

Adaptive Imperial Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Ottoman Administrative Strategies in Algeria and Hungary

Abdallah Abdel-Ati Al-Naggar ^{1*} Abdellah Abdellaoui ²

1 Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary), abdallah.abdel@btk.elte.hu

2 University of Abbes Laghrour Khenchela (Algeria),
abdellahabdellaoui44@gmail.com

Received: 03/11/2025 Accepted: 09/01/2026 Published: 30/01/2026

Abstract:

This comparative study examines Ottoman administrative strategies in Algeria (1518–1830) and Hungary (1526–1699) to understand how the empire adapted governance models to distinct cultural, religious, and geopolitical contexts. Through analysis of primary sources and historical documentation, the research investigates three core questions: variations in administrative approaches, the role of religious and cultural factors in shaping governance, and the influence of local resistance or cooperation on policy implementation. The study reveals fundamental differences in Ottoman integration methods – Algeria's incorporation, initiated by a local request for protection against Spanish expansion and facilitated by a shared Islamic identity versus Hungary's military conquest – which produced divergent administrative outcomes. While both territories featured centralised Ottoman elite governance organised into provinces, implementation differed markedly. Algeria maintained relative autonomy, preserved local customs, and

* Corresponding author

sustained economic stability, fostering a cooperative relationship viewed as protection against European expansion. Conversely, Hungary experienced direct military occupation, economic disruption through land redistribution, demographic decline from prolonged warfare, and persistent resistance. Despite religious tolerance policies in both regions, the Christian-Muslim divide in Hungary created additional tensions absent in Muslim-majority Algeria. These findings demonstrate Ottoman strategic flexibility in imperial governance, adapting between indirect rule and direct control based on local conditions. The research contributes to understanding how empires navigate cultural heterogeneity and the lasting impacts of differentiated governance approaches on regional development.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, Islamic governance, imperial governance, Algeria, Hungary, administrative adaptation.

INTRODUCTION:

The administrative policies of empires have profoundly shaped the trajectories of nations and regions throughout history, with the Ottoman Empire standing as one of the most influential powers to control vast and diverse territories. A comparative analysis of Ottoman governance in Algeria and Hungary provides valuable insights into the complexities of imperial rule and administrative adaptation.¹ By examining the administrative, political, military, economic, social, and religious aspects of these two distinct regions, this study reveals the intricacies of Ottoman strategies and their varying degrees of effectiveness.

Algeria and Hungary, as territories with markedly different cultural and geopolitical characteristics, present a compelling case study in Ottoman imperial governance. While existing scholarship has examined Ottoman governance separately in North Africa and Europe, few studies systematically compare administrative strategies across these distinct regions. This research addresses this gap by showing how imperial flexibility operated in practice, offering new insights into comparative imperial history.

Understanding the Ottoman Empire's differential approach to Algeria and Hungary requires a nuanced, cross-regional analysis. By systematically comparing these territories, we can identify both similarities and differences in administrative strategies, thereby deepening our understanding of how the empire managed contrasting cultural, economic, and geopolitical contexts. This analysis enhances our knowledge of the Ottoman legacy and its lasting impact on regional histories, while highlighting the complexities of imperial administration.

This study addresses three primary research questions: First, how did Ottoman administrative strategies differ between Algeria and Hungary? Second, what role did religious and cultural differences play in shaping Ottoman governance? Third, how did local resistance and cooperation influence Ottoman policy implementation?

Our study employs comparative historical analysis targeting a contribution to a deeper understanding of Ottoman politics in both Algeria and Hungary. While this paper acknowledges certain limitations – including the vast scope of the Ottoman Empire necessitating focus on specific periods, potential language barriers, and constraints in accessing certain primary sources – it endeavors to present a balanced and nuanced analysis within these parameters.

1. The Incorporation of Algeria and Hungary into the Ottoman Empire

1.1 Algeria's Integration into the Ottoman Empire (1518–1830)

The Central Maghreb, located in North Africa between the Wattasid Sultanate of Fez² to the west and the Hafsid Sultanate of Tunis³ to the east, experienced a profound geopolitical crisis in the early sixteenth century. The fall of Granada⁴ in January 1492 marked the culmination of the Spanish Catholic Reconquista, ending centuries of Islamic rule in Iberia. After the disintegration of the Almohad Empire in the thirteenth century, Spanish expansion across the Mediterranean – particularly targeting fortified coastal strongholds in North Africa – intensified the fragmentation of the

dynastic states governing the Maghreb. During this period, the Central Maghreb (later Algeria) lacked both territorial unity and centralized governance from the port city of Al-Jazair Beni Mezghena (modern Algiers).⁵

Before 1500, the area now known as Algeria consisted of dispersed tribal communities governed by local leaders and religious authorities. These communities faced ongoing European aggression, which intensified after the expulsion of Muslim populations from Andalusia.⁶ Throughout the sixteenth century, the North African coast suffered repeated Spanish naval incursions, prompting the rise of the Barbarossa brothers as prominent defenders of the region.⁷ They established their base in Algeria to resist Spanish expansion and protect local Muslim populations.

Following Aruj Barbarossa's death in 1518,⁸ his brother Khair al-Din assumed leadership and launched systematic campaigns to eliminate Spanish influence and their local collaborators. The local population, recognizing his military effectiveness, urged him to remain in Algeria – a request that significantly influenced subsequent events.⁹ However, aware of the limitations of confronting European powers independently, Khair al-Din sought an alliance with a more powerful Muslim state, turning to the Ottoman Empire.¹⁰ Muslim cities threatened by Christian forces traditionally sought protection from the Islamic Caliphate, and Khair al-Din proposed formal integration of Algeria into the Ottoman Empire. This proposal received enthusiastic support from the local population, who sent a formal letter to the Ottoman Sultan¹¹ pledging their allegiance. Sultan Selim I accepted this proposal, bringing Algeria under Ottoman protection in 1518, where it remained until the French conquest in 1830.¹²

1.2 Ottoman Expansion into Hungary (1526–1699)

The Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453 marked a pivotal moment in the empire's European expansion. Under Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451–1481), the empire entered a new phase of territorial consolidation and growth. Throughout the second half of the

fifteenth-century, Hungary faced escalating Ottoman incursions. By this period, the Ottoman Empire had achieved unprecedented unity and military strength compared to its early fourteenth-century form. The fall of Constantinople fundamentally altered the balance of power in southeastern Europe, with the city transformed into a strategic logistical hub for subsequent European campaigns.

The conquest enabled Ottoman control over the Black Sea region and the Danube Delta between 1464 and 1484.¹³ Under Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481–1512), the Ottoman navy underwent substantial development, providing essential logistical support for Central European campaigns and further consolidating imperial dominance in the region.¹⁴ The Ottomans systematically expanded into territories bordering the Kingdom of Hungary, capturing Serbia in 1459 and Bosnia in 1463, while Wallachia had already submitted to Ottoman suzerainty in 1421. Sultan Suleiman I (the Magnificent) ascended the throne on 30 September 1520, and immediately began mobilizing forces for a campaign against Hungary.¹⁵ At the Battle of Mohács in 1526, the Hungarian army suffered a catastrophic defeat – the most devastating since the Battle of Muhi against the Mongols in 1241.

By the mid-sixteenth century, as the Ottoman Empire reached its zenith, Hungary was unable to defend its southern borders effectively. By 1541, approximately one-third of the Kingdom of Hungary, including Buda,¹⁶ had fallen under direct Ottoman control. This domination, solidified under Sultan Suleiman I, persisted until 1699. This period, characterized by 150 years of nearly continuous military engagement, introduced entirely new cultural and political dynamics to Central Europe.¹⁷

2. Ottoman Policy in Algeria

Ottoman-Algerian relations, deeply rooted in early modern history, spanned more than three centuries and encompassed various dimensions including security, political-military affairs, and economic, social, and cultural interactions.

2.1 Military and Administrative Structure

Sultan Selim I sent approximately 2,000 soldiers equipped with firearms and artillery¹⁸ to Algeria, while also welcoming Anatolian volunteers. To cover travel expenses, these volunteers received privileges similar to those of the Sipahis (Ottoman cavalry). Many of these individuals, originally from impoverished backgrounds in Anatolia, later rose to positions of aristocracy and leadership within Algerian society.¹⁹

Following its establishment, the administrative and political system in Algeria was characterized by Ottoman monopolization of key positions and senior ranks within governing institutions, effectively excluding the local population from meaningful political participation. The regime in the newly established Ottoman *Eyalet*²⁰ (province) did not develop into a system of indigenous governance. Instead, ruling authority remained concentrated in a foreign military elite that benefited significantly from Mediterranean corsairing activities under the leadership of Barbarossa brothers' and their successors, maintaining control over Algeria for three centuries.²¹

The Algerian historian Abou el Kacem Saadallah,²² in his work *Algeria's Cultural Heritage*, observes: "The Ottoman rulers were expected to apply Islamic principles in governance, engage with and consult the inhabitants, and integrate with them. However, they acted otherwise, ruling as a privileged group that monopolized power throughout the Ottoman period, exploiting the population and treating them as conquered subjects".²³

The Ottoman regime in Algeria underwent several distinct phases, each marked by unique political dynamics and governance structures:

A.The Beylerbeylik Period (1518–1588): Rulers directly appointed by the Ottoman Sultan established the foundation of Turkish administration in Algeria, largely through the efforts of the Barbarossa brothers.

B.The Pashalik Period (1588–1659): A system was introduced that limited each Pasha's term to three years.

C.The Aghas' Rule (1659–1671): A brief, turbulent period characterized by administrative instability and disorder.

D.The Deys' Rule (1671–1830): Algeria achieved significant political autonomy during this period.²⁴ Although nominally affiliated with the Ottoman Empire, Algeria operated independently, with the Sultanate's influence remaining largely symbolic. The Dey, as head of state, assumed comprehensive administrative and political functions including judicial oversight, declaration of war, treaty negotiations, cabinet meetings, and collection of tributes from European states. The Dey also appointed officials to sensitive governmental positions, further consolidating Algeria's autonomous governance.²⁵

During the Ottoman period, Algeria experienced significant political and administrative transformations. These changes contributed to the development of the Algerian state, enhancing its regional and international prominence. Algeria emerged as a major power in North Africa and the Mediterranean basin.²⁶

The historian Wilhelm Spencer²⁷ notes: "All accounts, from both Christians and Muslims, agree that the Algerian state was highly regarded for its discipline, stability, respect for law, social cohesion, and cultural achievements". Algiers became recognized as a key center for the Ottoman fleet's naval operations and served as a hub for introducing Turkish customs, clothing, and traditions into North Africa. Spencer further emphasizes that historical documentation, diplomatic correspondence, and numismatic evidence demonstrate Algeria's strong affiliation with the Ottoman Sultanate, adding: "The corsairing activities indirectly brought economic and cultural prosperity to Algiers".

A shared perception of external threats and collective responsibility for safeguarding the security and territorial integrity of Islamic lands in the western Muslim world served as fundamental justification for the continuation of Ottoman-Algerian relations. This bond persisted despite periods of tension and political inconsistency, often shaped by conflicting interests or miscalculations on both sides.

The military dimension remained paramount in this relationship, largely due to the state of perpetual warfare between Algeria, the Ottoman Empire, and European powers. This continuous conflict underscored the strategic importance of their alliance, even amid internal discord and political tensions.

Administratively, Algeria's governance under the Ottoman Empire followed a hierarchical system. The Ottoman administration divided the territory into regions called *Beyliks*,²⁸ establishing various administrative offices in both urban and rural areas. This organizational framework enabled the Ottomans to extend authority across most of the country. By 1565, Algeria's administrative structure had been fully established, with the territory divided into four Beyliks:

- **Dar al-Sultan:** Algiers and its immediate suburbs, directly governed by the central authority
- **Beylik al-Titteri:** The central region, with its capital at Médéa
- **Beylik al-Sharq:** The eastern region, with Constantine as its capital
- **Beylik al-Gharb:** The western region, with Oran as its capital (established following final liberation from Spanish control in 1792)²⁹

This administrative division underwent continuous modifications before assuming its final form. The Regency of Algiers' administrative structure was distinguished by flexibility and efficiency, achieved through organizational methods that allowed the delegation of authority to various officials based on evolving administrative needs and responsibilities.³⁰

The Turkish regime prioritized central control, most effectively implemented in Dar al-Sultan and parts of the Titteri region, one of the earliest areas of Turkish settlement. In these regions, appointing Turkish officials to the highest administrative positions while

allowing local populations autonomy in managing internal affairs proved sufficient.

This administrative flexibility played a crucial role in achieving Algeria's territorial unification, establishing borders that the French later encountered during colonization. Additionally, this adaptable structure contributed to the longevity and consolidation of Ottoman rule in Algeria, which lasted for over three centuries.³¹

Despite the Ottoman Empire's considerable contributions to establishing a structured administrative framework in Algeria, the system had significant shortcomings. In the later Ottoman period, these deficiencies became particularly evident. The systematic exclusion and marginalization of local elements from administrative roles created a substantial divide between ruling authorities and the indigenous population, further deepening disconnection between governors and governed.³²

2.2 Economic Policies

Local economic activity developed following the administrative reforms introduced by the Ottomans upon their arrival in Algeria. This economic transformation was shaped by various factors including property ownership structures, tax collection systems, standards of trade and maritime commerce, and the quality of agricultural and artisanal production.

2.2.1 Agriculture and Trade

The majority of the population of the Ottoman Algeria consisted of farmers, with approximately 90% living in rural areas. Algeria's economy underwent cyclical fluctuations, alternating between periods of recovery in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and subsequent decline. The arrival of Andalusian migrants significantly contributed to growth in industry, trade, and agricultural production. As a result, major Mediterranean powers, particularly France and Britain, competed for trade dominance in Algeria, seeking to monopolize its markets.³³

Land ownership in Algeria was governed by Islamic law (Sharia), which regulated land use and management. During the Ottoman era, these provisions remained largely unchanged, with rulers preserving existing conditions except where necessary modifications were required. Land ownership categories reflected those of the wider Ottoman Empire:

- **Mulk (Private Property):** Directly owned and exploited by individuals
- **Ardh al-Arsh (Communal/Tribal Lands):** Known locally as "Throne lands," collectively managed by tribes or communities
- **Ardh Miri (State Lands):** Including public warehouses (Makhzen) and state-controlled territories
- **Waqf³⁴ (Endowment) Lands:** Religious endowments managed under the supervision of appointed agents affiliated with religious institutions.³⁵

Algeria's commercial activity during the Ottoman era was concentrated in major cities and in weekly or seasonal markets. Algiers, as both the capital and seat of government, remained the primary economic hub. Constantine, despite its inland location, ranked second in importance due to its strategic position on a plateau overlooking pastoral plains renowned for producing high-quality livestock, including premium Barbary horses exported to Europe through the ports of Béjaïa³⁶ and Skikda³⁷.

Oran,³⁸ reclaimed from Spanish control in 1792, and Annaba³⁹ in the east also played significant commercial roles. Annaba, under Beylik jurisdiction, became a center for trading leather, wool, dates, and various local products. These industries included manufacturing tailored to urban and agricultural needs, such as wool processing, carpet weaving (zarabi), pottery, textiles, blacksmithing, and other crafts. Many of these artisanal traditions were notably preserved and advanced by Andalusian and Jewish communities, contributing to the region's economic and cultural vitality.⁴⁰

The corsairing economy was not merely a supplementary activity but the central pillar of the Algiers Regency's fiscal and political strength. Maritime raids provided substantial revenue through the capture of ships, cargo, and, most lucratively, the ransoming of captives. This system was formalized through treaties with European states, which often agreed to pay annual "tribute" to secure safe passage for their shipping. As Nabil Matar elucidates, the Barbary states derived a significant part of their income from what they viewed as legitimate maritime jihad and from the 'presents' and ransoms that European nations paid them. This financial independence from Istanbul's subsidies was a key factor underpinning Algeria's political autonomy, allowing the Dey to maintain a powerful navy and exert influence across the Mediterranean.⁴¹

The Algerian economy experienced significant decline from the second half of the seventeenth century until the French occupation in 1830.⁴² This downturn resulted from multiple factors including epidemics, plague outbreaks, prolonged natural disasters, and outdated agricultural and industrial practices. The resulting trade stagnation further affected all economic sectors, exacerbating the overall decline.

2.2.2 Revenue Sources and Taxation

Internal revenue collection in Ottoman Algeria primarily relied on *Zakat* (Islamic alms tax) and various other forms of taxation. External revenues came from multiple sources including maritime spoils from naval engagements, diplomatic gifts, cargo duties, and tributes from European powers. The state received financial subsidies from Constantinople, as well as income generated through port trade, the export of Algerian products, slave sales, and prisoner ransoms.

Revenue sources for Algeria's treasury during the Ottoman era were diverse and included the following:

- **Ghanaim (Spoils of War):** Revenue from military operations, particularly maritime *Jihad*⁴³

- **Denouche (Beylik Contributions):** Regular annual and quarterly treasury contributions
- **Agricultural Taxes:** Levies and penalties on agricultural producers
- **Urban Fees:** Revenue from city dwellers, including professional guild fees and sectarian union contributions.⁴⁴

2.3 Cultural and Social Differentiation

The population of Ottoman Algeria was differentiated by lifestyle, sources of livelihood, and relationships with the ruling authorities. Broadly, the population was divided into two main categories: urban residents and rural inhabitants.⁴⁵

2.3.1 Religion and Education

During the Ottoman era, cultural life in the Islamic community centered on religious sciences, with the Maliki school of jurisprudence predominating. Sufi orders significantly influenced cultural life, particularly as many Ottoman supporters were mystics who established *zawiyas* (religious centers) throughout the country. Notable institutions included the *Zawiya* of Sidi Cheikh in Bayadh,⁴⁶ the *Zawiya* of Karzaz in Touat,⁴⁷ and the *Zawiya* of Sidi Abdul Jabbar in Figuig.⁴⁸

Although the Ottoman Empire's official doctrine followed the Hanafi school,⁴⁹ with the Hanafi Sheikh al-Islam⁵⁰ regarded as second in authority only to the Pasha, coexistence with the Maliki school occasionally presented challenges. Some Sufi orders expressed hostility towards Ottoman rule, with certain groups mounting open rebellions. Many Sufi order members who opposed Ottoman rule faced repression or execution by the authorities.

Despite political tensions, religious education remained widespread during the Ottoman era. Children aged 6–12 typically attended Quranic schools (*Kuttab*), funded by parents without formal state interference. Secondary education took place in madrasas and

Zawiyas, supported by *Waqf* endowments. Enrolment numbers varied but were generally moderate to high. Higher education in religious sciences was particularly robust, extending beyond urban centers to rural and mountainous areas. These institutions produced graduates who formed a unified cultural elite, significantly influencing public opinion.⁵¹

Religious institutions in Algeria, established since the first century Hijri (7th century CE), to function in much the same way under Ottoman rule. Mosques served as foundational educational institutions, supported by *Zawiyas*, *Ribats* (fortified religious centers), *Kuttab*, *Madrasas*, libraries, and *Waqf* endowments. These institutions played crucial roles in shaping Algeria's cultural, intellectual, and spiritual life throughout the Ottoman period.⁵²

3. Ottoman Policy in Hungary

The Ottoman occupation began during a period of significant transformation for the Kingdom of Hungary and coincided with the Ottoman Empire's zenith under one of Europe's most formidable rulers. The Ottomans sought to incorporate Hungary as a fully integrated province within their empire. Sultan Suleiman's primary objective was to secure Hungary as a strategic corridor for Ottoman forces advancing towards Vienna. This development marked an unprecedented transformation in Central Europe, comparable to the Christian reconquest of Islamic territories eight centuries earlier. Ottoman rule brought radical changes to Hungary, profoundly impacting military institutions, diplomatic policies, economic structures, and social composition.⁵³

3.1 Political and Administrative Structure

The decisive military defeat at Mohács in 1526 was a watershed moment in Hungarian political and military history. Following this catastrophe, Ottoman forces advanced into Hungary in a wedge formation, occupying vast central territories. Consequently, Hungary fragmented into three distinct regions:

A. Central Hungary: Under direct Ottoman occupation

B. Eastern Hungary (Transylvania): Where Hungarian nobles proclaimed János Szapolyai (1526–1540), Prince of Transylvania and son of former Palatine István Szapolyai, as King of Hungary

C. Western Hungary (Royal/Habsburg Hungary): Where another noble faction declared Ferdinand of Habsburg (1526–1563) as King of Hungary. Ferdinand, married to Anna (sister of King Louis II of Bohemia) and serving as Austrian Archduke, represented Habsburg interests in the region.⁵⁴

This tripartite division initiated a period of significant political fragmentation and military contestation in Hungary.

Suleiman skilfully exploited divisions within the Hungarian political elite. János Szapolyai, initially diplomatically isolated and suffering two defeats against Ferdinand's forces (1527–1528), became a vassal of the Ottoman Porte. Despite his initial intentions, Szapolyai ultimately emerged as the primary Ottoman representative in Hungary, establishing the foundations for Ottoman control over substantial Hungarian territory.

The Principality of Transylvania, comprising the eastern third of the former Kingdom of Hungary, remained a semi-autonomous Ottoman vassal for over 150 years. This separation established a dangerous precedent undermining Hungarian national unity. The Ottoman Empire demanded increasingly burdensome annual tribute from the Principality while subordinating its foreign affairs to the Sultan's authority.

During the early modern period, increasing Habsburg dominance generated unrest among other European ruling dynasties. The Ottoman Empire, as Habsburg rival, found common cause with the Hungarian and Transylvanian estates, both of which opposed Habsburg hegemony.⁵⁵

Following the fall of Buda to Ottoman forces in 1541, Hungary's tripartite division was solidified. The central region including Buda came under direct Ottoman control. Transdanubia and parts of modern Slovakia fell under Habsburg rule, supported by Hungarian

nobility based in Bratislava. Meanwhile, the Principality of Transylvania, east of the Tisza River, operated as an Ottoman vassal state, initially governed by János Szapolyai's (Zápolya's) son, John Sigismund^{56, 57}. This division persisted for over 150 years despite continuous resistance to Ottoman rule throughout Hungary.

The Ottomans designated their Hungarian territories as *Madjaristan*. For administrative purposes, Sultan Suleiman divided Hungary into two major *Vilayets*⁵⁸ (provinces): Buda and Temesvár. Following territorial acquisitions in the early seventeenth century, two additional smaller *Vilayets* were established: Eger and Kanizsa. Buda remained the largest province, extending from Buda northward to Belgrade southward, and was subdivided into twelve *sanjaks*⁵⁹.

As *Timar* provinces, *Madjaristan's* territories were organized under central Ottoman administration. All land officially belonged to the Sultan in Istanbul,⁶⁰ who granted temporary usage rights to local Ottoman officials. The political system imposed military-based governance structures. A Bey governed each of the twelve *sanjaks*, all subordinate to the Pasha heading the hierarchy. Local dominance was maintained through *Sipahis*, serving as primary agents of Ottoman authority.⁶¹

3.2 Economic Policies

Significant economic transformations took place in Hungary during the Ottoman period. Historian Géza Pálffy notes: "During the prolonged Ottoman occupation, economic activity in Hungary shifted from formerly powerful royal cities to secondary and tertiary centers, particularly market towns that prospered as livestock trading hubs. Simultaneously, Hungary's bourgeoisie experienced numerical decline during this period".⁶² This shift marked fundamental restructuring of Hungary's economy, with traditional urban centers losing prominence while smaller towns emerged as key economic actors.

Hungary's economy was severely disrupted when the Ottomans assumed control in 1541. Persistent sixteenth-century conflicts

devastated the country's fertile plains, rendering much agricultural land unproductive. Farmers' attempts to restore previous agricultural activities were largely unsuccessful. In response, the Ottomans introduced large-scale animal husbandry, recognizing that abandoned farmlands were suitable for cattle grazing. Herding quickly became as Hungary's primary economic driver, fundamentally reshaping the regional economy during Ottoman rule.⁶³

Agriculture, historically vital to Hungary, became even more central during the Ottoman period. However, successive conflicts – including the Fifteen Years' War (1593–1606), the Ottoman campaigns of 1663–1664, and the Wars of Liberation (1683–1699) – devastated both the economy and society. These wars prevented demographic and economic recovery, with some regions failing to achieve even partial restoration.

Food production ceased entirely in war zones, leaving troops and civilians vulnerable to starvation. Harsh conditions were worsened by outbreaks of disease – plague, dysentery, typhoid, and malaria – resulting in high mortality rates among soldiers and civilians. Despite widespread destruction, Hungary's economy demonstrated remarkable resilience, proving stronger than anticipated given the prolonged adversity.⁶⁴

Not all Hungarian cities experienced decline. Some, distant from conflict zones, developed into political and financial centers. Others leveraged strategic locations to achieve economic progress and accumulate wealth. Market towns such as Debrecen, situated in relatively peaceful areas, thrived as commercial hubs, highlighting regional disparities in the war's impact.⁶⁵

3.2.1 Revenue and Taxation

The seventeenth century saw rapid expansion of tax farming, with initial Ottoman institutions focusing primarily on taxation, including customs and tax farms. All disposable income sources were declared state property. Significant portions were allocated through the *Timar*, *Zeamet*, and *Khas* land systems, where holders collected taxes.

The Ottoman central authority (Sublime Porte) emphasized efficient tax collection. As the sole legal landowners, the Ottoman dynasty directly managed approximately 20% of land for personal benefit, distributing the remaining land among military personnel and government officials. These landholders' primary objective was wealth accumulation, reflecting overarching Ottoman economic priorities.

Certain village communities received tax exemptions but were required to contribute natural resources or provide labor. In other sultanate settlements, residents paid annual taxes to provincial treasuries. During the sixteenth century, direct state taxes – city taxes and special war levies – were collected by temporary collectors. Meanwhile, most revenue from the sultan's lands was gathered through the mukataa system, employing hired tax farmers.⁶⁶

A key distinction in the Ottoman tax regime in Hungary was the imposition of the *Jizya*⁶⁷ (poll tax) on its Christian subjects. This tax was a fundamental marker of the legal status of non-Muslims (Dhimmis) under Islamic rule, symbolizing their protected but subordinate position. While the Ottoman state was efficient in collecting all forms of taxes, the *Jizya* carried a specific religious and legal connotation that was absent in the tax system applied to the Muslim population of Algeria. As Pál Fodor explains, *Jizya* was the most important direct tax collected from the non-Muslim population... Its collection was a clear manifestation of the Islamic character of the Ottoman state and the subordinate status of Christians. This tax differentiated the Ottoman experience in Hungary not only administratively but also in terms of religious identity and legal hierarchy from that in Muslim-majority Algeria.⁶⁸

In contrast, European societies, particularly during the Middle Ages, paid taxes to dual authorities: secular royal power and religious Church authority. Moreover, the feudal system subordinated members of society to their lords, further entrenching social and economic hierarchies.⁶⁹

3.3 Social and Cultural Impact

3.3.1 Demographic Change

Numerous studies indicate that Hungary's two centuries of war, combined with disease and epidemics, profoundly affected population growth. The plague in the second half of the seventeenth century caused significant mortality, particularly among urban populations.

Historian Gábor Ágoston notes that Ottoman occupation led to significant population decline, from an estimated 4 million before conquest to 2.5 million by the end of the sixteenth century. Ágoston states: "The seventeenth-century situation remains uncertain. The prolonged 1593–1606 war, combined with famine and epidemics, likely greatly reduced the population. However, this decline appears to have been mitigated by the mid-seventeenth century".⁷⁰

Ottoman-controlled territorial boundaries in Hungary shifted frequently, with significant differences between permanently controlled settlements and those temporarily occupied. Inhabitants faced considerable challenges, particularly along military frontiers, but demonstrated remarkable patience and resilience. Despite hardships, the population maintained hope, adapting to ongoing warfare. This exceptional perseverance and regenerative capacity proved crucial for survival throughout the prolonged Ottoman occupation.⁷¹

Overall, Hungary's settlement network suffered significant losses. Areas near rivers, military routes, and central or southern regions underwent the most profound changes. Approximately half of the settlements in regions frequently affected by conflict or situated along key invasion routes disappeared. Conversely, populations sought refuge in perceived safer locations, leading to growth in certain villages and market towns.⁷²

3.3.2 Religious and Cultural Aspects

Beyond Islamic law, Muftis in Ottoman Hungary required knowledge of Christian laws governing the majority population. The Mufti of Buda held particular influence. Locally, *Qadis*⁷³ represented Ottoman law and order. A *Qadi* presided in every Muslim town or city, serving as judge over both Muslim and Christian communities.⁷⁴

The relationship between the Ottoman Empire and its non-Muslim subjects, particularly Christians, during Ottoman control of Hungarian territory remains historically contentious. Some scholars argue that the Ottoman Empire treated non-Muslim citizens as inferior, subjecting them to special taxes, while others contend that these subjects received equal treatment to Muslims.

The relationship between the Ottoman state and its Christian subjects in Hungary is best understood within the framework of the *Millet* System. This system did not seek individual equality but granted recognized religious communities (*millets*) a significant degree of self-governance in personal law, education, and internal affairs under their own religious leaders, in exchange for loyalty and payment of the *Jizya*. As explained by Benjamin Braude, *the millet system provided a mechanism for the Ottoman state to rule over a religiously diverse population without attempting to assimilate them. The leaders of the millets were responsible to the state for the conduct of their communities.* This accounts for the apparent contradiction in historical accounts: while Christians were *legally second-class citizens* subject to specific taxes, their religious institutions and communal life could continue with minimal interference, fostering a pragmatic, if not entirely equal, coexistence. This policy was fundamentally different from the shared Islamic identity that facilitated integration in Algeria.⁷⁵

Regarding religious tolerance and inter-community cooperation, historian Pál Ács observes: "People living in Ottoman Hungary demonstrated remarkable openness towards each other. Catholics and Protestants, Christians and Muslims studied each other's writings for years and lived closely in spiritual terms. Religious diversity

flourished; groups coexisted under different conditions and circumstances, largely accepting mutual diversity. Over centuries, Islam allowed Christians and Jews to practice their religions freely".⁷⁶

However, other scholars such as Gábor Ágoston present contrasting views, emphasizing significant Catholic Church losses under Ottoman rule. Ágoston illustrates: "The truth of this statement is evident in Austria and Italy still maintaining rich monastic networks, while only traces remained in pre-1945 Hungary".⁷⁷

Historian Géza Fehér provides balanced perspective: "Research into Hungarian history has struggled to provide unified and objective portrayal of the Turkish period, fraught with serious contradictions. Generally, two diametrically opposed views prevail. The extremely Turcophobic standpoint emphasizes negative aspects, while opposing advocates, ignoring serious conflicts and hardships persisting over a century, present illusory, idyllic pictures of Turkish-Hungarian coexistence".⁷⁸

As in other imperial provinces, mosques served as central focal points for religious and cultural life of the Muslim community in Hungary. These institutions were integral to moral education. Friday prayers, held exclusively in mosques, provided valuable educational opportunities. The *Khatib* (preacher) and the *Cami* (mosque) played significant roles in the education of Muslim children. Students initially studied the Arabic language and grammar. The teaching of *Hadith* (Prophetic traditions) was common in mosques. Additionally, Islamic law (*Fiqh*) and inheritance law were taught, contributing to the community's religious and legal education.⁷⁹

Cultural exchange and mutual influence between Ottomans and Hungarians were particularly evident in linguistic convergence. Numerous studies demonstrate mutual language influence, extending to contemporary literary works, folk songs, customs, and cultural practices.

Turkish influence also permeated Hungarian cuisine. Dishes such as stewed meat, granulated dried pastry, stuffed cabbage, and stuffed paprika were introduced during this period. Furthermore, coffee and tobacco arrived through Turkish trade, with coffee drinking and smoking customs adopted from Turkish practice.

Hungarian adoption and development of Turkish musical instruments such as *tárogató* (Hungarian woodwind) and its Turkish counterpart *Zurna* – exemplify the profound intellectual influence the Ottoman Empire exerted on Hungary.⁸⁰

3.4 Urban Impact

The gradual transformation of Hungary's political system, demographic changes, shifts in ethnic composition, and the evolution of the settlement network collectively reshaped the country's architectural landscape. In 1541, Ottoman troops captured Buda, Hungary's medieval capital. The nature of the Ottoman presence was largely determined by the strategic importance of the newly established provinces: Muslim towns emerged at the sites of former Christian urban settlements, while strong border fortresses were built along the Ottoman-controlled periphery of Hungarian territory.⁸¹

Providing precise accounts of construction activities during this period is difficult, given the significant differences between communities that remained under Ottoman control and those that were only temporarily occupied.⁸²

4. Comparing Ottoman Governance in Algeria and Hungary

4.1 The Process of Imperial Integration

Notable distinctions appear in the manner and circumstances of each territory's integration into the Ottoman Empire. Although both Algeria and Hungary entered the Ottoman sphere in the sixteenth century, their incorporation processes differed fundamentally. Algeria's annexation occurred relatively peacefully, without military force. Through the efforts of the Barbarossa brothers to counter Spanish influence, Algerians formally requested Ottoman protection

and governance, believing that Islamic allies were crucial for defending against a Christian Spanish invasion.

Conversely, historians generally agree that the Ottoman invasion of Christian territories began with the fall of Constantinople. The occupation of Hungary constituted direct military intervention, furthering Ottoman expansion into Central Europe. Although religious intolerance broadly characterised this period, the Ottoman presence in Algeria was more amicable, as Algerians shared a religious identity and regarded Ottoman Turks as protectors and comrades. In contrast, the Ottomans in Hungary assembled armies and used military force to extend their control. For Hungarians, defending their religion and homeland against foreign occupiers was not merely a political struggle but also a deeply personal conflict that threatened their faith and cultural traditions.

4.2 Administrative Governance Policies

Despite Algeria's peaceful annexation contrasting with Hungary's military occupation, both regions shared centralized administrative structures. Turkish rulers were appointed to govern on behalf of the Ottoman Empire in both territories. The Ottomans implemented various administrative reforms, establishing hierarchical governmental systems.

Algeria experienced four distinct periods of Ottoman rule. During the final *Deys' Rule*, the country was divided into three administrative provinces (*Beyliks*). A Turkish official (*Bey*) oversaw each *Beylik*, while the *Dey*, as Governor-General and highest official, supervised all three provinces.⁸³

This administrative method closely resembled that of Hungary under Ottoman rule. The Ottomans designated Hungarian territories as *Madjaristan*. Sultan Suleiman divided Hungary into two *Vilayets*: Temesvár and Buda, which were further subdivided into twelve *sanjaks*. Following territorial acquisitions in the early seventeenth century, two smaller *Vilayets* – Eger⁸⁴ and Kanizsa⁸⁵ – were established.

Each *Vilayet* was governed by a Pasha, with Hungary as a whole overseen by the Pasha of Buda. The political system followed military models, with the Pasha at the top of the hierarchy and twelve Beys, each responsible for a *sanjak*, beneath him. The *Sipahis* (Ottoman cavalry) served as the final local rulers under Ottoman control.⁸⁶

Although Hungary was not fully integrated into the Ottoman Empire, Ottoman influence remained limited, allowing smaller towns and villages functional autonomy in internal affairs. However, in larger cities, the Ottomans established permanent settlements and constructed administrative and religious buildings.

A key aspect of Ottoman politics in Algeria involved respecting local customs and laws, allowing autonomy in local matters. This approach maintained stability and minimised widespread resistance. While Ottoman rulers held power as privileged groups monopolising authority, they exercised full administrative control over Algeria, which was then regarded as independent. The Dey's affiliation with the Ottoman Sultanate remained largely nominal; nevertheless, the primary purpose of this affiliation was defence against crusades.⁸⁷

4.3 Economic Governance Aspects

support the imperial treasury, Ottoman authorities in both Algeria and Hungary exploited local wealth, but through fundamentally different systems of land tenure. In Algeria, land ownership largely followed established Islamic legal categories, which included private (*Mulk*), communal (*Arsh*), state (*Miri*), and religious endowment (*Waqf*) lands. This system integrated existing local norms, reflecting a strategy of indirect rule. In contrast, the Ottoman administration in Hungary dismantled the pre-existing feudal system. The province was reorganized under the *Timar* system, where the Sultan in Istanbul retained official ownership of all land. Approximately 20% of the land was managed directly for the Sublime Porte's benefit, while the remainder was temporarily granted to military and administrative officials (pplx://action/translate). This imposition of

direct, centralized control highlights a governance model based on military occupation rather than local accommodation

The primary goal of Ottoman landowners was wealth accumulation. The *Sublime Porte* emphasised tax collection as central to administration. As sole landowners, Ottomans in Hungary faced challenging security conditions that hindered regional stabilisation and the implementation of coherent economic policy. Some Ottoman-controlled territories were lost, while repeated wars, famines, and disease caused emigration.⁸⁸

In contrast, Algeria's situation proved more favorable for the Ottomans. Political stability had a positive impact on the economy, leading to recovery, particularly in Mediterranean trade, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Ottoman authorities attempted to impose tax regimes in Hungary to support castles, border fortifications, and military campaigns. In Algeria, taxes such as *Zakat al-Ochore*⁸⁹ and *Waqf* were Islamic levies supporting public treasury. These funded government employees' and soldiers' wages, with portions sent to the Sultan in Istanbul.⁹⁰

4.4 Military Strategies

The direct military invasion strategy in Hungary required larger military commitment and more manpower than Algeria's peaceful integration as a Sultanate. Persistent resistance and Hungary's "liberation wars," in contrast to Algeria's relative stability, led the Ottoman Empire to adopt harsher policies in Hungary. This approach reflected the differing international circumstances, geographical and ethnic characteristics, and religious beliefs between Algeria and Hungary.

4.5 Social and Religious Dimensions

4.5.1 Demographic Impact

By preserving tribal life and customs, Ottoman administration in Algeria sought to earn the respect and loyalty of the local population. This approach ensured relative safety and stability. In urban areas, although farming and herding predominated, other trades also developed. Population categorization followed occupation: urban dwellers lived in cities, while rural residents lived in the countryside. Conversely, Hungary experienced significant population decline due to prolonged warfare and political instability, particularly in border regions. These factors hindered the establishment of stable communities. Despite these challenges, populations adapted to their circumstances.⁹¹

4.5.2 Religious Sphere

For Algerians, the Ottoman maintainance of existing religious structures and systems presented no obstacles, given their shared faith. Similarly, as with other ethnic groups enjoying religious autonomy within the empire, the Ottomans permitted Hungarians to practise their religion. Overall, the Ottomans largely adhered to policies of religious tolerance.

In Algeria, Islamic culture centered on religious sciences. Education was widespread, with children learning Quranic scripture from ages 6 to 12. Secondary and higher religious education developed, with institutions established across rural areas. Islamic institutions including mosques, schools, and libraries were founded early in Algeria's history. During the Ottoman era, the Maliki doctrine through Sufi orders significantly influenced cultural life. Despite prevailing peace, some Sufi orders resisted Ottoman control, leading to rebellions.⁹²

Similarly, Muslims in Hungary educated children within Islamic contexts. Children received their initial education at *Mekteb-Isibyans*.⁹³ The relationship between Ottoman Empire and Christian subjects in Hungarian territories remains historically debated. Some

claim the Ottomans treated non-Muslims as second-class citizens, while others argue received equal treatment. Some emphasize negative aspects; whereas others present idealized images of coexistence. Unlike Muslim-majority Algeria, which shared common religion and culture, Hungary's population lived with a foreign culture and religion.

If marginalization policies applied to Algeria's local population primarily targeted non-Muslims, the implementation of similar policies in Hungary, whereas through peaceful means or by force was not uncommon. While significant Islamic conversions occurred in the Balkans under 500 years of Ottoman rule, no widespread religious shift took place in Hungary.⁹⁴

Findings and discussion:

This comparative analysis of Ottoman governance in Algeria and Hungary yields several significant conclusions:

- During a period of expanding Ottoman power and global influence, both Algeria and Hungary were crucial arenas in the contest between major powers. The analysis shows that Ottoman governance was highly adaptive to local conditions, employing direct military control in Hungary and indirect rule through existing power structures in Algeria. This strategic flexibility indicates a nuanced understanding of regional differences, rather than a uniform imperial policy.

- The military occupation regime in Hungary differed markedly from the Ottoman administrative system in Algeria. In Hungary, the Ottomans relied on complete direct military control, whereas in Algeria, governance depended on allegiance to the Ottoman Sultan as Muslim Caliph and protector of Islamic lands. The circumstances surrounding the establishment of Ottoman rule in Algeria help explain contemporary Algerian perspectives on this historical period, which are characterised by gratitude that the Ottomans did not impose their will through military invasion or direct Maghrebi intervention. In contrast, Hungarians viewed the

Ottomans as unwanted invaders and occupying forces who devastated the country and its cities, leaving a lasting impact on Western perceptions of Eastern Muslims in general and Turkish people in particular.

- The Ottomans significantly influenced Algeria's economic and social fabric by preserving traditional agricultural practices while introducing advanced techniques and fostering trade networks with both Ottoman territories and European nations. In contrast, in Hungary, Ottoman taxation and the redistribution of agricultural land to Turkish rulers and elite families disrupted rural communities, forcing peasants to flee conflict zones. These policies, intended to consolidate Ottoman authority, led to long-term economic and social discontent.

- In both Algeria and Hungary, the Ottomans maintained central administrative policies, prioritising dominance in key positions of power. However, this approach hindered integration with local populations, as they neither adopted local languages and customs nor achieved lasting social or political stability. As a result, Ottoman Turks often remained perceived as outsiders despite centuries of rule.

- Education under Ottoman rule followed distinct trajectories. In Algeria, religious instruction remained the cornerstone of education, with no significant Ottoman efforts to modernise schools or introduce contemporary methods. This allowed Algerians to retain traditional approaches to scientific and intellectual development without external interference.

- The Ottoman legacy profoundly influenced subsequent state formation trajectories in both regions. Algeria's experience of relatively autonomous governance under Ottoman suzerainty arguably provided institutional foundations for later nationalist movements, while preserving indigenous administrative structures that could be mobilized for anti-colonial resistance. The maintenance of local customs and laws created a dual legitimacy system that, paradoxically, both sustained Ottoman rule and

preserved the cultural resources necessary for its eventual overthrow.

– Hungary's experience of tripartite division and direct military occupation had different but equally profound consequences. The prolonged territorial fragmentation weakened Hungarian national cohesion, created lasting regional disparities, and embedded deep cultural memories of foreign domination that would influence Hungarian political consciousness well into the modern era. The demographic disruption and economic dislocation caused by Ottoman rule fundamentally altered Hungary's developmental trajectory, contributing to its peripheral position within European economic systems.

– This analysis opens several promising research directions. First, extending this comparative framework to other Ottoman provinces could reveal whether the Algeria-Hungary dichotomy represents broader patterns or unique cases. Second, examining how Ottoman administrative practices influenced subsequent French colonialism in Algeria and Habsburg governance in Hungary could illuminate processes of imperial learning and adaptation. Third, investigating how local historiographies in Algeria and Hungary have constructed narratives of the Ottoman period could reveal how imperial legacies are mobilized for contemporary political purposes.

In conclusion, the contrasting policies and impacts of Ottoman governance in Algeria and Hungary highlight fundamental tensions in imperial rule: between centralisation and flexibility, extraction and legitimacy, and cultural accommodation and administrative efficiency. The Ottomans left a nuanced legacy in Algeria through economic and cultural continuity, while their presence in Hungary provoked resistance and discontent. Both cases demonstrate that imperial governance was neither monolithic nor static, but a dynamic process of negotiation between imperial ambitions and local realities. This comparative analysis ultimately reveals that the Ottoman Empire's varying success in Algeria and Hungary stemmed not from

military power alone, but from its ability – or inability – to construct legitimate governance frameworks that resonated with local populations. The empire's longevity in Algeria resulted from its capacity to position itself as protector rather than conqueror, while its troubled tenure in Hungary reflected the insurmountable challenges of governing across deep cultural divides. These insights enhance our understanding of how empires rise, adapt, and ultimately fall – not as uniform entities, but as complex assemblages of diverse regional arrangements, each with its own logic, tensions, and historical trajectory.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Ottoman Administrative Strategies in Algeria and Hungary

Dimension	Algeria (1518–1830)	Hungary (1526–1699)
Mode of Integration	Voluntary incorporation; Algerian delegation requested Ottoman protection against Spanish threat (1519)	Military conquest; Decisive defeat at Battle of Mohács (1526); forced occupation of central Hungary (1541)
Initial Justification	Mutual benefit: Ottoman military support in exchange for allegiance; shared Islamic identity	Imperial expansion; strategic buffer against Habsburg Austria; control of Danube trade routes
Administrative Structure	Autonomous <i>eyalet</i> (province) with 3–4 <i>beyliks</i> ; Regency system with elected <i>deys</i> (1671–1830)	Direct occupation: 6 <i>eyalets</i> subdivided into 12 <i>sanjaks</i> ; centralized control under the Pasha of Buda
Governance Model	Indirect rule; local autonomy preserved; corsair elite (<i>ta'ifa al-ru'asa</i>) governed alongside Ottoman officials	Direct military administration; <i>Timar</i> system imposed; garrison state over 20,000+ janissaries
Religious	Collaboration through shared Islamic identity; Ottoman	Confessional conflict; Muslim minority ruling

**Adaptive Imperial Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Ottoman
Administrative Strategies ... ————— Abdallah Al-Naggar, Abdellah Abdellaoui**

Policy	legitimacy recognized by local <i>ulama</i>	Christian majority; limited efforts at conversion; religious taxes imposed
Economic System	Mixed property regime: <i>mulk</i> (private), <i>waqf</i> (endowment), <i>beylik</i> (state); maritime commerce (<i>jihad</i> and trade)	<i>Timar</i> feudal system; agricultural taxation; disruption of traditional land tenure; economic exploitation
Local Elite Integration	Turkish-Algerian elite (<i>kouloughli</i>) emerged; native leadership retained in interior	Hungarian nobility displaced; collaboration with pro-Ottoman factions (Szapolyai); Transylvania as vassal state
Military Organization	Janissary corps + corsair fleet (<i>ta'ifa al-ru'asa</i>); autonomous naval operations; revenue from maritime raids	Garrison-based system; fortress network (Buda, Pest, Esztergom, Székesfehérvár); defensive strategy against Habsburgs
Local Resistance	Minimal internal resistance; tribal autonomy in interior maintained; external threats (Spain, Morocco)	Persistent armed resistance; continuous warfare with Habsburgs; nationalist uprisings; anti-Ottoman sentiment
Duration & Stability	312 years (1518–1830); stable governance until French invasion	173 years (1526–1699); instability; constant military pressure; ended by Habsburg reconquest
Economic Impact	Prosperity through Mediterranean trade; Algiers became major commercial hub; stable tax revenues	Agricultural decline; population loss; economic disruption; warfare-driven poverty
Cultural Influence	Significant Ottomanization of urban centers; Turkish language/customs adopted by elite;	Limited cultural integration; linguistic separation maintained;

	architectural legacy	religious divide perpetuated
Ottoman Control Level	Low to moderate; Algiers operated semi-independently; Istanbul's influence symbolic in many areas	High; direct military occupation; centralized administration; constant Istanbul oversight
End of Ottoman Rule	French colonial conquest (1830); not due to local uprising	Habsburg military reconquest (1699); Treaty of Karlowitz; Hungarian cooperation with Austrians

Table 2: Chronological Timeline of Key Events

Year	Algeria	Hungary
1515–1518	Brothers Aruj and Khair al-Din (Barbarossa) capture Algiers (1516); Aruj killed in Tlemcen (1518)	—
1519	Algerian delegation requests Ottoman protection; Sultan Selim I recognizes Khair al-Din as Beylerbey	—
1521	Algiers officially becomes Ottoman <i>eyalet</i> under Sultan Suleiman I	—
1526	—	Battle of Mohács (August 29): Ottoman forces under Suleiman I defeat Hungarian King Louis II; 25,000+ Hungarians killed
1529	Barbarossa captures Peñón of Algiers from Spain	First Siege of Vienna (Sept-Oct): Ottoman forces fail to capture Habsburg capital; winter forces

**Adaptive Imperial Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Ottoman
Administrative Strategies ... ————— Abdallah Al-Naggar, Abdellah Abdellaoui**

		retreat
1541	Hasan Agha defeats Spanish naval attack led by Charles V (October); divine mandate for Ottoman rule established	Occupation of Buda (August 29): Suleiman I captures Hungarian capital; central Hungary becomes Ottoman territory
1544–1554	Hasan Pasha defeats Saadian Morocco; conquest of Tlemcen (1551); Zayyanid dynasty ends	—
1552	Peace treaty with Morocco establishes Moulouya River as border	—
1566	—	Battle of Szigetvár (Aug-Sept): Ottomans capture fortress but Suleiman I dies during siege; marks peak of Ottoman expansion
1571	—	Principality of Transylvania formalized as Ottoman vassal state
1591	Introduction of <i>dey</i> system; election of military governors begins shift towards autonomy	—
1596	—	Battle of Mezökeresztes (Oct): Ottoman victory but strategic stalemate; Habsburg-Ottoman wars intensify
1606	—	Treaty of Zsitvatorok: Peace between Ottomans and Habsburgs; Hungary remains divided
1659–1660	Plague epidemic devastates Algiers; political instability follows	—
1671	<i>Dey</i> becomes supreme authority in Algiers; Ottoman Sultan's role becomes nominal	—

**Adaptive Imperial Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Ottoman
Administrative Strategies ... ————— Abdallah Al-Naggar, Abdellah Abdellaoui**

1683	—	Battle of Vienna (Sept): Ottoman defeat marks beginning of Ottoman decline in Europe
1686	—	Siege of Buda (June-Sept): Habsburg forces recapture Buda after 145 years of Ottoman rule
1688–1690	—	Habsburgs reconquer most of Ottoman Hungary
1697	—	Battle of Zenta (Sept 11): Decisive Habsburg victory; Ottomans suffer 30,000 casualties
1699	—	Treaty of Karlowitz (Jan 26): Ottomans cede Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia to Habsburgs; end of Ottoman Hungary
1711	Venetian bombardment of Algiers; Algerian fleet retaliates successfully	—
1775	Spanish expedition against Algiers fails; O'Reilly disaster	—
1815	U.S. naval campaign against Algiers (Barbary Wars); decline of corsair power	—
1827	"Fan Incident": Dey Hussein strikes French consul; diplomatic crisis begins	—
1830	French Invasion (June 14): Algiers falls; end of Ottoman Algeria after 312 years	—

REFERENCES:

Foreign-language Journals

1. Gábor Ágoston: *The Last Muslim Conquest, The Ottoman Empire and its Wars in Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2021.
2. Géza Dávid: *Studies in Demographic and Administrative History of Ottoman Hungary*. Istanbul, The ISIS Press, 1997.
3. James McDougall: *A History of Algeria*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
4. Jane Hathaway: *The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule (1516–1800)*. London, Routledge Taylor & Francis, 2013.
5. Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter.
6. Nabil Matar: *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689*. Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2005.
7. Pál Ács: *Reformations in Hungary in the Age of the Ottoman Conquest*. Göttingen, Refo500 Academic Studies (R5AS), Band 052, 2019.

Foreign-language Journals

1. Ágnes Kolláth: *The Research History of Early Modern Pottery in Hungary*. Sigel, *Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico*, Antaeus, 37, 2021, Pp. 283–328.
2. Géza Fehér: *Hungary Relations with the Ottoman Empire*. DergiPark (Erdem), 9(27), 1997, Pp. 1063–1074.
3. Géza Pálffy: *The Impact of the Ottoman Rule on Hungary*. Budapest, *Hungarian Studies Review*, Vol. XXVIII (1–2), 2001, Pp. 109–132.
4. Gyöngyi Kovács: *Ottoman Military Architecture in Hungary*. Budapest, Hungarian National Museum, Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art, Proceedings, 2009, Pp. 375–392.

5. Jordán Petrőcz: Perspective on turkey's cultural policy in Hungary: symbolism of the ottoman heritage. Bucharest, Strategic Impact (76), 2020, Pp. 52–75.

6. Mobarek Chouder – Tahar Toumi: A study in the political conditions of Algeria at the end of the Ottoman era. Corhogo, Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Ziglôbitha, RA2LC n°10 Vol. 1, 2024, Pp. 243–258.

7. Moussem Abdelhafid: The reality of the administration in Algeria during the Ottoman era between the positives and negatives- Reading and commentary. Saida, The journal of El-Ryssala for studies and research in humanities, Vol 06(3), September 2021, , Pp. 129–135.

8. Pál Fodor: Ottoman Policy Towards Hungary 1520–1541. Acta Orentalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XLV (2–3), 1991, Pp. 11–85.

9. Pál Fodor: Some Notes on Ottoman Tax Farming in Hungary. Budapest, Academiae Scietiarum Hungaricae, Acta Orientalia, Volume 54(4), 2001, Pp. 427–435.

Electronic sources:

1. The official website of Algiers 2 University: <https://univ-alger2.dz/index.php/en/university-en/1494-doctor-abou-el-kacem-saadallah,-the-father-of-historians> (Accessed: 02.10.2025)

Arabic-language Books

1. أبو القاسم سعد الله: تاريخ الجزائر الثقافي. المجلد الأول. الجزائر، دار بصيرة للنشر، 2007.

2. أبو القاسم سعد الله: أبحاث وآراء في تاريخ الجزائر. الجزء 2. الجزائر، دار البصائر للنشر والتوزيع، 2007.

3. بلقاسم الحفناوي: تعريف الخلف برجال السلف. الجزائر، مطبعة بيبير فونتانا الشرقية، 1906.

4. بوعشرين موسى زرابي - فاطمة الزهراء: العلاقة بين إيالة الجزائر والباب العالي. مظاهر التبعية والإستقلال 1519-1830. المسيلة، جامعة المسيلة، مذكرة ماستر في تاريخ الجزائر الحديث، 2022/2021.
5. حنيفي هلايلي: أوراق في تاريخ الجزائر في العهد العثماني. عين مليلة، دار الهدى للنشر والطباعة، ط 1، 2008.
6. سهيل صابان حقي: معجم الألفاظ العربية في اللغة التركية، ط 1. الرياض، جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية (فهرسة مكتبة الملك فهد الوطنية)، 2005.
7. الشريف الزهار: مذكرات الحاج أحمد الشريف الزهار نقيب أشرف الجزائر (تحقيق: أحمد توفيق المدني). الجزائر، الشركة الوطنية للنشر والتوزيع، 1974.
8. عبدالعزيز شهبي: الزوايا الصوفية والعزابة والإحتلال الفرنسي في الجزائر. وهران، دار الغرب للنشر والتوزيع، 2007.
9. ناصر الدين سعيدوني - المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984.
10. وليم سبنسر: الجزائر في عهد رياس البحر. تعريب، عبد القادر زبادية. الجزائر، دار القصبة للنشر، 2006.

Arabic-language Journals

1. أرزقي شويتام: طبعة الحكم العثماني في الجزائر 1519-1830. الجزائر، جامعة الجزائر 2، مجلة التاريخ المتوسطي، مجلد 4، العدد 1، يونيو 2022، ص 102-127.
2. بلال مريم - محمد دراج: العلاقات العثمانية-الجزائرية 1519-1830 من خلال أرشيف المكتبة الوطنية "دراسة نموذجية". باتنة، جامعة باتنة، مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية والإنسانية، المجلد 23، العدد 02، 2022، ص 183-198.
3. بلقاسم صديقي - عبلة بن يطو: الإدارة المركزية والإقليمية بالجزائر العثمانية 1519-1830، المجلد 7، العدد 1، 2023، ص 419-446.

4. مؤيد محمود حمد المشهدي - سلوان رشيد رمضان: أوضاع الجزائر خلال الحكم العثماني، 1518-1830. تكريت، جامعة تكريت، مجلة الدراسات التاريخية والحضارية، المجلد 5، العدد 16، 2013، ص 411-455.
5. ناصر الدين سعيدوني: الأوضاع الاقتصادية والاجتماعية والثقافية لولايات المغرب العثمانية (الجزائر - تونس - طرابلس) من القرن العاشر الى القرن الرابع عشر الهجري (من القرن 16 حتى القرن 19 الميلادي). الكويت، حوليات الآداب والعلوم الاجتماعية، الحولية 31، 2010.

Footnotes:

-
- ¹ Jordán Petrőcz: Perspective on turkey's cultural policy in Hungary: symbolism of the ottoman heritage. Bucharest, Strategic Impact (76), 2020, P. 52.
- ² The Wattasid Sultanate was a ruling dynasty of Morocco, based in Fez, from 1472 to 1554. As a branch of the related Marinid dynasty, the Wattasids rose to power in 1465 after a popular revolt overthrew the last Marinid sultan.
- ³ It was a significant Islamic Sunni dynasty that ruled from 1229 to 1574. Founded by Abu Zakariya Yahya, the dynasty expanded its territory and became a major cultural and economic center.
- ⁴ It marked the end of the Granada War and the Reconquista, concluding nearly 800 years of Muslim rule in the Iberian Peninsula.
- ⁵ James McDougall: A History of Algeria. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, P. 9.
- ⁶ Jane Hathaway. The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule (1516-1800). London, Routledge Taylor & Francis, 2013, P. 44.
- ⁷ Aruj Barbarossa and his brothers, Muslim corsairs from Mytilene, established their base in Algeria to resist Spanish expansion. After Aruj's death in 1518, his brother Khair al-Din continued operations
- ⁸ مؤيد محمود حمد المشهدي - سلوان رشيد رمضان: أوضاع الجزائر خلال الحكم العثماني، 1518-1830. تكريت، جامعة تكريت، مجلة الدراسات التاريخية والحضارية، المجلد 5، العدد 16، 2013، ص 413.
- ⁹ Jane Hathaway. The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule (1516-1800). London, Routledge Taylor & Francis, 2013, P. 44.
- ¹⁰ وليم سينسر: الجزائر في عهد رياس البحر. تعريب، عبد القادر زبادة. الجزائر، دار القصبة للنشر، 2006، ص 93.
- ¹¹ The title used by Ottoman rulers from Bayezid's era, serving not only as political leader but also as supreme leader of the Muslim world (Caliph), the most important religious and political leader of Islam. Also called Bab-ı Ali (Sublime Porte) or High Door in Turkish, referring to the seat of Ottoman government.
- ¹² James McDougall: A History of Algeria. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, P. 9.
- ¹³ Pál Fodor: Ottoman Policy Towards Hungary 1520-1541. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XLV (2-3), 1991. P. 285.

¹⁴ Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 5.

¹⁵ Gábor Ágoston: *The Last Muslim Conquest, The Ottoman Empire and its Wars in Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2021, P.153.

¹⁶ Ottoman administrative center in Hungary, now part of Budapest on the Danube's western bank.

¹⁷ Ágnes Kolláth: *The Research History of Early Modern Pottery in Hungary*. Sigel, Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico, Antaeus, 37, 2021, P. 283.

¹⁸ بوعشرين موسى زراي – فاطمة الزهراء: العلاقة بين إيالة الجزائر والباب العالي. مظاهر التبعية والإستقلال 1830–1519.

المسيلة، جامعة المسيلة، مذكرة ماستر في تاريخ الجزائر الحديث، 2022/2021، ص 13.

¹⁹ بلال مريم – محمد دراج: العلاقات العثمانية–الجزائرية 1830–1519 من خلال أرشيف المكتبة الوطنية "دراسة نموذجية".

باتنة، جامعة باتنة، مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية والإنسانية، المجلد 23، العدد 02، 2022، ص 185.

²⁰ The largest administrative divisions of the Ottoman Empire, subdivided into *Sanjaks*, then *kazas*, and finally villages.

²¹ James McDougall: *A History of Algeria*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, P. 12.

²² Abou el Kacem Saadallah (1930–2013) is a prominent scientific scholar and one of its significant cultural icons. He has several authored books, articles and translated books. In 1965, he got his PhD in Modern and Contemporary History from the University of Minnesota in USA. Abdelaziz Bouteflika, Ex-President of Algeria said about him: "He is an encyclopaedic author who masters different literary arts, including the short story, essay, poetry and investigation. He wrote biographies of different icons of Algeria, among them travelers, scholars and faqihs. He arabised and translated, he wrote press articles and various historical researches, as well as the free writing". For detailed information about him, see the official website of Algiers 2 University: <https://univ-alger2.dz/index.php/en/university-en/1494-doctor-abou-el-kacem-saadallah,-the-father-of-historians> (downloadable: 02.10.2025)

²³ أبو القاسم سعد الله: تاريخ الجزائر الثقافي. المجلد الأول. الجزائر، دار بصيرة للنشر، 2007، ص 141.

²⁴ ناصر الدين سعيدوني – المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب،

1984، ص 14.

²⁵ وليم سبنسر: الجزائر في عهد رياس البحر، تعريب، عبد القادر زبادية. الجزائر، دار القصبة للنشر، 2006، ص 93.

²⁶ Moussem Abdelhafid: The reality of the administration in Algeria during the Ottoman era between the positives and negatives-Reading and commentary. Saida, The journal of El-Ryssala for studies and research in humanities, Vol 06 , N° 03, September 2021 P. 130.

²⁷ A historian and professor of history specialized in the history of the Mediterranean region, particularly focusing on the Barbary corsairs and the Ottoman Regency of Algiers during the early modern period. He served as a full, tenured Professor of History at Florida State University starting in 1968 until his retirement.

²⁸ Turkish term adopted by Ottomans as title for provincial governors. In Algeria, refers to the governmental and administrative system of the Bey – a political, administrative, economic, social, and ideological system adapted to local tribal order and customs.

²⁹ أرزقي شويثام: طبيعة الحكم العثماني في الجزائر 1830–1519. الجزائر، جامعة الجزائر 2، مجلة التاريخ المتوسطي، مجلد 4،

العدد 1، يونيو 2022، ص 109.

³⁰ بلقاسم صديقي – عبلة بن يطو: الإدارة المركزية والإقليمية بالجزائر العثمانية 1519–1830، المجلد 7، العدد 1، 2023، ص 130–132.

³¹ Moussem Abdelhafid: The reality of the administration in Algeria during the Ottoman era between the positives and negatives-Reading and commentary. Saida, The journal of El-Ryssala for studies and research in humanities, Vol 06(3), September 2021, P. 131.

³² أرزقي شويتام: طبيعة الحكم العثماني في الجزائر 1830–1519. الجزائر، جامعة الجزائر2، مجلة التاريخ المتوسطي، مجلد 4، العدد 1، يونيو 2022، ص 112.

³³ أبو القاسم سعد الله: أبحاث وآراء في تاريخ الجزائر. الجزء 2. الجزائر، دار البصائر للنشر والتوزيع، 2007، ص 310.

³⁴ Islamic endowment system where individuals dedicate real estate for religious or social purposes, creating charitable institutions with substantial socio-economic impact.

³⁵ ناصر الدين سعيدوني: الأوضاع الاقتصادية والاجتماعية والثقافية لولايات المغرب العثمانية (الجزائر – تونس – طرابلس) من القرن العاشر الى القرن الرابع عشر الهجري (من القرن 16 حتى القرن 19 الميلادي). الكويت، حوليات الآداب والعلوم الاجتماعية، الحولية 31، 2010، ص 18.

³⁶ Béjaïa is a Mediterranean port city and commune in Algeria, and also the capital of Béjaïa Province.

³⁷ Mediterranean Sea port city located in northeastern Algeria, and situated on the Gulf of Stora.

³⁸ Major coastal city located in the northwest of Algeria. It is the second most important city of Algeria, after the capital.

³⁹ Annaba is an touristic centre, coastal city, and is considered one of the major tourist attractions in the western Mediterranean.

⁴⁰ حنيفي هلايلي: أوراق في تاريخ الجزائر في العهد العثماني: عين مليلة، دار الهدى للنشر والطباعة، ط 1، 2008، ص 156.

⁴¹ Nabil Matar: Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689. Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 2005, Pp. 83–85.

⁴² James McDougall: A History of Algeria. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, P. 13.

⁴³ Ghanaim are spoils of war obtained through military operations. In maritime jihad, particularly during Ottoman naval campaigns and North African corsair activities, ghanaim from captured ships, cargo, and ransoms provided substantial revenue, distributed according to Islamic law among combatants, the state, and charitable causes.

⁴⁴ ناصر الدين سعيدوني – المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984، ص 28.

⁴⁵ Ibid. P. 137.

⁴⁶ It is a significant cultural and spiritual center located in the town of El-Abiodh Sidi Cheikh, Algeria. It serves as the central *Zawiya* (Sufi lodge) for the Ouled Sidi Cheikh tribe and the founding center for their large and influential Sufi order, making it a historical and religious landmark. The customs associated with the *Zawiya* are recognized by UNESCO as part of Algeria's intangible heritage, and it hosts annual celebrations that reinforce community bonds and preserve Sufism.

⁴⁷ It is one of the most prominent religious and scholarly institutions in southwestern Algeria. It belongs to the Sunni *Shadhili* tradition and is also known as the Ahmadiyya Order (*al-Tariqa al-Ahmadiyya*), named after its founder, the Sufi saint Sīdī Aḥmad ibn Musa al-Hasani, known as "Mawlay Karzaz" (d. 1016 AH/1608 CE), who was renowned for his piety, blessings (*Baraka*), and manifest spiritual miracles (*Karamat*). The mother *Zawiya* serves as a major spiritual and educational center located south of the town of Qanadsa on the road to Touat. It has played a

significant role in disseminating religious knowledge, Sufism, and spiritual education throughout the region. The *zāwiya* operates under a precise hierarchical system comprising the *Sheikh* (spiritual master), his *khalifa* (successor), the *muqaddimun* (deputies), their assistants, and servants responsible for daily affairs. Followers of the Karzazi Order spread from Tlemcen in the north to Guerrara and Touat in the south, passing through Wādī Saoura, establishing an influential spiritual network across the religious and social spheres over the centuries. For more details, see:

عبدالعزیز شہی: الزوايا الصوفية والعزابة والإحتلال الفرنسي في الجزائر. وهران، دار الغرب للنشر والتوزيع، 2007، ص 117-118.

⁴⁸ It is one of the most prestigious scholarly and religious institutions in eastern Morocco. It was founded by the pious saint Ahmad ibn Musa al-Idrisi al-Hasani al-Figuig in Qasr al-Maiz during the 9th century AH (15th century CE). His son, Abdul Jabbar, continued his father's work and built a mosque and a new zawiya to receive students and scholars. He also established a famous scientific library known as "Dar al-Udda" (House of Preparedness), which contained precious manuscripts and references on jurisprudence, Quranic readings, and legal rulings (*nawazil*). The zawiya played a central role in spreading knowledge and educating generations, serving as a religious and cultural beacon that attracted students from various parts of the region. For successive centuries, it combined education, spiritual formation, and community service. For more details, see:

بلقاسم الحفناوي: تعريف الخلف برجال السلف. الجزائر، مطبعة بيز فونتانا الشرقية، 1906، ص 11؛ ناصر الدين سعيدوني — المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، ج 4 العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984، ص 183.

⁴⁹ It was founded by Imam Abu Hanifa (699–767 CE). It is the largest Sunni Islamic legal school and served as the official doctrine of the Ottoman Empire. Distinguished by its emphasis on rational reasoning (*ra'y*) and flexibility in legal interpretation, it remains predominant in Turkey, Central Asia, and South Asia.

⁵⁰ Sheikh al-Islam (Turkish: Şeyhülislam) was the highest religious authority in the Ottoman Empire, serving as chief mufti. Officially institutionalized during Sultan Murad II's reign (1421–1451), the Sheikh al-Islam issued fatwas (religious legal opinions) that guided Ottoman law and policy, confirmed the legitimacy of new sultans, advised the Sultan on religious matters, and appointed judges and senior religious officials. His approval through fatwas was required for major state decisions including declaring war, establishing laws, and imposing taxes, making this position essential for the religious legitimacy of Ottoman governance.

⁵¹ ناصر الدين سعيدوني — المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984، ص 145–187.

⁵² James McDougall: A History of Algeria. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, P. 26.

⁵³ Matthew Pearsall: Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 3.

⁵⁴ Géza Fehér: Hungary Relations with the Ottoman Empire. DergiPark (Erdem), 9(27), P. 1067.

⁵⁵ Géza Pálffy: The Impact of the Ottoman Rule on Hungary. Budapest, Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XXVIII (1–2), 2001, P. 112.

⁵⁶ John Sigismund Szapolyai (Szapolyai János Zsigmond; 1540–1571) was King of Hungary as John II from 1540 to 1551 and from 1556 to 1570, and the first Prince of Transylvania, (1570–1571).

⁵⁷ Géza Fehér: Hungary Relations with the Ottoman Empire. DergiPark (Erdem), Vol. 9 (27), P. 1063–1074.

⁵⁸ Administrative province designation used particularly in later Ottoman periods, functionally similar to eyalet.

⁵⁹ Originally meaning the state's flag or standard, later referring to administrative subdivisions of provinces.

⁶⁰ Istanbul (Astana/Constantinople): The Ottoman capital, called Dar al-Khalifa (Abode of the Caliphate) or Dar al-Sultan (Abode of the Sultan) due to the Sultan's residence.

⁶¹ Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 11.

⁶² Géza Pálffy: *The Impact of the Ottoman Rule on Hungary*. Budapest, Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XXVIII (1–2), 2001, P. 119.

⁶³ Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 21.

⁶⁴ Géza Pálffy: *The Impact of the Ottoman Rule on Hungary*. Budapest, Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XXVIII (1–2), 2001, P. 118.

⁶⁵ Gábor Ágoston: *The Last Muslim Conquest, The Ottoman Empire and its Wars in Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2021, P.119.

⁶⁶ Pál Fodor: *Some Notes on Ottoman Tax Farming in Hungary*. Budapest, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Acta Orientalia, Volume 54 (4), 2001, P. 428–431.

⁶⁷ In brief, money collected by the Islamic government from non-Muslims in return for the protection of the Muslim state, as well as exemption from military service.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ أرزقي شويتام: *طبيعة الحكم العثماني في الجزائر 1519–1830*. الجزائر، جامعة الجزائر2، مجلة التاريخ المتوسطي، مجلد 4، العدد 1، يونيو 2022، ص 114.

⁷⁰ Gábor Ágoston: *The Last Muslim Conquest, The Ottoman Empire and its Wars in Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2021, P. 105.

⁷¹ Géza Dávid: *Studies in Demographic and Administrative History of Ottoman Hungary*. Istanbul, The ISIS Press, 1997, P. 2.

⁷² Géza Pálffy: *The Impact of the Ottoman Rule on Hungary*. Budapest, Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XXVIII (1–2), 2001, P. 119.

⁷³ Plural of *Qadi* (judge). They were central to the Ottoman Empire's law and order, acting as judges who applied Islamic law (sharia), dynastic law (Kanun), and local customs to resolve civil and criminal matters. They also held broader administrative duties, such as overseeing religious endowments and acting as guardians for orphans. Qadis served as a check on military power and were responsible for maintaining order within their designated jurisdictions.

⁷⁴ Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 15.

⁷⁵ For more details, see: Benjamin Braude: "Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewsi, Vol. 1. New York, Holmes & Meier, PP. 69–88.

⁷⁶ Pál Ács: *Reformations in Hungary in the Age of the Ottoman Conquest*. Göttingen, Refo500 Academic Studies (R5AS), Band 052, 2019, P. 17.

⁷⁷ Gábor Ágoston: *The Last Muslim Conquest, The Ottoman Empire and its Wars in Europe*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2021, P. 120.

⁷⁸ Géza Fehér: *Hungary Relations with the Ottoman Empire*. DergiPark (Erdem), Vol. 9 (27), P. 1070.

⁷⁹ Gábor Ágoston: *Muslim Cultural Enclaves in Hungary Under Ottoman Rule*. Budapest, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Acta Orientalia, Tomus XLV (2–3), 1991, P. 183.

⁸⁰ Géza Fehér: Hungary Relations with the Ottoman Empire. DergiPark (Erdem), Vol. 9 (27), P. 1071.

⁸¹ Gyöngyi Kovács: Ottoman Military Architecture in Hungary. Budapest, Hungarian National Museum, Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art, Proceedings, 2009, PP. 375–376.

⁸² Géza Dávid: Studies in Demographic and Administrative History of Ottoman Hungary. Istanbul, The ISIS Press, 1997, P. 4.

⁸³ Mobarek Chouder – Tahar Toumi: A study in the political conditions of Algeria at the end of the Ottoman era. Corhogo, Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Ziglôbitha, RA2LC n°10 Vol. 1, 2024, P. 243.

⁸⁴ A historic city known for its castle, wine, and thermal baths.

⁸⁵ Or the Kaniye Eyalet. It was an administrative territorial entity of the Ottoman Empire existed until the 1699 Treaty of Karlowitz. It included parts of present-day Hungary and Croatia.

⁸⁶ Matthew Pearsall: Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 11.

⁸⁷ ناصر الدين سعيدوني – المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984، ص 14–22.

⁸⁸ Matthew Pearsall: Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 11.

⁸⁹ It is an Islamic religious obligation imposed on agricultural produce, specifically grains and fruits harvested from the land. The term gets its name because the amount due is traditionally one-tenth (al-ushr) of the agricultural yield. The rate varies depending on the irrigation method: crops irrigated naturally by rainwater or rivers are subject to 10% (one-tenth) zakat, while crops irrigated through human effort using wells or machinery are subject to 5% (half of one-tenth). For mixed irrigation methods, the rate is 7.5% (three-quarters of one-tenth). This form of zakat differs from other types as it is due immediately at harvest time when the produce reaches the minimum threshold (nisab) of approximately 653 kilograms, rather than following the lunar calendar cycle. It represents a fundamental pillar of Islamic economic justice, ensuring wealth redistribution and supporting community welfare. For more details, see:

سهيل صابان حقي: معجم الألفاظ العربية في اللغة التركية، ط1. الرياض، جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية (فهرسة مكتبة الملك فهد الوطنية)، 2005، ص 109؛ الشريف الزهار: مذكرات الحاج أحمد الشريف الزهار نقيب أشرف الجزائر (تحقيق: أحمد توفيق المدني). الجزائر، الشركة الوطنية للنشر والتوزيع، 1974، ص 47

⁹⁰ ناصر الدين سعيدوني – المهدي بوعبدلي: الجزائر في التاريخ، الجزء 4، العهد العثماني. الجزائر، المؤسسة الوطنية للكتاب، 1984، ص 32.

⁹¹ Géza Dávid: Studies in Demographic and Administrative History of Ottoman Hungary. Istanbul, The ISIS Press, 1997, P. 2.

⁹² Gábor Ágoston: Muslim Cultural Enclaves in Hungary Under Ottoman Rule. Budapest, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Acta Orientalia, Tomus XLV (2–3), 1991, P. 187.

⁹³ It is an Ottoman-Arabic compound term meaning "children's school" or "school for boys." The term consists of two parts: *Mekteb*, meaning school or place of learning, and *Sibyan*, meaning boys or children. This corresponds to what is known in Islamic educational tradition as the *Kuttub* or traditional primary school. In Ottoman administrative terminology, *Mekteb* referred to formal schools, while *Madrasa* was used for specialized religious institutions. These primary schools taught children reading, writing, Quran memorization, and basic religious principles. They were widespread throughout the Ottoman Empire and the Islamic world, serving as the foundational level of traditional education before students progressed to higher institutions.

The *Mekteb-Isibyans* played a crucial role in preserving Islamic knowledge and culture across generations. For more details:

سهيل صابان حفي: معجم الألفاظ العربية في اللغة التركية، ط1. الرياض، جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية (مكتبة الملك فهد الوطنية)، 2005، ص 210.

⁹⁴ Matthew Pearsall: *Madjaristan: The Ottomans in Hungary 1520–1686*. Washington, Western Washington University, Honors Program Senior Projects, 2000, Spring Quarter, P. 34.

