
- ⁸⁸ Maldi, Kamal. “Tunis’s Relations with Western Mediterranean European States and the Influence of the Navy during the Reign of Hammouda Pacha (1782–1814).” Master’s thesis, University Centre of Ghardaia, 2011–(2012), 46.
- ⁸⁹ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 34.
- ⁹⁰ Born in Izmir in 1755, he was compelled to emigrate to Algeria, fleeing a homicide charge. See Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine fi al-Ahd al-Turki (1792–1833)*, trans. Saleh Nour, rev. and ed. Abderrahmane Chibane (Algiers: Dar Kortoba Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2010), 24.
- ⁹¹ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 25.
- ⁹² Helaili, Hanifi. *Awraq fi Tarikh al-Jazair fi al-Ahd al-Othmani*, 50.
- ⁹³ Bouaziz, Yahia. *Al-Mourassalat al-Jazairiya al-Isbaniya fi Archif Ettarikh al-Watani li Madrid (1780–1798)* (Algiers: Dar El Bassair Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 2009), 79.
- ⁹⁴ A group of islands that became Italian in 1865 and was famed for its strong naval fleet. See Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, note, 284.
- ⁹⁵ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 38.
- ⁹⁶ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, marginal note, 63.
- ⁹⁷ The sikkin (or soukane): a French coin equal to 2 piastres and 6 riyals. See Souria Hissam, “Relations between the Eyalets of Algiers and Tunis during the Eighteenth Century,” 90.
- ⁹⁸ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 256.
- ⁹⁹ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Mohamed Othmane Bacha, Day al-Jazair (1766–1791)*, 65.
- ¹⁰⁰ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 40.
- ¹⁰¹ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 41.
- ¹⁰² El Imam, Rachad. *Siyassat Hammouda Bacha fi Tunis (1782–1814)*. Tunis: منشورات الجامعة التونسية, 1980, 77–374.
- ¹⁰³ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 41.
- ¹⁰⁴ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 260.
- ¹⁰⁵ Mohamed Ben Mbarek El Mili. [Reference previously cited], 243.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ezzahar, Ahmed Chérif. *Moudhakkirat Chérif Ahmed Ezzahar*. Edited by Ahmed Toufik El Madani. Algiers: Al Charika Al Wataniya Lil Nachr wa al-Tawzi, 1974, 96.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 44.
- ¹⁰⁸ Maldi, Kamal. “Tunis’s Relations with Western Mediterranean European States and the Influence of the Navy during the Reign of Hammouda Pacha (1782–1814),” 60–61.
- ¹⁰⁹ El Madani, Ahmed Toufik. *Mohamed Othmane Bacha, Day al-Jazair (1766–1791)*, 96.
- ¹¹⁰ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 41–42.
- ¹¹¹ Feist, Eugene. *Tarikh Bayat Constantine*, 123.

-
- ¹¹² Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 74.
- ¹¹³ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 2, 42.
- ¹¹⁴ Ezzahar, Ahmed Chérif. *Moudhakkirat Chérif Ahmed Ezzahar*, 122.
- ¹¹⁵ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 74.
- ¹¹⁶ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 75.
- ¹¹⁷ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 47–48.
- ¹¹⁸ Ezzahar, Ahmed Chérif. *Moudhakkirat Chérif Ahmed Ezzahar*, 125.
- ¹¹⁹ Ben El Antri, Mohamed Essalah. *Farida Monissa*, 75.
- ¹²⁰ Amiraoui, Ahmida. *Alaqat Baylek Echarq al-Jazairi bi Tunis Awakhir al-Ahd al-Othmani wa Bidayat al-Ihtilal al-Faransi*. Algiers: Dar al-Baath, 2002, 45.
- ¹²¹ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 50.
- ¹²² Tablit, Ali. *Erraiss Hamidou, Amirale al-Bahriya al-Jazairiya (1770–1815)*. El Biar, Algiers: منشورات تالة, 22, 2006.
- ¹²³ Tablit, Ali. *Erraiss Hamidou*, 23.
- ¹²⁴ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 241.
- ¹²⁵ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 88.
- ¹²⁶ Rousseau, Alphonse. *Al-Hawliyyat al-Arabiya*, 317.
- ¹²⁷ Ibn Abi Dhiyf, Ahmed. *Ithaf Ahl al-Zaman*, vol. 3, 89.