Turks, Moors, Deys and Kingdoms: North African Diversity in English News before 1700[1]

Nat Cutter

This paper explores, using the case study of diversity, the usefulness of the English-language news press as a window into early modern British perceptions of North Africa. While historians typically argue that most Britons knew very little about North Africa and its people, haphazardly employing 'Turk' or 'Moor' to stand in for all Muslims (and a great deal more), the news press provides fascinating evidence for a robust and detailed understanding of North African ethnic, political and religious diversity that was made available to thousands of Britons, including those in a position to profoundly impact international relations.

It is a commonplace in historical studies of the period that the typical Briton in the seventeenth century knew little or nothing true about North Africa and its people. While actual personal encounters with North Africa were surprisingly common, these experiences rarely reached the public domain. Theatrical representations of North Africans, according to Nabil Matar, were 'types nearly always based on Spanish and Italian literary sources and never on actual familiarity with Muslims…[playwrights] invented stage Muslims without any historical or religious verisimilitude'.[2] Sermons, aiming to encourage donations to redeem captives and discourage conversion to Islam, were filled with 'Muslims imagined and determined by wild theological interpretations', the 'ahistorical…eternal enemies of Christendom'.[3] Katie Sisneros comes to a similar conclusion about broadside ballads:

> their purpose was not to represent the Turk at all. Rather, it was to

[1] I would like to acknowledge the wonderful contributions of my supervisors, Richard Pennell and Una McIlvenna, the team and anonymous readers at MHJ, and above all Belinda Cutter, without whom none of this would be possible. This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship.

[2] Nabil Matar, "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704' in *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption*, edited by Daniel J. Vitkus (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 4.

[3] Gerald MacLean and Nabil Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 26-28.

> represent a wide variety of enemies of the English by using a term that was largely accessible by the majority of English subjects … He was the enemy, any enemy … Catholics, anti-Catholics, the French, Presbyters, Jesuits, Jews, and the Devil himself.'[4]

Though, as Daniel Vitkus has argued, these forms of popular culture in many cases had significant influence on cultural tropes surrounding North Africa, and provide to modern scholars fascinating insight into 'an anxious interest in Islamic power that is both complicated and overdetermined', they could not be considered reliable sources on the real North Africa.[5] For those who wished to access such information, the knowledge gap was sometimes filled by the somewhat more factual accounts written by captives and travellers who had encountered North Africans in person. However, these were few in number and often difficult to access, even as they increased throughout the seventeenth century. Vitkus and Matar list just fifteen unique Barbary captivity narratives published before 1714 (with a total of nineteen editions) which provide, according to Matar, 'the most extensive description of England's early modern encounter with Islam and Muslims in North Africa'.[6] Captives were well-placed to report on real conditions in North Africa, and while some of their narratives, like William Okeley's *Eben-Ezer,* printed three times in the 1670s and 1680s, and Francis Knights' *A Relation of Seven Yeares Slavery* (published in London, 1640), which Matar calls 'the first accurate description of Algeria by an English writer', were more popular, influential or reliable than others, due to their limited circulation their impact is difficult to determine.[7] Traveller accounts of North Africa were even fewer and largely less accurate than captivity narratives, mixing fiction, rumour, generalisations, previous accounts and actual experiences that made them closer to entertainment than information.[8]

Gradually after the Restoration, some more accurate printed news and studies of North Africa began to emerge. Karim Bejjit has collected some eighteen published accounts on the English occupation of Tangier (1662-84), each based on 'close and sustained contact with the local population both in times of peace and war', though overwhelmingly filtered through the needs and

[4] Katie Sisneros, '"The Abhorred Name of Turk": Muslims and the Politics of Identity in Seventeenth-Century English Broadside Ballads' (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2016), 262-63.
[5] Daniel Vitkus, ed., *Three Turk plays from early modern England : Selimus, A Christian turned Turk, and The renegado* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 3-4.
[6] Matar, 'Introduction', 6; Daniel J. Vitkus, ed., *Piracy, Slavery and Redemption,* 371-76.
[7] Nabil Matar, *Britain and Barbary* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 62-64.
[8] See Matar, 'Introduction,' 2-3; MacLean and Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World,* 17-18.

ambitions of the Tangier community.[9] More formal 'scholarly' accounts based on eyewitness testimony began to appear about the same time, with accounts like Tangier chaplain Lancelot Addison's *West Barbary* (London, 1671) and *The Present State of the Jews* (London, 1675, 1676, 1682), based partly on interviews with Moroccans, beginning to become popular. Addison's work found its way into the libraries of Hans Sloane and Robert Hooke, and was even translated into German in 1676.[10] Richard Blome's *A Description of the Island of Jamaica* was originally printed in 1672. In the 1678 reprinting, and subsequent editions, it included the tract: '*together with the present state of Algiers*'; while George Meriton included a section on Barbary in his 1671 *Geographical Description of the World*.[11] Kenneth Parker, emphasising the under-use of government publications in historiographical accounts of this process, highlights the official publication of Articles of Peace negotiated with Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli in 1662, 1677, and 1682, which aimed to establish rights for merchants and diplomats in these states and provide assurance of ongoing peaceful engagement.[12] Nevertheless, none of these texts both enjoyed a large circulation, and aimed to distinguish and describe North Africa and its people. Therefore, what accurate information they offered was often lost among a confusion of fiction, polemic and fear.[13] Without a corpus of sources to indicate a more robust and accurate vision of North African life, numerous scholars have concluded that the term 'Turk' in popular English-language discourse stood in as a prejudice-laden, generic term for all Muslims, and a great deal more besides, taking into account little of the great ethnic, political and religious diversity that existed throughout the Islamic world, including North Africa.[14]

---

[9] Karim Bejjit, *English Colonial Texts on Tangier* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), xi.

[10] See William J. Bulman, 'Constantine's Enlightenment: Culture and Religious Politics in the Early British Empire' (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2009), 84-85, 92-93.

[11] Kenneth Parker, 'Reading "Barbary" in Early Modern England, 1550-1685', *Seventeenth Century* 19, 1 (2004): 99; Matar, *Britain and Barbary,* 145.

[12] Parker, 'Reading "Barbary"', 101-5.

[13] Linda Colley, *Captives* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2002), 83; Matar, 'Introduction', 2-5. Gerald Maclean writes that by 1660, 'certain aspects of the Ottoman state were evidently well known' but 'the Ottoman "Turk" remained a rather distant but an increasingly familiar figure, most often a non-Christian enemy, but seldom simply that.' This level of information, however, is not generally understood to have been available on North Africa during the seventeenth century. See Gerald Maclean, *Looking East* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 208. See also Jo-Ann Esra, 'Diplomacy, Piracy and Commerce', in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographic History,* volume 8, edited by David Thomas and John Chesworth (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 15-34.

[14] For examinations of the use of 'Turk' and 'Moor' see Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 15; Emily C. Bartels, *Speaking of the Moor* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 14; Timothy Brook, *Vermeer's Hat* (London: Profile Books, 2009), 261; Palmira Brummet, '"Turks" and "Christians"', in *The Religions of the Book,* edited by Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 113-14; Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning* (Newark: University

News as a Source for North Africa

However, one major body of sources has been under-utilised in the reconstruction of popular knowledge of North Africa in the seventeenth century. Materials published in the periodical news press provide evidence of a far more specific and accurate understanding of North African diversity, made available repeatedly and in great numbers both to the political and literary elites of England who wrote and distributed the news, and to a vast and socially diverse group of readers. This understanding contributed to shifting and developing popular perceptions of North Africa, as well as contributing to the character of actual interactions.

I have undertaken for this paper an extensive survey of British printed news coverage of North African affairs, with a view to illuminating the extent of knowledge available to those who freely settled in the region (mostly middle-class, urban, English men). These individuals likely already had access to better information, if they wanted it, from the scholarly sources named above and from eye-witnesses who moved through the ports and corridors of power in London. However, it has been recognised only to a very limited extent that seventeenth century newspapers provided to their readers in England, and now provide to modern historians, a veritable treasure trove of information about North Africa and its people. Nabil Matar and Gerald Maclean, the premier twenty-first century scholars of British interaction with North Africa, use newspapers sparingly, usually as 'side-glances' from their main narratives compiled from other sources, despite acknowledging that 'there was a vast production of various forms of newspapers containing information about the Ottoman Empire'.[15] Ros Ballaster, Robert Davis, and Linda Colley each

of Delaware Press, 2005), 16; Jesús López-Peláez Casellas, '"Race" and the Construction of English National Identity', *Studies in Philology* 106, 1 (Winter 2009), 40; Emily Kugler, *Sway of the Ottoman Empire on the English Identity in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 12-13, 26-27; Maclean, *Looking East*, 6-8, 202; Gerald Maclean, 'Milton among the Muslims', in *The Religions of the Book*, 182-84; Gerald Maclean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 167; MacLean and Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World,* 32; N.I. Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 6; Linda McJannet, 'Islam and English Drama: A Critical History', *Early Theatre* 12, 2 (2009): 185-86; Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 5, 6-7; Sisneros, '"The Abhorred Name of Turk"', 8, 16-17; John Tolan, Henry Laurens and Gilles Veinstein, *Europe and the Islamic World: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 3; Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 90-91.

[15] MacLean and Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World*, 240. See also Matar, *Britain and Barbary*, 160; Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 161; Nabil Matar, 'The Last Moors: Maghāriba in Early Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Journal of Islamic Studies* 14, 1 (2003): 48, 51; Matar, *Turks, Moors and Englishmen,* 38-39.

briefly note the widespread presence of newspaper reports surrounding North Africa and their role in circulating news from that area, but none venture to an extended analysis.[16] I argue that this study promises to provide valuable information on English-speaking perceptions of North Africa, for the following reasons.

Firstly, the sheer volume of information provided by news sources adds a vast amount of material to extant sources on North African history. I have collected for this study over 2,300 individual news items partly or wholly concerning North Africa and North Africans before 1700, a corpus totalling approximately 260,000 words. As indicated above, this volume of information available to English-language readers in the news media dwarfs any other collection which historians have considered to be a leading sources of public information and perceptions about North Africa. The scale and range of this news reporting expands the possibilities for extensive quantitative and qualitative research to be undertaken into, for example, the scale, patterns and change over time in North African naval attacks against Europeans (and vice versa); the routes by which news about North Africa reached Britain; and North African military and naval tactics. In addition, these sources, by virtue of their range and number, occasionally preserve previously unknown or lost texts, including lists of redeemed Barbary captives, lists of North African pirate fleets, and first-hand accounts from Europeans, including Britons, living in or visiting North Africa. These sources promise to usefully complement and extend existing knowledge.

Secondly, the periodical news press's broad circulation and reputation for accurate and 'fresh' news makes this corpus a vital source for understanding public perceptions and knowledge of North Africa. Though Sisneros rightly argues that broadside ballads were one of the only published sources referencing Muslims that reliably and consistently reached the poor, illiterate, rural and migrant populations of Britain, it is well-established that particularly by the later seventeenth century, news media also reached a vast and socially diverse readership.[17] Throughout the period, according to Joad Raymond, the 'British public had a nearly pathological interest in reading and hearing news'.[18] By the early eighteenth century, it was a common cause of concern

[16] Ros Ballaster, *Fables of the East* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 104; Colley, *Captives*, 83; Robert C. Davis, *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 5-6.
[17] Sisneros, '"The Abhorred Name of Turk"', 9-10, 13-14, 22-26.
[18] Joad Raymond, 'The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere in the seventeenth century', *Prose Studies* 21, 2 (1998): 109.

and ridicule among higher-class men that newspapers provided foreign news to 'half-educated readers … moving about in worlds not realised'.[19] According to Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, periodical publications, mostly news, comprised around a quarter of all publications in Britain between 1641 and 1700 – some 31,000 individual issues.[20] Natasha Glaisyer has shown that the *Oxford* (later *London*) *Gazette,* the only English-language periodical running continuously from 1665-1700 and England's only news periodical from 1665-78 and 1685-95, enjoyed a vast circulation in the period: 13,000-15,000 per issue in 1666, 4,000-7,000 in 1678-81, 10,000-19,000 in 1695-97, and 7,000-12,000 in 1705-7.[21] Raymond calls it 'a model of publicity, essential to the coffee-house culture of the day'.[22] The most popular papers founded after publishing restrictions were eased in 1695, the *Post Boy* and *Post Man,* both of which focussed on foreign news, sold 3000-4000 copies per issue by 1704.[23] However, even these impressive figures belie the potential readership: since many newspapers were passed around to correspondents, read aloud in public, or bought by coffee-houses or clubs to be read repeatedly by patrons, scholars have estimated that individual issues frequently reached hundreds if not thousands of people.[24]

The *Gazette* focused heavily on foreign news, in part because the English court did not wish their proceedings to be made too public, and in part because local news was likely to have already been transmitted widely by word of mouth. This paper held such a reputation for reliability and broadly non-partisan reporting surrounding foreign events that it became a journal of record for use in contemporary historical research and even court cases, as well as being relished by a wide public.[25] This reputation for reliability in large part was warranted, since its information came directly from the offices of the Secretaries of State. Distilled from dispatches sent from diplomatic personnel, *Gazette* reports contained the most reliable and up-to-date information from first-

[19] James Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 145; Raymond, 'The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere', 121.
[20] Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, *British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987), vii.
[21] Natasha Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers: The circulation of the *London Gazette* in the 1690s', *Media History* 23, 2 (2017): 259; John Childs, 'The Sales of Government Gazettes during the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-81', *English Historical Review* 102, 402 (January 1987): 103-6; Raymond, 'The newspaper,' 123.
[22] Raymond, 'The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere', 127.
[23] Jeffrey R. Wigelsworth, 'Bipartisan politics and practical knowledge: advertising of public science in two London newspapers, 1695-1720', *British Journal for the History of Science* 41, 4 (December 2008): 519 and note 7. This is the earliest year statistics are available.
[24] Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper*, 28, 127, 142.
[25] Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers', 262-64.

hand English sources in North Africa, as well as indirect reports transmitted through diplomats in European ports and capitals where news often arrived before it was sent to England.[26] When other newspapers appeared which placed a higher emphasis on domestic news than the government-controlled *Gazette*, the still significant quantity of foreign news they contained reached an even broader audience, including many who would not normally take notice of such events.[27] These non-government newspapers mainly gathered their news from Dutch and French newspapers, which had their own direct and indirect sources, but they occasionally also published their own foreign letters, and information gathered from ships arriving in English ports. In many cases, these papers were seen as even more trustworthy than the *Gazette,* since their editorial policy was not set 'by Authority' at Whitehall.[28] The reports received by news writers are always reported as anonymous, but by tracing the date and origin provided, news can be closely linked to surviving diplomatic dispatches from throughout the Mediterranean world.[29]

Finally, because of its sources and reputation, the periodical news press can be seen as both an expression of, and influence on the perceptions of the elites in government, diplomacy and trade who determined the course of British relations with North Africa. Written by government employees on the back of diplomatic correspondence, the *Gazette* is the most pure expression of official views, but all papers prioritised accuracy and first-hand information, and readers thus placed a great deal of trust in their content.[30] It has long been recognised that individuals with actual experience of North Africa, in the words of C.R. Pennell, 'knew North Africa best', but it is generally assumed that this knowledge only rarely diffused into the broader community.[31] However, through newspapers, experienced diplomatic opinions were heard directly by

[26] Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers', 261-62; P.M. Handover, *A History of the London Gazette 1665-1965* (London: HM Stationery Office, 1965), 4, 11-12, 21-22, 25-26, 36-37; Keith Williams, *The English Newspaper* (London: Springwood Books, 1977), 13-16; Michael Harris, 'Timely notices: The uses of advertising and its relationship to news during the late seventeenth century', *Prose Studies* 21, 2 (1998): 145-47.
[27] Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper,* 13.
[28] Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper,* 123-26, 130-35, 137-40; Rachel Scarborough King, 'The Manuscript Newsletter and the Rise of the Newspaper, 1665-1715', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 79, 3 (Autumn 2016): 411-14, 424, 429-30, 435-37; Handover, *History,* 11-12.
[29] A detailed analysis of the sources and channels of reporting, and how editors or the secretaries altered original reports before they reached the public is beyond the scope of this paper, but will be fruitful ground for subsequent research.
[30] Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper,* 123-26, 130-35; King, 'The Manuscript Newsletter', 411-14, 424, 429-30, 435-37; Handover, *History,* 11-12.
[31] C.R. Pennell, *Piracy and Diplomacy in Seventeenth-Century North Africa* (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1989), 54; Parker, 'Reading "Barbary",' 104-5.

the public – and they were read enthusiastically.[32] Mark Hanna, in his study of early eighteenth century news coverage of piracy, writes that 'newspapers brought deep-sea piracy into colonists' homes, nurturing the perception of a grand Atlantic crime wave'.[33] It is reasonable to assume that North African affairs, dominated as they were in English news by naval warfare and captivity, inspired similar interest, and penetrated the popular imagination to a similar extent. Readers would be attracted by the exotic appeal of reading about strange and distant places, the diplomatic and economic logic of understanding the culture of foreign lands before selling to or negotiating with them, and the voyeuristic attraction presented by tales of Barbary captivity. But even more importantly for the business and political community who most avidly consumed foreign news, the ever-present threats of naval attack against English shipping, of land attack against the British colony at Tangier from 1661-84, and from the predilection among North African governments to seize English goods or agents in the event of conflict, made knowledge of North African affairs vital information for the promotion of trade throughout the Old World.[34] As Gerald Maclean notes,

> interest in matters Ottoman were by no means reserved for those involved in high and sometimes secretive matters of state … the activities of English merchants and diplomats in the Ottoman Empire were the subject of considerable public interest.[35]

Since diplomats and other expatriates in North Africa were overwhelmingly drawn from the literate, urban middle-class in England, and were usually at one point or another engaged with maritime trade, the news media in London effectively reached the social group most likely to influence political and economic relations between England and North Africa in the future. Moreover, the *Gazette* is known to have circulated widely among government employees, even being sent abroad to diplomats and trading houses in foreign countries, meaning that those who left England still likely retained links to her media representations.[36] The precise influence news representations had on actual

[32] Gerald Maclean, *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 243.
[33] Mark G. Hanna, *Pirate Nests and the Rise of the British Empire, 1570-1740* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 372.
[34] Elizabeth Lane Furdell, 'Grub Street Commerce: Advertisements and Politics in the Early Modern British Press', *Historian* 63, 1 (2000): 38; Nabil Matar, 'Britons and Muslims in the early modern period: from prejudice to (a theory of) toleration', *Patterns of Prejudice* 43, 3 (2009): 215-16; Maclean, *Looking East,* 208, 215-17; Matar, 'Introduction', 5; Raymond, 'The newspaper', 127-28; Sutherland, *Restoration Newspaper,* 12, 127, 131.
[35] Maclean, *Looking East,* 205.
[36] Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers', 261.

interactions with North Africa is difficult to ascertain, but would provide fruitful material for future research.

Taken together, then, the news press provides historians of British-North African relations with an unprecedented quantity of reliable information from a variety of sources, that repeatedly reached a vast number of people in England.

Diversity In North Africa

One immediate application of this study is an exploration of that conventional wisdom surrounding the terms 'Turk' and 'Moor'. As discussed above, it is widely agreed among historians that in seventeenth century English-language popular discourse, the word 'Turk' (and sometimes 'Moor' for North Africa) was used as a generic term for all Muslims, and any understanding of ethnic, religious or political divisions within this monolithic community was patchy at best. According to Maclean,

> Christian culture in England had for so long defined itself in contrast to Islam that the words 'Turk' and 'Turkish' were not only synonymous with Muslim and Islamic but had also come to refer to a generalised range of personal qualities and meanings that could be applied to anyone, regardless of ethnicity or religion, including the English themselves if they behaved in certain ways.[37]

More specific knowledge gradually became available but it is generally believed that this did not significantly filter outside the corridors of power and specific interest groups, into pulpits, stages, and the popular press, until well into the eighteenth century.[38] However, the periodical news press presented a more accurate and less monolithic expression, and made this expression available to a vast audience much earlier than previously understood.

North Africa in the seventeenth century was a patchwork of political, ethnic and religious divisions. The region now known as Morocco was composed of four separate historic kingdoms (Morocco, Fez, Sus, and Tafilalt), which in the seventeenth century were as often divided by civil war or rebellions as united under a single ruler. The Regencies of Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli were all nominally ruled from the Turkish Ottoman court at Istanbul, but each had its own distinctive governments, levels of autonomy, and diplomatic

[37] Maclean, 'Milton among the Muslims', 182.
[38] Matar, *Britain and Barbary*, 3; Matar, 'Britons and Muslims', 215-16; Matar, *Turks, Moors and Englishmen*, 6-8. See also Sisneros, '"The Abhorred Name of Turk"', 7, 153-54.

relationships. There was a small number of Anatolian Turks in the Regencies, but they were concentrated in capitals and major cities, and held the vast majority of political and military offices, as well as official sovereignty over all such activities. Outside these urban areas, the population of the regencies, and the whole of Morocco, remained ethnically Maghrebi-Arab in coastal and fertile plain areas, and nomadic Arab-Berber in the mountains and deserts, in addition to minority populations of Jews, black sub-Saharan Africans, and white European-born converts to Islam. North African religion was also variegated and distinct from Anatolian, Levantine or Arabian Islam.[39] In short, North Africa was an extremely diverse region, and any reliable source should have presented the categories and divisions that existed there.

Precise and accurate North African divisions are evident throughout the English news corpus, but they vary according to the content, source and extent of reporting. At the most basic level, 'Barbary' or 'Africa' is used to distinguish the people of North Africa from their Muslim siblings in the Levant, Anatolia, Persia and India. 'Turk' and 'Moor' appear as 'national' terms, but also as 'ethnic' terms that cross political lines (contrasted with one another, and with the Islamic 'Arab', 'Negro', and 'Renegade'). News writers, when appropriate, make clear distinctions between Morocco, Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli, and recognise their autonomy from one another and the Ottoman Empire. They recognise distinctive governmental structures and offices, including the different roles held by Beys, Deys, Aghas, Pashas and Divans of the regencies, and the Emperor and constituent kingdoms of Morocco as well as warlords and rebels. Very occasionally they also reference diverse religious practices.

I wish to argue that (at least in relation to North Africa) 'Turk' in the news described not an imaginary enemy, or an undifferentiated Muslim, but in line with reality, the ethnic Turks and the North African governments, territories, armies, and navies they controlled. Likewise, I argue that 'Moor' was meant to convey the non-nomadic, Arabic-speaking North Africans who ruled the Regencies before the Turks and continued living under them after the Ottoman conquest, as well as the entities and jurisdictions elsewhere this group continued to rule. Since Arab, Negro, and Renegade are terms that appear far less frequently, I will only briefly survey their usage, but each usage

[39] For this overview, see Jamil M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib in the Islamic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 10-25, 160-65, 170-79, 191-92, 215-40; Magali Morsy, *North Africa 1800-1900* (London: Longman, 1984), 30-36, 38-50; Phillip Naylor, *North Africa* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009), 116-40; Matar, *Britain and Barbary*, 3; C.R. Pennell, *Morocco* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2003), 78-108.

of these terms presents further evidence that one term could not encompass all Muslims, even to the distant Britons.

Turks, Moors, Arabs, Negroes, Renegades

It is very clear from even a cursory examination of the English-language news corpus that the most common terms for North African Muslims used in English sources (Turk, Moor, Arab, Negro, and Renegade, hereafter TMANR; see Table 1) were not completely interchangeable.[40] Of the 884 articles in my corpus that use one of these terms to characterise North Africans, 126 (14.3 per cent) contain reference to more than one term, and 370 (41.9 per cent) also contain national or sub-national referents, suggesting that single terms were not sufficient, or that multiple categories were recognised.[41] In 620 articles, North Africans are described using national categories alone, without using these terms at all (see Table 2). Moreover, in many cases, even apparently general usage of TMANR terms is perfectly logical based on actual conditions in North Africa, and does not preclude a nuanced national and ethnic understanding of divisions.

'Turk' is the most common single term used to describe the North African people of the Regencies (408 articles). However, in most items employing this term, the news writers show an awareness of others, either referencing multiple TMANR terms – 'Turks, Moors and Renegades', eighty-six articles (21.0 per cent) – and/or distinguishing certain 'Turks' from others of different national or regional affiliation – 'the Turkish ships of Algiers' or 'of Barbary', 235 articles (57.5 per cent). Either 'Turk' alone was not sufficient without a national marker, or it was one among several available and distinct categories for different groups of people.

Of the 173 articles (42.4 per cent) in my corpus using 'Turk' to describe North Africans without including any other distinction, all but twenty-four are very brief reports of feared, planned or actual encounters with North African ships. Given that all Regency ships were licensed, owned, and commanded

[40] Since the Ottoman Empire was so large and important, I have excluded from these figures references to "Turk" in the press unless they can be reasonably linked to North Africa or North Africans. It is acknowledged this limits the number of references, and that generic uses of Turk impacted on the ways North African Turks were viewed, however the number of references examined here remains significant.

[41] In calculating references to nationality, I have included references to individuals and 'people', 'those' ships, and armies 'of [place]' (e.g. the *Lemon Tree* of Algiers, those of Tunis, the people of Tripoli), because these are uses where TMANR terms might be reasonably substituted by writers (e.g. Turks Admiral). For the same reason I have excluded references to Emperors, Kings, Deys, Beys, Governments, Ambassadors and Divans 'of [place]' and instead counted them as examples of knowledge of political institutions and sovereignty (see below).

by ethnically Turkish rulers, and that the numbers of Regency ships attacking Christian shipping around North Africa almost invariably dwarfed those from Morocco, it is not unreasonable for news writers in brief reports to use 'Turk' as shorthand for 'Muslim pirate'. In effect, most Muslim ships that Christian sailors encountered *were* 'Turkish' in a political sense, if not always individually staffed and commanded by Anatolian Ottomans. These articles are rarely hostile or polemical, preferring to recall only the bare facts, suggesting that they were not using 'Turk' as the slur described above by Maclean and Sisneros. For example, in 1671 it was reported that a Tangier ship was 'lately engaged with three Turkish ones on the Coast of Barbary; had maintained for a long time a sharp fight with them; and was since safely arrived thither again.'[42] Even in such short reports, moreover, ships are very often referred to by their national jurisdiction as well as or instead of 'Turk', meaning that 'Turk' alone was not the norm.[43]

Among the remaining items which employed only 'Turk', several times it appears as a generalist term in the politically- and religiously-charged context of captivity. In 1652, the *Faithful Scout* reported that Parliament debated

> the sad and deplorable condition of many hundreds of poor Christians, which have long lain under the persecution of Turkish Tyranny; and after some Debate thereupon came to this glorious Result … to redeem poor English Captives from exile of cruel slavery … A prosperous Gale attend his Motion; and a Christian Vote, and Blessing, be present, in all his Debates and Consultations; for, doubtless, 'tis a Sacrifice pleasing both to God and Man.[44]

In this and similar cases, the emotive power of 'Turk' to inspire readers into support of anti-captivity initiatives seems to have won out over concerns for accuracy. In several more cases, the article purports to come directly from correspondents on the ground in North Africa, so the use of Turk is more likely to be accurate than generalist – there simply were no reasons to mention ethnicities or nationalities in the context of the story.[45]

---

[42] *LG*, 28-31 August 1671.
[43] See e.g. *Last News Concerning the Arrival of Bethel Gabor,* 30 May 1623; *Moderate Intelligencer,* 1-8 October 1646; *Mercurius Publicus,* 24-31 January 1661; *LG*, 3-6 February 1668, 22-25 August 1670, 6-10 February 1679.
[44] *Faithful Scout*, 23-30 January 1652. The spelling in all quotes have been modernised, but punctuation retained.
[45] *LG*, 29 March-1 April 1669; *True Protestant Mercury*, 22-29 June 1681; *Domestic Intelligence*, 22-25 August 1681; *Post Man*, 3-5 August 1699.

Outside of these articles, the term 'Turk' refers exclusively to entities under the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Regencies, often in deliberate opposition to subjects of Morocco, and to Moors, Arabs, Negroes and Renegades.[46] No Moroccan subject, except perhaps those who left their country and took up service or residence under the Ottoman Regencies, appears to have been referred to as 'Turk'. This provides the first indication that 'Turk', at least in relation to North Africa, was not a monolithic term used to describe all Muslims.

Similarly, 'Moor' most commonly describes the people and ships of Morocco and her constituent kingdoms; there is no significant evidence in the news press to indicate that 'Moor' was inaccurately used to describe Turkish Ottomans.[47] However, since Morocco was overwhelmingly populated by Arabic-speaking, non-nomadic native North Africans, and, as argued above, it was reasonable to refer to groups of people from a polity by the ethnicity of the ruling class, it remains at this point unclear whether the term 'Moor' was wholly national, or if it had an ethnic referent as well. This question is best addressed to the 73 articles in which 'Moors' appear outside the kingdoms and ships of Morocco.[48]

These 'Moors' fall into two main categories. Firstly, there are those who lived in major Regency cities, and/or served in their armies or navies. They are found on Regency fleet lists ('the *Golden Pearl,* Captain Ali, Moor') or when ships are captured by Europeans ('the 8th instant arrived a Spanish man of War of 36 Guns, bringing in with him a man of War of Algiers of 19 Guns, several Mortar-pieces, with above 80 Moors, 14 Christians, and two Renegadoes').[49] They appear in extreme circumstances, such as in 1660, when

[46] See e.g. *Continuation of our Weekly* News, 21 August 1623; *LG*, 24-27 August 1668, 17-21 December 1668, 5-8 April 1669, 10-13 May 1669, 9-13 December 1669, 10-14 February 1670, 23-27 December 1675, 2-5 December 1678, 10-13 May 1680; *True Protestant (Domestic) Intelligence,* 14 May 1680; *Current Intelligence,* 7-10 May 1681; *True Protestant Mercury,* 21-24 December 1681; *Loyal Protestant, and True Domestic Intelligence,* 1 June 1682. Two possible exceptions, in which Moroccans are possibly called Turks, are found in *Newes,* 29 October 1663; *Loyal Protestant,* 23 May 1682.

[47] See e.g. *LG,* 3-7 December 1668, 10-14 February 1670, 2-5 December 1672, 27-30 January 1679; *Impartial London Intelligence*, 7-11 April 1681; *Flying Post,* 23-26 November 1695; *Protestant Mercury,* 23-28 July 1697; *Post Man,* 4-7 June 1698; *London Post with Intelligence*, 22-25 September 1699; *Post Boy,* 23-26 December 1699. One possible exception is the 1676 Anglo-Tripolitan treaty, which refers to Englishmen being permitted to 'turn Moor', see *LG,* 13-17 April 1676.

[48] This figure excludes references to Moors in and around Oran, discussed below, and a handful of solely Portuguese-sourced references to Moors from Angola and Oman.

[49] *Newes*, 20 April 1665; *LG*, 27-30 July 1668. See also, among others, *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, 6-13 June 1663; *LG*, 7-11 October 1669, 25-29 November 1669, 31 March-4 April 1670, 30 January-2 February 1671, 15-18 December 1673, 23-27 September 1675, 23-27 March 1676, 22-25 September 1679, 29 March-2 April 1683, 30 June-3 July 1684, 18-22 February 1692, 27-30 August 1694; *True Protestant (Domestic) Intelligence*, 14 May 1680; *True Protestant Mercury*, 25-29 January 1681; *Universal Intelligence*, 11-18 May 1681; *Impartial Protestant Mercury*, 2-8 November 1681;

'the King of Algiers … was stabbed by a Moor, who came to kiss his hands', or the 1676 Anglo-Tripolitan treaty which required that 'if an Englishman in Tripoli strike, wound or kill a Turk or Moor, he shall not be punished with greater severity than a Turk'; and also in times of peace, like in 1665 when an English ship departed from Tunis with 'Moors and English Commodities for Algiers', and in 1698 when the Algerian government sent a ship of Moors to Paris 'to notify the King that their new Dey … is installed according to ancient Custom'.[50] These 'Moors' are accurately depicted as important but (given the Turkish dominance) second-class subjects of the Regencies. For example, in 1681, the Algerians declared war on the French because 'the French have not released the Moors that are Slaves on board their Galleys', and after the French released them, the Tunisians contrived to follow suit, demanding 'the liberty of the Moors, belonging to that City, that are slaves in the French Galleys … to make this a pretence to break with us'. But in 1689 the Franco-Algerian Treaty named a ransom price of 150 pieces of eight for enslaved Algerian Turks, but just 100 for their Moors.[51] These Ottoman Moors were not confined to the North African Regencies: in 1686, a Moor reportedly made it all the way to Budapest in the Ottoman military, escaping capture at the hands of Holy Roman Imperial forces by swimming away down the Danube.[52] However, since the ships, armies and ports of Ottoman North Africa were notoriously multi-ethnic, this Moorish presence may simply indicate that Moroccans had travelled and taken up positions in new lands, not that the term 'Moor' refers to the continuing Maghreb-Arab majority ruled by the Ottomans.

More interesting, then, for the purpose of this paper, is the second category: 'Moors' apparently permanently resident in the Regencies, and dominant outside of the major cities. For example, in 1664, the French hoped to capture a city in the eastern territories of Algiers. First they aimed at Bugia (Béjaïa), 'but finding that besides the strength of the Place, they [the Algerians] had upon some intelligence poured in great numbers of Moors', they sailed further east to Gigery (Jijel), where 'the Moors entertained them with several Skirmishes', before they were overcome. Over the following months the Moors lost 'near a thousand men' in attempts to retake the city, until they were reinforced in October with 'the forces of Algiers, and of Constantine' to a total of '14000 men,

Post Man, 15-17 February 1698.

[50] *Mercurius Publicus*, 27 December 1660-3 January 1661; *Flying Post*, 13-15 August 1695; *Newes*, 27 April 1665; *Post Man*, 20-22 October 1698.

[51] *LG*, 3-7 November 1681, 14-17 November 1681, 12-15 December 1681, 9-12 January 1682, 16-19 December 1689.

[52] *LG*, 13-15 September 1686.

that is to say, 6000 Turks and 8000 Moors'.[53] Jijel was controlled throughout the Ottoman period by Maghrebi-Arabs from the clan of Bin Habyles, so it is unsurprising that no Turks were mentioned until reinforcements arrived from major Turkish-dominated cities.[54] These 'Moors' were, in reality and for news readers, the traditional and continuing rulers of the land. Similarly, in 1668, the government of Tripoli was unable to provide as many ships as requested for the Ottoman Fleet, because they 'had been diverted by the Moors, who have lately made a severe war upon them, and by their frequent inroads, destroyed a considerable part of the Country within their Dominions'.[55] In February 1669, the French Consul at Tunis was accused by the Tripolitans of

> holding a private correspondency with the Moors about Tripoli, inviting them to make war upon Tunis, and persuading them that the French would … assist them with a strong Fleet; which so incensed them [the Tripolitans], that after they had dragged him about the Streets, and broken the bones of his Legs, Thighs, and Arms, they burnt him yet alive [alongside] a Moor whom they had seized and charged with the carrying of letters to this effect.[56]

Despite this, the civil war continued, for in April 1669 it was reported that Tripoli had dispatched a large

> Army against the Moors, and were … raising a Fort [to] serve as a Bridle to restrain their incursions; to which end they employed great numbers of men [including] all the Christian slaves … some of their parties being sent out, had taken prisoner a Moor, said to be an eminent Commander amongst the Moors.[57]

In 1673, the 'Moors in the Country' around Tripoli were once again 'up in Arms, and threatened new Revolutions in that Government'; and in 1698 and 1699 the Tripolitans and Tunisians both faced internecine conflict between the 'Moors, that inhabit the Mountains', 'those that dwell in the Plain' and 'the Moors of the Flat Country'.[58] These Moors were powerful groups that evidently controlled recognised territory under Regency authority. If 'Turk' and 'Moor' were simply national categories, these Moors should never have appeared outside of Morocco. It is for this reason that I argue 'Moor' is a deliberately

[53] *Newes*, 18 August 1664, 3 November 1664, 10 November 1664.
[54] Morsy, *North Africa*, 43.
[55] *LG*, 18-22 June 1668.
[56] *LG*, 22-25 March 1669.
[57] *LG*, 5-8 April 1669. See also *LG*, 2-5 August 1669.
[58] *LG*, 29 September-2 October 1673; *Flying Post*, 17-20 September 1698; *Post Boy*, 17-20 September 1698; *Flying Post*, 27-29 September 1698; *Post Boy*, 29 June-1 July 1699.

ethnic as well as national term, referring to the continuing Maghrebi-Arab majority of North Africa, both under the Ottoman Turks and under their own authority in Morocco.[59]

The accuracy of distinctions between 'Turks' and 'Moors', however, only persisted so far. On the borderlands of Ottoman and Moroccan territory, ethnicity and nationality became difficult to disentangle, revealing the limits of news writers' ability to accurately convey North African categories. An instructive case study is the coverage of several sieges of Oran, a Spanish enclave in Algerian territory near the border with Morocco. In 1675, a Turkish-controlled Algerian army marched out against Moroccan 'Moors' and 'Arabs' attacking the border city of Tlemcen, but wound up convincing them to join together in a holy war against 'the Spaniards of Oran' who were 'assisted with 6000 Moors, who are in their pay.' The occupants of Oran 'at first put the Turks into great disorder, but were at last driven back'. While this, at first glance, aligns with the practice described above of describing military forces by the nationality of the leaders (first Moors and Turks separately, then Turks commanding the whole), in another item in the same *London Gazette* issue, the same attack is described undertaken by 'the Moors'.[60] In 1677, rumours circulated of Oran 'being closely besieged by the Moors.' It was reported that 'some Algerian Men of War happening to Cruise before the place … and the Governor having at the same time notice that Baba Hassan [Bey of Algiers] was abroad with a considerable Army, gave occasion to their apprehensions of being besieged'.[61] In 1695, the Algerians abandoned a joint siege with the Emperor of Morocco, which had been collectively described as Moorish, when a revolt saw their Dey and twenty other leaders executed for collaborating with this enemy ruler.[62] The siege was left to 'Moors, who are Subjects to the King of Morocco' fighting against 'the Moors under the Government of Spain'.[63] On several other occasions, the Moors attacking Oran are not identified with any national jurisdiction. Even excluding all references in which the nationality of 'Moors' and 'Turks' is unclear, there is evidence of news writers recognising the continued existence of groups under the Ottomans similar enough to the Moroccans to be referred to by the same word.

[59] Pennell writes (*Morocco,* 1) that by the eighteenth century in English minds 'Moors were the urban inhabitants of all north-western Africa, and sometimes all Muslims'.
[60] *LG*, 22-26 July 1675.
[61] *LG*, 23-27 July 1677.
[62] *Post Boy*, 14-17 September 1695.
[63] *Post Boy*, 23-26 December 1699.

The terms 'Arab', 'Negro' and 'Renegade' appear much less frequently than 'Turk' and 'Moor' in relation to North Africa, but such usage as persists is enough to derive definitions consistent with reality. 'Negroes' are described as slaves and sailors aboard European ships, as foot soldiers in the army at Tangier, and as sailors aboard North African ships, but most frequently as 'Muley Ismail's Guard of Negroes,' the Moroccan Sultan's crack army of West African slaves, bought from across the Sahara and answerable to him alone, which numbered over 150,000 by his death in 1727.[64] From these uses we can infer that the news press uses the broadly standard definition of 'Negro' in English-language discourse, a black-skinned sub-Saharan African. 'Renegade' also had a reasonably standard usage, describing European-born converts to Islam who had settled in North Africa, often employed as soldiers or sailors to exploit their sought-after expertise in navigation, siege warfare and munitions.[65] 'Arab' is more ambiguous. 'Turks, Moors, Arabians and Tangerines' are instructed after English negotiations with the Divan (ruling council) of Algiers to 'bring in all such Slaves as had been subject to his Majesty of Great Britain'.[66] Arabians serve the Riffian warlord Khadir Ghaylan during his rule over northern Morocco, join in the Algerian siege of Oran after a call to holy war in defence of Islam, invade Morocco, 'being thereto incited, as 'tis supposed, by the Turk', and appear as 'Arabic Adventurers' in the mountains of Algeria.[67] References to the Arabic language appear occasionally, but only in reference to Turks and Moors, suggesting that 'Arab' peoples (at least in North Africa) are not synonymous with speakers of the Arabic language. If Moors are defined as argued above, perhaps these Arabs are the nomadic Berber and Bedouin tribes that are known to have dominated the hinterland mountains and deserts of North Africa.[68] While these references are not sufficient to demonstrate that a unique and robust definition of Arab, Negro, or Renegade in North Africa was available to English readers through the news alone, it is further evidence that

[64] *LG*, 5-8 April 1669; *Haarlem Courant Truly Rendered Into English*, 17 January 1680; *LG*, 14-17 November 1687; *LG*, 5-9 January 1682; *LG*, 9-13 September 1675; *LG*, 4-7 April 1681, 8-11 June 1696; *Post Boy*, 27-29 August 1696; *Flying Post*, 30 July-2 August 1698. See Abun-Nasr, *History of the Maghrib,* 230-31, 234-37; Pennell, *Morocco,* 99-100.

[65] See e.g. *LG,* 30 November-3 December 1668, 29 August-1 September 1670, 14-17 November 1670, 4-8 May 1671, 22-25 September 1673, 7-11 December 1676, 8-12 November 1677, 22-25 September 1679, 4-8 March 1680, 13-17 December 1683; *Impartial London Intelligence,* 12 May 1681; *Loyal Protestant, and True Domestic Intelligence*, 5 January 1682; *Post Boy*, 5-7 September 1695; *Flying Post*, 4-7 June 1698.

[66] *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, 12-19 January 1663.

[67] *LG*, 8-11 April 1667; *LG*, 22-26 July 1675, 2-5 August 1675; *Loyal Impartial Mercury*, 25-29 August 1682; *Loyal Impartial Mercury*, 25-29 August 1682.

[68] This usage is identified in first-hand accounts in Matar, *Britain and Barbary*, 3.

ethnic distinctions were recognised among North African Muslims, and that their presentation in the news was broadly consistent with reality.

Governments, Territories and Sovereignty

In the above section, I have suggested above that 'Moor' and 'Turk' were both ethnic and national terms, which specifically designated particular ethnic groups when appropriate or characterised entities by the dominant ethnic group in the state to which they belonged; and that 'Arab', 'Negro' and 'Renegade' are also broadly ethnic categories (at least in opposition with other Muslim groups). As noted above, in hundreds of cases, these terms are qualified by or contrasted with national terms. It is upon these I now wish to focus. These national terms in the press were not generic or arbitrary, but were linked with specific and distinctive national features, providing English readers with an additional layer of distinction alongside the ethno-national terms described above. These distinctions present in at least four different ways.

Firstly, nations are described as distinct sovereign states with recognised borders. This can be seen in how sub-national territories within North African states (themselves often called 'Kingdoms') are frequently named and correctly allocated. Each of the kingdoms of Morocco, Fez, Tafilalt and Sus appear as such, and when Muley Ismail completed his conquests, it was reported that he had 'brought the whole Empire of Morocco under his obedience, having defeated all those that opposed him; so that there is at present none remaining to disturb his new acquired Sovereignty.'[69] Numerous non-capital cities and territories, including Béjaïa, Bizerte, Jijel, Porto Farina, and Annaba, and the European presidios in Larache, Mazagan (El Jadida), Penon de Velez, Tangier, Ceuta, Melilla, and (sometimes) Oran, are accurately described in relation to the North African jurisdiction that controls or surrounds them.[70]

Secondly, idiosyncratic political institutions are to a significant extent accurately described. The complex and distinctive relationships between the offices of Dey, Bey, Pasha, Agha and Divan in each of the Ottoman Regencies are implicitly acknowledged in the ways events are reported, if not probed or explained in extensive detail. The Divan or city assembly of Algiers was

[69] See e.g. *LG*, 14-17 September 1668, 19-23 November 1668, 10-14 August 1671, 21-24 October 1672, 7-11 November 1672, 9-12 March 1674, 21-25 July 1687. See Abun-Nasr, *History of the Maghrib*, 228-29.

[70] See e.g. *Continuation of our Weekly News*, 21 August 1623; *Intelligencer*, 27 June 1664; *LG*, 11-14 October 1669, 8-12 June 1671, 12-15 April 1675, 21-25 July 1687, 18-22 February 1692; *Flying Post*, 17-19 November 1696.

headed by Ottoman-appointed Pashas, or governors, until 1659, by military commander Aghas from 1659-71, and by Deys from 1671-1711.[71] Accordingly, the English news press refers to Pasha and Divan ruling in 1652, English officials negotiating with Aghas in 1663, but from 1668 onwards increasingly speaks of the Dey (or King) and Divan of Algiers, with the Pasha and Aghas marginalised.[72] In Tunisia, by contrast, Pashas operated from 1591 as wholly nominal Ottoman supervisors while the Deys ruled, but Deys increasingly came to dominate only the capital, while Beys took control over the countryside, taxation and foreign trade, raising their profile until they took complete control in 1705.[73] Newspapers speak of the Dey and Pasha in most affairs until 1678, when Beys begin to revolt, clearly controlling the countryside and exercising political authority, as well as allying with neighbouring powers, though the Dey continued to correspond with Europeans. In 1695, it was reported that the Beys had captured Tunis, and Deys and Pashas thereafter disappear in the English coverage.[74] The divergent patterns of governmental control in North Africa, despite confusingly similar terminology, are broadly accurate and certainly distinct.

Thirdly, English newspapers repeatedly recognise that each of the four major states in North Africa had separate and distinct relations with their Ottoman and European neighbours. Each government is recorded as separately negotiating treaties, settlements and ransoms with European countries on numerous occasions – Algiers in at least fifty-five articles, Tunis twenty, Tripoli thirty, and Morocco forty-five. England was in all-out war with Algiers in 1669-72, but simultaneously traded peacefully with Tunis and Tripoli.[75] In 1696, all three major non-government newspapers ran the same account of French diplomatic negotiations in Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli as the first story in their papers, making it near-impossible for readers to escape that each country negotiated for itself.[76] The Regencies in the 1660s appear to be controlled

[71] Abun-Nasr, *History of the Maghrib,* 159-60.
[72] See e.g. *Several Proceedings in Parliament,* 19-26 February 1652; *Kingdomes Intelligencer,* 12-19 January 1663; *LG,* 16-20 November 1671, 12-15 August 1672, 28 June-1 July 1686, 5-8 September 1687; *Impartial Protestant Mercury,* 22-25 November 1681; *Post Boy,* 14-17 September 1695, 16-19 November 1695, 30 July-1 August 1696, 5-7 October 1699.
[73] Abun-Nasr, *History of the Maghrib,* 170-74.
[74] *The Surprisal of Two Imperial Towns*, 19 July 1622; *Affairs of the World,* 16 June 1623; *Moderate Intelligencer,* 5-12 November 1646; *Newes,* 29 October 1663; *LG,* 19-22 April 1669, 28 July-1 August 1670, 27 February-2 March 1671, 23-27 March 1676, 21-25 August 1684, 29 October-2 November 1685, 19-23 November 1685, 16-19 January 1688, 3-7 October 1695; *Impartial Protestant Mercury,* 7-10 February 1682.
[75] See *LG*, 28 October-1 November 1669, 22-25 November 1669.
[76] *Flying Post*, 13-15 October 1696; *Post Boy*, 13-15 October 1696; *Post Man*, 13-15 October 1696. See also *LG*, 7-11 April 1670, 21-24 October 1672, 30 November-4 December 1682, 27-31 May

closely from the Ottoman Porte, which handed down governors, diplomatic treaties, and demands for military assistance, but from the 1670s increasingly to the end of the century Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli are all recognised to be functionally autonomous.[77] The Regencies frequently are depicted as denying Ottoman requests for ships to join the navy in the wars with Venice, even as the ships are variously distinguished from and subsumed under the 'Turkish' banner when they are sent.[78]

Finally, English newspapers frequently refer to wars between different North African states, and internecine conflicts within them, in ways that present clear national distinctions. A key example is the struggle between brothers Muhammad and Ali, Beys of Tunisia, and various Deys and Pashas of Tunis (including several of their uncles). The English press consistently and accurately represented the familial nature of the conflict, the shifting involvement of Algerian and Tripolitan forces, and the particular dominance of the Dey and Pasha over the City of Tunis. They also emphasised certain key events in the conflict, including the invasions by Algiers in 1685-86 and 1694-95, the siege and sacking of Tunis in 1686 and 1695, and the subsequent falling-out between the Beys and Algiers in 1695 leading to a short three-sided war before a revolution in Algiers ended their involvement.[79] 'We have advice' reported the *Gazette*,

> that the two Brothers Beys … have at last taken the City of Tunis. The Succours they had received from Algiers, put them into a condition to press the Siege very viciously … the Besieged were forced to great Extremities, being shut up as well by Sea as Land; And there were besides great Divisions among the principal Commanders of the Militia, which were increased, by the secret Intelligence the Beys had within the place. Several Proposals of an Accommodation had been made, which the Dey would not hearken to; At last the Militia and the chief of the Divan being wearied with the length of the Siege, pressed him to yield, which he refusing, they secretly treated with the Beys,

1686, 14-17 November 1687; *Current Intelligence,* 29 October-1 November 1681.

[77] *Newes*, 29 October 1663; *LG*, 18-22 June 1668; *LG*, 23-27 March 1676; *LG*, 13-17 July 1678; *LG*, 28 June-1 July 1686.

[78] See for example *Moderate Intelligencer,* 15-22 April 1647; *Perfect Diurnall,* 27 June-4 July 1653; *LG,* 23-27 July 1668; 6-10 July 1671; 24-26 October 1672; 30 March-2 April 1685; 24-27 August 1691.

[79] LG, 21-25 August 1684, 29 October-2 November 1685, 19-23 November 1685, 7-10 December 1685, 1-5 April 1686, 28 June-1 July 1686, 8-12 July 1686, 16-19 August 1686, 27-30 August 1694, 13-17 September 1694, 13-17 June 1695, 8-12 August 1695, 3-7 October 1695; *Post Boy,* 11-13 June 1695, 16-19 November 1695.

> and opened the Gates to them, who then became Masters of the Town without any loss.[80]

The detailed and accurate reporting of this conflict, and several others like it, provided for English readers a clear awareness of North African internal and international political and military conflicts.

Religion and Piety

Distinctively North African religious beliefs and practices, as distinct from more general Islamic piety, were rarely reported in the English press. Those few items that are available should not be given primary significance, however several interesting examples deserve attention. It is known, for example, that Moroccans in the seventeenth century had a high regard for the wisdom and leadership of mystic holy men, many of whom led rebellions against the Sultan.[81] Accordingly, we repeatedly find 'Marabouts', 'Saints', 'Mahallis', 'Dervishes', and 'Muhammadan Priests' as highly-respected religious leaders and revolutionaries among Moroccans, who are exploited by military leaders to forge unity. We also find Moroccan warlord Ghaylan consulting 'Savios' and 'Rabbins' about Islamic law regarding holy war against Christians before attacking Tangier.[82] There are examples of specifically Moroccan religious requirements, including travelling only during daylight and praying in darkness, not travelling during fasts, allowing Cooks and Muftis to drink wine while all others abstained, and idiosyncratic fasting practices during Ramadan.[83] Finally, there is evidence of conflicting interpretations of Islamic law, in a 1667 dispute between Algiers and Tunis over a captured ship:

> those of Algiers having in the name of their Divan [demanded] restoration, the Goods belonging formerly to Muslims of that place, and by their Law to be returned to them; which the other refuse, offering only half satisfaction, insisting upon [precedent].[84]

These examples indicate that some information was available to English readers suggesting that the Islam of North Africa itself was not monolithic, let alone the ethnic and national groups who believed in it.

---

[80] *LG,* 8-12 July 1686.
[81] Pennell, *Morocco,* 89-90; Naylor, *North Africa*, 124-31.
[82] *Moderate Intelligencer,* 6-13 May 1647; *Intelligencer,* 11 April 1664; *Oxford Gazette,* 21-25 December 1665; *Current Intelligence,* 16-19 July 1666; *LG,* 22-26 July 1675, 5-8 September 1692; *Post Man*, 30 August-1 September 1698.
[83] *Loyal Protestant, and True Domestic Intelligence,* 5 January 1682; *LG*, 9-13 November 1682; *Post Boy*, 2-4 March 1699.
[84] *LG*, 26-30 September 1667, 5-9 December 1667.

Conclusion and Future Research

I have shown in this paper that the English periodical news press provided a diverse group of readers before 1700 with a vast quantity of reliable and up-to-date information about North Africa and its people. News writers made surprisingly clear distinctions between different groups of Muslims, using ethno-national terms like 'Turk' and 'Moor' as well as national and sub-national designations, each of which had accurate and precise meanings to their readers. However, this is by no means the only information presented by these publications to the news-reading public. As we have seen already, news items frequently concerned the dramatic affairs of diplomacy, captivity and warfare, providing readers with up-to-date information on Algerian naval attacks, sieges on Tangier and the other European settlements, and the progress of treaty negotiations. Though the news press focuses on these conventionally newsworthy stories, reports frequently appear of quiet, peaceful and profitable trade with North Africa, that gave readers – both those who were financially or professionally invested, and those who were not – a more accurate sense of the nuanced military threat and economic opportunities North Africa embodied. I hope to undertake a deeper examination of these sources to indicate the extent to which peace treaties and capitulations were observed, the potential of which can be illustrated by the following. In 1669, six years after the English last made peace with Algiers, a ship arrived in Yarmouth reporting,

> that off the North Cape they met with an Algiers man of War of 36 Guns, who sent their boat aboard them, and made a strict search, but that the Master of this ship and the Merchant going aboard the Turks man of War were civilly Treated, and offered a supply of any necessaries they could furnish them with, excusing the strictness of the search upon several abuses put upon them by such of their Enemies as had pretended their ships and goods to have been English.[85]

Numerous examples attest to ships travelling back and forth to North Africa, and being 'most civilly treated' in their encounters with North Africans. In 1696, the famous business periodical *Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* devoted an entire page to explaining why trade with North Africa should become a priority: being 'one of the fruitfullest Countries in the World', where 'if we should get all the Trade that a Probability may be shown for; we should out-do all our Neighbours'.[86] While the average British reader likely

[85] *LG*, 29 March-1 April, 1669. See also *LG*, 6-9 April 1668; 31 August-3 September 1668; 3-7 June 1669; 22-25 January 1672; 20 August-2 September 1675; *Post Man*, 12-14 January 1697.
[86] *Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade*, 21 February 1696.

retained a great deal of misinformation, supposition, and assumption, it is clear that periodical news writers provided to their readers a vast and surprising quantity of reliable and up-to-date information about North Africa and its people. We should expect, at the very least, that literate urbanites understood that North Africa was not a monolithically threatening and undifferentiated place. A future study may also fruitfully investigate the original diplomatic or mercantile sources of news, the channels by which this news was transmitted to England, editorial policies exercised by the secretaries of state and news writers on their sources, and the ways in which captives, merchants, consuls and military officials responded to these reports and tropes when they encountered North African in person. This would offer a further fascinating insight into the influence news exercised on British-North African relations in the seventeenth century.

Table 1: Categories used to describe individuals, groups or ships in/from North Africa

Term	Articles employing term
Turk…	408
Moor…	524
Arab…	8
Negro…	11
Renegade/Renegado…	52
Total using TMANR	885
National/sub-national descriptions	990

Table 2: Analysis of terms

Term	Articles employing term
Uses of multiple TMANR	127
Uses of TMANR and national descriptions	370
Uses of TMANR without national descriptions	515
Use of national descriptions without TMANR	620
Uses of Turk without MANR or national descriptions	173
Moors outside Morocco (excluding ambiguous references to Oran, and invading Moroccan armies)	73
References to political offices, institutions, sovereignty or autonomy	766