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Georgians in the Military Establishment in Egypt in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The system of military slavery in Egypt in the eighteenth century brought together men and women of many ethnicities. There are to be found among the Ottoman military garrisons (turkish: ocak-s) and the neo-mamluk households rooted in Egypt slaves from the Caucasus, Russia, western Europe, and Africa. Even converted Jews and Armenians, minorities from within the borders of the Ottoman Empire, are to be found among neo-mamluk households in eighteenth century Egypt. But the ethnicities that came to dominate the Ottoman ocak-s and neo-mamluk households (arabic: buyūṭ; sing. bayt) and to direct the course of Egyptian history in the second half of the eighteenth century were the slaves drawn from Circassia and, above all, from Georgia.

The trade in slaves became widely established in the Black Sea littoral during the course of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries through the efforts of the Italian trading factories (Kafa, Tana). Slaves were taken to Western Europe and to Egypt. The export of Georgian slaves by Genoese merchants is noted as early as the 1330s. Georgians are also mentioned by the Shāfiʿī scholar Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Minhājī al-Asyūṭī (d. in 889/1484) among the slaves of various ethnicities sold in Egypt. It is evident that the number of Georgian slaves in Egypt in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was small. The Georgian ethnicity is not clearly traced among the mamluk elite (sultans, amīr-s) in Egypt during this period in which the dominant role was played by Kipçaks and, later on, by Circassians.

1. Beradze, Seafaring and Naval Trade, p. 119-120.
By the end of the fifteenth century the United Kingdom of Georgia had disintegrated and a number of circumstances, among which were the unequal struggles with both the Safavid and Ottoman empires, the Ottoman blockade of Georgia’s Black Sea littoral, and continuous raids by Daghestani Muslim tribesmen (the Lezgis), known in Georgian as lekiánoba, created a favorable setting for the development of a slave trade in Georgia and an increased flow of Georgian slaves to various regions of the Islamic Middle East. During this period the slave trade, commonly known in Georgian as tkvis skidva, i.e., the sale of captives, assumed an extremely menacing character. Georgia became one of the principal donor regions from which the armed forces of Safavid Iran and the Ottoman Empire received replenishment. The leadership of the Ottoman central government in Istanbul and provincial elites in Egypt, Iraq and Tunisia used Georgian slaves extensively. In Egypt in particular, Georgians came to dominate both the beylicate and the ranks and officer corps of the seven military garrisons the Ottomans deployed there.

André Thevet (d. 1592), who made his journey to Turkey, Egypt, Palestine, and Syria in the 1550s, A. Geoffreus, and Petro Bizaro were among the first European travelers who paid attention to the Georgian mamluks in Ottoman Egypt. A century later, the famous Ottoman traveler Evliya Çelebi visited Egypt in the 1670s and noted that “Mamluks came from various regions and ethnic groups. Although the Circassians seem to have been the outstanding element, there were Abaza, Georgians, Russians, Imeretians, Mingrelians and others.”

Ottoman pay registers indicate a large influx of freeborn Anatolians and Caucasian slaves, above all Georgians, to Egypt in the second half of the seventeenth century and the first half

3. “It has been reckoned that these raids, together with the various local wars which took place in Georgia, reduced the population by as much as half during the eighteenth century. By 1800 the combined population of Eastern and Western Georgia had sunk to less than half a million”. Lang, A Modern History of Georgia, p. 36.


5. André Thevet, “Cosmographie du Levant”, p. 179, notes mamluks “ou prendre en Arménie et Mingrelie”.

6. Geoffreus, Hoffhaltung des turkischen Keyser, p. 219, notes that “All the mamluks were Christians … and most of the mamluks were Georgians (Iberians and Colchis), Circassians, Albanians and Jacobite and Nestorian Christians”.


8. Evliya Çelebi, Sey yabatname X, p. 159, cited in Winter, Egyptian Society under Ottoman Rule, p. 53. Abaza refers to Abkhazs. Imeretians and Mingrelians were inhabitants of Western Georgia.
of the eighteenth century. Their numbers increased, particularly among the Janissaries, in the period 1675-1677 to 1737-1738. The registers of the early decades of the eighteenth century also reveal that the Gönüllüyan regiment in Cairo was composed primarily of Georgian households. Moreover, archival materials in Cairo demonstrate the predominant position of Georgians within the Qazdughlī household as early as the 1730s.

The presence of Georgian mamluks in Egypt is widely documented by western travelers of the eighteenth century such as Richard Pococke, Charles Perry, James Bruce, Carsten Niebuhr, Sergey Pleshcheev, James Capper, the anonymous author of a 1770 tract entitled *Histoire d’Égypte*, Saveur Lusignan, C.F. Volney, the Baron de Tott, and the anonymous author of a 1770 tract entitled *Histoire d’Égypte*, Saveur Lusignan, C.F. Volney, the Baron de Tott.

9. Hathaway, *The Politics of Households*, p. 45-46. See Table 3.3, "Non-Anatolian places of origin among the Janissaries listed in Maliyeden Mudever 4787 (1675-1677) and 7069 (1737-1738)."
12. Pococke, *A Description of the East. Volume the First, Observations on Egypt*. “It is probable that the greater part of the people of Cairo are of the Mameluke race, descended from the slaves mostly of Georgia.” (p. 38) “The slaves of the officers of the military bodies, when they give them their liberty by ordering them to let their beards grow, become members of that body, and are advanced; and so it is really government thro’ every part; but the slaves are by no means a despicable people, they are the fairest and most promising Christian children of Georgia, taken for the tribute, brought here to be sold, and become reported Mahometans.” (p. 167) “Those who are properly Turks, here commonly marry slaves of Circassia, Georgia and other countries who exceed the natives of the country in beauty.” (p. 181).
13. Perry, *View of the Levant*, p. 152, states that “These slaves were brought young from the country now called Mengrelia, between Euxine and the Caspian Sea … It has been observed to produce the bravest bodies of men and most beautiful women of all the Eastern region … The slaves of military officers, when set at liberty, become Janissaries, and are advanced gradually … But these slaves whether of the Beys or military officers, are by no means a despicable people, for they are the fairest and most promising children of Georgia, and are taken for the tribute due from the country to the Grand Signor.” (p. 156).
14. Bruce of Kinnaird, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile I*, p. 34, notes that “… in the house of Ali Bey … all were Georgian and Greek slaves.” In the 1804 edition of this work the quotation is in Volume I, p. 109.
15. Niebuhr, *Travels through Arabia*, p. 77, states: “Like the Mamelukes, who, having been all slaves, chose their chiefs only from among those who had risen to honour through the path of servitude, the present Beys have been almost all slaves, bought for fifty or not more than an hundred sequins. They are often Christian children from Georgia or Mingrelia”.
16. Sergey Pleshcheev, *Daily Notes*, p. 46, remarks, “There were Georgian, Circassian, Abkhaiian, Kalmyk and Ukrainian slaves in Ali Bey’s army”.
17. Capper, *Observations*, p. 20, asserts: “The cash-ears are Georgian or Circassian slaves, whom the Bey has bought and adopted when young”.
18. “The slaves of the officers and the other grandees of the country are, for the most part, the children of Christians of Georgia and Circassia who were taken to Egypt in their earliest youth and who were raised in the manners and customs of the Turks.” See Bibliothèque nationale (Paris), Ms. Fr. 24597, Anonymous, *Histoire d’Égypte*, folio 166.
19. Lusignan, *A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey*, contains a great deal of information that will be examined below.
20. Volney, *Travels through Syria and Egypt*, p. 181, says that "the young peasant, sold in Mingrelia or Georgia, no sooner arrives in Egypt than his ideas undergo a total alteration. The Turks hold Tcherkasses, or Circassian slaves, in the highest estimation; next to them the Abazans, next the Mingrelians, after them the Georgians, after them the Russians and Poles, next the Hungarians and Germans, then Negroes and, last of all, the Spaniards, Maltese, and other Franks, whom they despise as drunkards, debauchees, idle, and mutinous.” (p. 117, note b).
21. Tott, *Memoires* (I, p. 79), remarked that “Georgian children, brought and sold in Egypt, replace those who die out of ten or twelve thousand mamlukes.”
W.G. Browne,22 C.S. Sonnini,23 George Baldwin,24 Dupuis25 (the French Governor of Grand Cairo), and Thomas Walsh.26 The Royal Court of the Eastern Georgian kingdom of Kartli and Kakheti was well aware of the predominant position of Georgian mamluks in Egypt in the late eighteenth century through the exchange of letters with the leading beys. The well-known Ahmad Jazzar Pasha of Palestine also provided the Ottoman central government with the same intelligence.27

By the early eighteenth century it is possible to identify a number of Georgian mamluks who rose to prominence in both the Ottoman garrison units, the ocak-s, and among the sanjaq bey-s, or simply beys, of Egypt. It was possible to move freely between the two positions as officers of the garrison units were often appointed to the sanjaqiyya. Georgians are also found within competing households or factions, so we cannot speak of any ethnic solidarity among the Georgian mamluks. According to the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century Egyptian historian ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Ḥasan al-Jabartī,28 whose sources are unstated, among prominent mamluks of the early eighteenth century were some with the nisba “al-Jurjī”, or Georgian. These were ʿIwāz Bey al-Jurjī, Khalīl Kāshif al-Jurjī, Muṣṭafā (Çelebi) Bey al-Sharīf ibn ʿIwaz Bey al-Jurjī, and ʿUthmān Katkhudā al-Jurjī.29 But as David Ayalon has warned, these nisba-s cannot always be trusted.30 Al-Jabartī also mentioned four amirs of certain Georgian origin.

The amīr Ḥusayn Bey, known as Abū Yadak, the son-in-law of Sulaymān Bey Bārim Dhayluh, a courageous horseman, became a sanjaq bey in 1103/1691-1692. When Qitās Bey

22. Browne, Travels in Africa, p. 48-49, remarks on the beys that, “They remain, as they have ever been, military slaves imported from Georgia, Circassia, and Mingrelia. A few have been prisoners, taken from the Austrians and Russians, who have exchanged their religion for an establishment”.
23. Sonnini, Travels in Upper and Lower Egypt, p. 424, notes that “Mamluks were not natives of Egypt, but were brought very young from Georgia, Circassia, and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, when they were purchased by the merchants to be resold at Cairo”.
24. Baldwin, Political Recollections, p. 50-51, refers unflatteringly to the mamluks as “… a set of swine-herds, vagabonds … kidnapped in the mountains of Mingrelia, Circassia, Georgia, and brought young into Egypt; sold, circumcised, and trained to the career of glory”.
25. Dupuis, To his Friend Carlo, p. 152, states that “Every Mamelouc is purchased—they are all from Georgia and Mount Caucasus—there are a great number of Germans and Russians amongst them, and even some Franc”.
26. Walsh, Journal, p. 165, describes a neo-mamluk structure greatly changed. Mamluks “were of all nations and countries, some Germans and Russians, but chiefly Georgians, Circassians, and from other parts of Mount Caucasus”.
27. See Batonishvili, Khumarstsvela Kalmasoba II, p. 189; Cezzar Ahmed Pasha, Ottoman Egypt, p. 33.
28. Al-Jabartī’s massive history remains a major source for the period of the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth century. He generally did not acknowledge his borrowing from earlier sources that cover the first century of his history, but he was a contemporary to the events he reported from the 1770s to his death in the 1820s. References throughout this paper to his history are to the English translation. See Al-Jabartī, ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History.
al-Faqārī was murdered in 1715 and his retainer Muḥammad Bey Qatāmish fled to Anatolia Ḥusayn Bey went into hiding in Cairo after he had already been an amīr for 24 years. When the civil war broke out between Muḥammad Çerkes Bey and Ismāʿīl Bey ibn ʿĪwāz, Ḥusayn Bey came out of hiding and supported Çerkes Bey, who belonged to the same faction. He fled when Çerkes Bey was defeated, but was captured by ʿAbdallah Bey, the son-in-law of Ibn ʿĪwāz Bey, and was beheaded in 1131/1718-1719.31

Riḍwān Aghā al-Faqārī, another Georgian who was a notable and influential man in Egypt, was appointed chief aghā of the Mustaḥfīzān (Janissary) Corps32 towards the end of 1118/1707. He became katkhudā of the Jawishiyya, then in 1120/1708-1709 became chief aghā of the Gönüllyüyan. He fled to Anatolia when his faction was defeated in the great civil war of 1711, but was permitted to return to Cairo in 1135/1722-1723. His wife and two sons had died and his tax farms had been sold to others, so he lived in obscurity in Cairo until Ismāʿīl Bey ibn ʿĪwāz appointed him chief aghā of the Gönüllyüyan. He led his fellow Georgian, ʿAli Bey al-Hindi, into a trap set by his enemies, who captured and executed him in 1141/1728-1729. Riḍwān Aghā died in the pestilence of 1148/1735-1736.33

ʿĀli Bey, known as al-Hindi, was the Georgian mamluk of Aḥmad Bey, a retainer of ʿĪwāz Bey al-Kabīr. Having distinguished himself on a campaign against the Greeks of the Morea in 1127/1715 in a battle in which the Ottoman troops first fled and his master Ahmad Bey was killed, ʿAli was elevated to the rank of amīr and sanjaq bey in Istanbul by the Ottoman central government and given the supervision of the khaṣṣakiyya (lands endowed in Egypt for the holy cities of Mecca and Medina) for life by order of the sultan. When Muḥammad Çerkes Bey and Muḥammad Çelebi ibn Abī Shanab overwhelmed Ismāʿīl Bey ibn ʿĪwāz and his supporters ʿĀli Bey al-Hindi was stripped of his positions, but the central government intervened and reasserted his positions, whereupon he was lured into a trap and beheaded by his enemies in late 1727.34

The first major Georgian household to arise in Egypt was founded by Muḥammad Bey Qitās, the mamluk of Qitās Bey.35 Qitās Bey, known as Qatāmish, had been a mamluk of Ibrāhīm Bey, the son of Dhū-l-Faqār Bey, a retainer of Ḥasan Bey al-Faqārī. He was appointed amīr and sanjaq bey during the lifetime of his master. He led the pilgrimage as amīr al-ḥajj as early as 1125/1713. He rebelled unsuccessfully in 1714 when ʿAbidī Pasha had his master killed and fled to Istanbul where he stayed until Dhū-l-Faqār came out of hiding in 1138/1725-1726 and Çerkes Bey fled from Cairo. Muḥammad Bey Qitās was permitted to return to Cairo and was

32. The best studies surveying the dominance, wealth, and importance of the Janissary regiment in Egypt during the Ottoman period are Shaw, The Financial and Administrative Organization, and Raymond, Le Caire des Janissaires.
granted the office of daftardār, which he was not able to assume until ‘Ali Bey al-Hindi was killed. He quickly regained importance, defeated Muḥammad Čerkes Bey and annihilated the Qāsimiyya faction. He created four sanjaq bey-s, including his mamluk ‘Ali, who was appointed amīr al-ḥajj, and his protégé Ibrahim Bey. When the Ottoman governor Bakir Pasha was deposed in 1143/1730-1731, Muḥammad Bey Qatāmish was appointed qaʾimmaqām. After the assassination of Dhū-l-Faqr Bey, Muḥammad Bey Qatāmish, with his four sanjaq bey-s (‘Ali Bey, Yūsuf Bey, Šālih Bey, and Ibrahim Bey), was the dominant amīr in Cairo. He and his sanjaq bey-s were killed in the plot approved by the Ottoman governor Bakir Pasha in 1736, but the Qatāmisha continued to hold power. Ibrahim Bey Qatāmish replaced ‘Uthmān Bey Dhū-l-Faqr as shaykh al-balad while his khushdash Khalīl Bey became amīr al-ḥajj.

The steady flow of slaves from Georgia in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century had created a critical mass of Georgian ocak officers and sanjaq bey-s who had risen to prominence among Egypt’s various households, whether Qasimi or Faqari, in the first half of the eighteenth century. In addition to the Qatāmish household cited above, another grouping of predominantly Georgian households emerged in the early eighteenth century within the Janissary corps in Cairo. This grouping, born out of the Faqārī faction, survived the disintegration of the two older factions, the Qāsimi and Faqārī, and emerged supreme by the 1730s-1740s through the efforts of several of its leading figures, namely ‘Uthmān Katkhudā and Sulaymān Katkhudā. The foundation of Qazdughlī dominance for the remainder of the eighteenth century, however, was laid by Ibrahim Katkhudā, another Georgian mamluk, who while maintaining Qazdughlī control of the rich and powerful Janissary regiment, shifted the balance of Qazdughlī power into the beylicate through the appointment of so many of his own mamluks as sanjaq bey-s. The Qazdughlī amīr-s, most of whom were of Georgian origin, came to control the vast system of urban tax farms, including the control of Egypt’s ports, through their hold on the top offices of the Janissary and other ocak-s, but also the extensive network of rich agricultural tax farms through their appointment as sanjaq bey-s.

36. Khushdashes were the slaves of a common master.
38. On the Faqari and Qasimi factions and their origins see Hathaway, A Tale of Two Factions.
39. The rise of the Qazdughlī faction is expertly analyzed by Hathaway, The Politics of Households, p. 52-97.
40. See Hathaway, The Politics of Households, p. 88-106. She concludes: “If we regard the purchase and promotion of mamluks as a strategy for household-building rather than an ethos, then we can reconcile the increasing prominence of mamluks in Egyptian military society after the middle of the eighteenth century with the pragmatic realities of that diverse society. Already in control of the Janissary corps, Ibrahim Kāhya came to hold sway over the entire province owing to a vacuum in the beylicate that he had helped to create. To maintain this power and to ensure the flow of revenues that went with it, he faced the challenge of controlling Egypt’s rural administration, dominated by kâshifs and sancak beys, while keeping a tight rein on the Janissary officers who policed Cairo’s civil life. The quickest and surest way to fill urban and rural, regimental and beylical posts with reliable men was to purchase mamluks from the most convenient source: the Caucasian region, and above all Georgia and Abkhazia.” (P. 105-106).
There remains a great deal of confusion relating to Ibrāhīm Katkhudā’s origins. Some eighteenth century sources, with which even some contemporary scholars agree, claim he was a free-born Muslim from western Anatolia. He was, in fact, a slave introduced like so many others into the Qazdughlī household in the early eighteenth century and was manumitted by the Qazdughlī leader ʿUthmān Katkhudā. It is almost certain that he was himself of Georgian origin. He built the most powerful Georgian household of the mid-eighteenth century and laid the foundation for the total dominance of Egypt by Georgian households throughout the second half of the century. He ruled Egypt in the years 1748 to his death in 1754 in partnership with Riḍwān Katkhudā al-Julfī, who dominated the ‘Azab Corps. Al-Damurdashī remarks that of all the income available to the duumvirs, Ibrāhīm Katkhudā took two-thirds and gave Riḍwān Katkhudā one-third. Riḍwān Katkhudā did not interfere in political affairs, but engaged in the construction of public monuments. Al-Jabarti noted that these years dominated by the duumvirs were a period of peace and prosperity. “Cairo’s beauties then were brilliant, it’s excellencies apparent, vanquishing its rivals. The poor lived at ease. Both great and small lived in abundance.”

Following the death of Ibrāhīm Katkhudā in 1754 Riḍwān Katkhudā al-Julfī was temporarily important until the Qazdughlī amīr-s attacked and killed him and annihilated his Julfī household. For the rest of the eighteenth century Qazdughlī amīr-s holding the rank of sanjaq bey dominated the province of Egypt. Their prominence was almost total from the period of ‘Alī Bey’s revolt against the Ottoman central government (1769-1772) to the annihilation of the mamluk system by Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha in 1811.

---

41. In his careful study of the succession document of Sulayman Jawish al-Qazdughlī, Michel Tuchscherer cites the succession document of ʿUthman Katkhudā al-Qazdughlī from the Shariʿa Court Archives of Cairo in which Ibrāhīm Jawīsh Mustafazān is listed as one of his manumitted slaves. See Tuchscherer, “Le pèlerinage de l’émir Sulaymān”, p. 157, note 10. This verifies the information by Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia, p. 80, and makes Lusignan’s assertions on his Georgian ethnicity more acceptable.

42. The Cypriot merchant S.K. Lusignan was one of only a handful of Christian travellers to Egypt in the eighteenth century to be attached to the household of a mamluk amir. He met ʿAlī Bey al-Kabīr when he was still a mamluk within the household of his master Ibrāhīm Katkhudā, later was attached to the household of ʿAli Bey and fled with him when ʿAli Bey was chased from Egypt by Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab in 1772. Ten years after his flight to Palestine with ʿAli Bey Lusignan wrote A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey against the Ottoman Porte from his fading memory. It was severely criticized by his contemporaries and many of today’s scholars tend to dismiss it because of its many errors. Yet we believe Lusignan is a reliable source when describing relations within the household of Ibrāhīm Katkhudā. On three occasions, for instance, Lusignan refers to Ibrāhīm Katkhudā as Georgian. See pages 70, 75 of Lusignan’s history.

43. Al-Damurdashi, Al-Damurdashi’s Chronicle of Egypt, p. 376.

44. Al-Jabarti, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History I, p. 332.

45. Ibrāhīm Katkhudā, who died on 7 Ṣafar, 1168/November 23, 1754, was buried in Cairo’s Lesser Cemetery (al-Damurdashi, Al-Damurdashi’s Chronicle of Egypt, p. 380). On the basis of the information given by al-Jabarti (I, p. 639; II, p. 364) it was demonstrated by A. Silagadze and G. Djaparidze that the anonymous grave close to the Imām al-Shafiʿī’s tomb in Imām al-Laithī Street and next to the graves of ʿAlī Bey al-Kabīr and Ismaʿīl Bey al-Kabīr (see Fībris al-āthār al-islāmiyya, p. 8, no. 385) belongs to their master, Ibrāhīm Katkhudā. See Silagadze and Djaparidze, New Materials for the Epigraphy of Eighteenth Century Egypt, p. 37-38.
There was a great deal of speculation by Europeans about ʿAli Bey’s origins and ethnicity. Sonnini, for instance, reported the fable that “... he was born in Germany, a country in which he never set his foot; that his name was Julius Leonard ...”⁴⁶ Lusignan, who became part of ʿAli Bey’s entourage, stated that he was born in the year 1728 in the principality of Abazea, or Amasia, and that his father was a priest of the Greek Church whose name was Daout (David).⁴⁷ Niebuhr also asserted that ʿAli Bey was the son of a “Prêtre de Géorgie,”⁴⁸ Pleshcheev, who had greater access to the beys than such European travelers as Sonnini or Niebuhr, noted that ʿAli Bey was Abazan, i.e., Abkhaz.⁴⁹ Finally, we have the testimony of the Ottoman scholar Findikli Efendi, who was in Egypt at the beginning of ʿAli Bey’s revolt against central authority, who wrote that ʿAli Bey sought Abkhazian supremacy in Egypt.⁵⁰ It must be concluded that ʿAli Bey was from Abkhazeti/Abazea, the northwestern part of Georgia, which at the time was a semi-independent principality, and that his father was a priest of the Georgian Orthodox rite. Services in Georgian churches were only in the Georgian language, which would explain why ʿAli Bey, and other mamluks from such principalities, were highly Georgianized even if they were not Georgian by nationality. ʿAli Bey’s favorite mamluk, Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab, is another example of this phenomenon.

Lusignan mistakenly writes that Muḥammad Bey was born in Circassia even though he at the same time calls him the countryman of ʿAli Bey.⁵¹ Yet Muḥammad Bey’s nephew, ʿUthmān Silahdār Aghā, is known to have been Abazan/Abkhazian. It would appear that Muḥammad Bey much preferred Georgians to Abazans or Circassians, for most of the mamluks he elevated to the beylicate were Georgians. We are inclined to conclude, therefore, that Muḥammad Bey was also a highly Georgianized mamluk from Abkhaz.

Lusignan gives us a convenient list of the amīr-s /beys in service to ʿAli Bey before his fall.⁵² They are:

“Muhammad Bey Abu ’l-Dhahab, an Abkhaz”⁵³
ʿAli Bey Tantawi, a Georgian⁵⁴
Isma’il Bey, a Georgian⁵⁵

53. On ʿAli Bey al-Kabīr and his favorite mamluk and son-in-law, see Crecelius, *The Roots of Modern Egypt*.
54. He was one of ʿAli Bey’s personal mamluks who remained faithful to his master in the dispute with Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab. He was killed in the battle of Şālīhiyya of April 30, 1773 in which ʿAli Bey was wounded and captured. See Al-Jabartī, “ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History I, p. 631, 642.
55. He was one of Ibrāhīm Katkhuda’s mamluks, thus the khusdāb of ʿAli Bey al-Kabīr. He played an important role in the affairs of Egypt in the second half of the eighteenth century. ʿAli Bey made him a sanjaq bey and married him in a grand public ceremony in the year 1174/1760-1761 to Ḥānim, the daughter of Ibrāhīm Katkhuda. He led ʿAli Bey’s army into Palestine in 1770, but later switched sides and joined Muḥammad Bey in opposition to ʿAli Bey. Following the death of Muḥammad Bey in 1775 he went into opposition to the dumvirs Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey, the mamluks of Muḥammad Bey. He was forced into exile for a time, but returned to...
Khalil Bey, a Georgian
‘Abd al-Rahman Bey, a Georgian
Murad Bey, a Circassian
Ridwan Bey, the nephew of ‘Ali Bey, of Abazia
Hasan Bey, a Georgian
Mustafa Bey, a Georgian
Ibrahim Bey, a Circassian
Ahmad Bey, of Abazia

Egypt and was made shaykh al-balad and ensconced in Cairo by Ghāzī Ḥasan Pasha when he expelled Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey from Lower Egypt in 1786. Ismā‘īl Bey remained dominant in Cairo until he perished in the great plague of 1791. On his career, see Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History, numerous citations. His tombstone gives the date of his death as 23 Sha‘bān 1200/April 27, 1791, which is at variance with Al-Jabartī's date of 16 Sha‘bān, 1200/April 20, 1791. See Robert Mantran, “Inscriptions turques de l'époque turque du Caire”, p. 217.

56. Not much is known about this Khalīl Bey, one of the young mamluks whom ‘Ali Bey quickly advanced to the beylicate in his dispute with the household of Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab. He died in September, 1777 fighting against the troops of Ismā‘īl Bey. See Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History I, p. 367; II, p. 18.

57. He was a personal mamluk of ‘Ali Bey, thus a khushdash of Muhammad Bey, Ḥasan Bey al-Jiddāwī, Ayyūb Bey, Riḍwān Bey and others. He went into temporary obscurity following the death of ‘Ali Bey and Muḥammad Bey, but was again appointed a sanjaq bey when Ismā‘īl Bey temporarily drove Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey from Cairo in 1777. He was killed by Murād Bey in June, 1778. See Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History II, p. 11, 36-38; III, p. 171.

58. This Murād Bey was one of the seven “maidens”, or young mamluks whom ‘Ali Bey appointed as a group to be sanjaq beys in 1772. See Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History I, p. 617.


60. Ḥasan Bey, who played an important role in the struggles among the Muḥammadiyya (the mamluks of Muḥammad Bey Abu-l-Dhahab) and the ‘Alawiyya (the mamluks of ‘Alī Bey), was for a time in partnership with his khushdash Ismā‘īl Bey, who was shaykh al-balad briefly in 1777-1778 and again when Ghāzī Ḥasan Pasha drove Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey into exile in Upper Egypt in the period 1786-1791. He appears to have died of the plague that struck Cairo in 1800. See Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History, numerous citations. His Georgian origin is confirmed by Russian archival materials.

61. Another of the seven young mamluks ‘Ali Bey raised to the beylicate. Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History I, p. 692, states that the amīr Muṣṭafa Bey al-Saydāwī died in a fall from his galloping horse in the open fields toward al-ʿAynī Palace in May, 1774.

62. His identity is not certain, but he could be Ibrāhīm Shallaq Balfiyya, for Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History I, p. 419 mentions that when ‘Ali Bey returned from the pilgrimage in 1764 he appointed a number of his mamluks to the beylicate, among whom was Ibrāhīm Shallaq Balfiyya. Ibrāhīm was killed by Murād Bey at the same time that ʿAbd al-Raḥman Bey was killed in June, 1778. See Al-Jabartī, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti's History II, p. 57-59.

63. He also remains unidentified, although Lusignan (A History, p. 135) cites an Aḥmad Bey dying in the siege of Ṣayda in 1772.
Latif Bey (Ayyub Bey), Circassian

ʿUthman Bey, Circassian

Achip Bey/ʿAjib Bey, Georgian

Yusuf Bey, Georgian

Dhu ʿl-Faqar Bey, Georgian

In addition, the Janissary ḍāḥā ʿAbd al-Rahman Aghā, one of his retainers. Al-Jabarti, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History I, p. 419, 420. Salim Aghā went into exile with Ibrāhīm in Dongola following the French incursion into Egypt. According to al-Jabarti (ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History IV, p. 346), he died there in 1231/1815-1816.

60. Al-Jabarti, ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabarti’s History I, p. 631, mentions him only once, when he was said to have been killed in the battle of al-Ṣāliḥiyya in April, 1773. Lusignan (A History, p. 146), however, has him abandoning ʿAlī Bey and not perishing.

71. Cezzar Ahmad Pasha, who had seen service in Egypt at the time of ʿAlī Bey, reported to the Ottoman government that, “The racial origin of the previously-described Emirs, Kashifs, and Ikhtiyars of the seven corps is for the most part Georgian. A very few of them are Abaza and Circassian.” See Cezzar Ahmad Pasha, Ottoman Egypt in the Eighteenth Century, p. 33.
lieutenant of the Eastern Georgian Kingdom of Kartli and Kakheti, visited Egypt in 1786. The official explanation for his visit was to see his uncle, but his patron, Erekle II of Kartli and Kakheti, supplied Kachkachishvili with letters of recommendation to I.I. Bulgakov, the Russian ambassador in Istanbul, and to the mamluk beys in Egypt, among them the shaykh al-balad Ibrāhīm Bey, Murād Bey, and their subordinate beys who, according to Kachkachishvili, were the King’s friends. Kachkachishvili composed the list of 18 mamluk beys who rebelled against the Ottoman central government. His information on this group of rebellious beys is reliable and trustworthy since he was accepted into the palaces of the Georgian leaders and spoke their language. He lists the following rebel beys, most of whose identities we have been able to identify.\textsuperscript{72}

“Shikh belad Ibreim Beg (Shaykh al-Balad Ibrahim Bey), Georgian\textsuperscript{73}
Murad Beg (Murad Bey), Georgian\textsuperscript{74}
Suleyman Beg (Sulayman Bey), Georgian\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{72} Kachkachishvili’s list has been published by Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 57 provides a photocopy of Kachkachishvili’s document.

\textsuperscript{73} Speculation on the ethnic origins of the military grandees of Egypt in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has often been spectacularly wrong. Ibrāhīm Bey, for instance, has been identified as being from Circassia or even from what was until recently Czechoslovakia. See, for instance, Olivier, Voyage dans l’Empire othoman II, p. 109; Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel IX, p. 536; Maḥmūd al-Sharqāwī, Misr fil-Qarn al-Ṯāmin ʿAŠar I, p. 80; The Napoleonic Guide, wysiwyg://74/http://www.napoleonguide.com/Ibrahim.htm. But in his encyclopedic work The Alms-Collecting Tour II, p. 189, Prince Ioane Batonishvili (Bagrationi) (1772-1830), the grandson of King Erekle II of Kartli and Kakheti (East Georgia), provided the first substantiated evidence that Ibrāhīm Bey was, indeed, Georgian when he revealed him to be Abram Shinjikashvili of the Georgian village of Martkofik. Moreover, he was visited in Egypt in 1778 by his brother Basil Shinjikashvili and by his brother-in-law (not his cousin), Gogi Beruashvili. See Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 22. Ibrāhīm Bey eventually sought refuge in Dongola in the aftermath of the French occupation of Egypt and the chaos of the ensuing period, but his connection with Egypt continued. According to Al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt (III, p. 156), Murād Bey died of the plague on 4 Dhū-l-Ḥijja, 1215/18 April, 1801 and was buried in Suhāj, next to the mosque of Shaykh al-ʿArif. Murād Bey’s wife, Sitt Nafisa, erected a tomb for him next to the grave of ‘Alī Bey and Ismāʿīl Bey in Cairo’s Lesser Cemetery, but he was never transferred there. His grave in Suhāj disappeared during the reconstruction of the mosque of Shaykh al-ʿArif.

\textsuperscript{74} Murād Bey’s origin was also the subject of much speculation. He was considered Circassian (Olivier, Voyage dans l’Empire othoman, p. 109; Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel XI, p. 596) or Russian (Gran, The Islamic Roots of Capitalism in Egypt, p. 16). Besides the evidence of Kachkachishvili (Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 22), there are other Russian archival materials indicating that Murād Bey was from Tbilisi. See Markova, Russia, Transcaucasia, p. 175, note 109. According to Al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt (III, p. 156), Murād Bey died of the plague on 4 Dhū-l-Ḥijja, 1215/18 April, 1801 and was buried in Suhāj, next to the mosque of Shaykh al-ʿArif. Murād Bey’s wife, Sitt Nafisa, erected a tomb for him next to the grave of ‘Alī Bey and Ismāʿīl Bey in Cairo’s Lesser Cemetery, but he was never transferred there. His grave in Suhāj disappeared during the reconstruction of the mosque of Shaykh al-ʿArif.

\textsuperscript{75} Sulaymān Bey’s Georgian origin is confirmed by Russian archival materials that indicate he was from a family of Georgian feudal lords. His Christian surname was Tarbaidze/Tarbaisidze and he was the brother of Ibrāhīm Bey al-Ṣaghīr al-Wālī. See Janelidze, “Kapudan Pasha Ghazi Hasan”, p. 228-229, and Janelidze, Georgian Mamluks in Egypt, p. 89-90. He had been appointed ʿabhā of the Janissaries when Abd al-Raḥmān Katkhūda was dismissed in 1776
Mustafa Beg emir haji (Mustafa Bey amir al-haji), Georgian
Little Ibrahim Beg (Ibrahim Bey al-Saghir), Georgian
Kilarchi Ahmad Beg (Ahmad Bey al-Kilarji), Georgian
Lachin Beg (Lajin Bey), Georgian
Ashqar Uthman Beg (‘Uthman Bey al-Ashqar) Georgian
Djiut Usein Beg (Husayn Bey al-Shift), Georgian

and then, in June, 1778, was made a sanjaq bey. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 35, 55. He acquired great wealth through his control of agricultural tax farms, retired to Jirje and died there of the plague in 1800-1801. Al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt III, p. 268; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 22.

76. Mustafâ Bey al-Kabir had been made a sanjaq bey by his master Muhammad Bey Abû-l-Dhahab, so he was the khushdash of Ibrâhîm Bey, Murâd Bey and others of the Muhammadiya. He was appointed amir al-hajj on several occasions. He died in 1800 during the French occupation of Egypt. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 595; II, p. 32-33, 60-61; III, p. 267-268; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 22.

77. Ibrâhîm Bey al-Šaghîr al-Wâlî, a mamluk of Muhammad Bey Abû-l-Dhahab, the brother of Sulaymân Bey Aghâ, was raised to the beylicate in June, 1778. Along with Ayyûb Bey al-Šaghîr and Sulaymân Bey al-Aghâ, he was temporarily banished to Upper Egypt by the duumvirs Ibrâhîm Bey and Murâd Bey in June, 1783, but was forgiven and made amir al-baj in 1200/1785-1786. In August, 1792 he was permitted to marry Ibrâhîm Bey’s daughter ‘Adîla Hânîm. He was said to have a household of about 600 mamluks. He drowned in the Nile in the battle at Imbâba against the French in July 1798. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 35, 73, 375; III, p. 99-100; Browne, Travels in Africa, p. 92; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

78. Ahmad Bey al-Kilarji was another of Muhammad Bey Abû-l-Dhahab’s mamluks who became a sanjaq bey and played an important role in Egyptian affairs after the death of his master. He is mentioned as a sanjaq bey in 1776 and in 1778 is mentioned among Murâd Bey’s household. He survived until the massacre of the mamluks undertaken by Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha in 1811 when he was captured and beheaded. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 695; II, p. 1, 33; IV, p. 180; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

79. Another of Muhammad Bey Abû-l-Dhahab’s mamluks. He is mentioned as a sanjaq bey in 1776-1777. He was killed in a battle between Ottoman forces and the rebellious amirs in February, 1787. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 695; II, p. 1, 227; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

80. ‘Uthmân Bey al-Ashqar (the blond, light skinned) was a mamluk of Ibrâhîm Bey. He was made khazindâr of Ibrâhîm Bey in 1778, then raised to the beylicate. In 1796 he served as amir al-hajj. He fled to Syria with his master upon the arrival of the French in 1798, joined the army of Ḥusayn Pasha Qapudân in its advance upon Egypt in 1801 and died in battle at Abû Qir. He was buried in Alexandria. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt, numerous citations, especially vol. III, p. 217, 332-333; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

81. There is some dispute about the ethnicity of Ḥusayn Bey, popularly known as al-Shift (the Jew). Al-Jabarti refers to him as al-Shift, but Kachkachishvili calls him djiuti, which in Georgian means stubborn, or obstinate (‘anîd in Arabic), and cites him as a Georgian. Even David Ayalon, “Studies in al-Jabarti”, p. 320, notes that we cannot establish that Ḥusayn Bey was called Shift because he was a Jew, or for other reasons. In July, 1783 ‘Abd al-Raḥmân, the former khazindâr of Ibrâhîm Bey, Qâsim Aghâ the Muscovite who had been a mamluk of Muḥammad Bey Abû-l-Dhahab and was now in Ibrâhîm Bey’s household, Ḥusayn Bey al-Shift, ‘Uthmân Kâshitf and Muṣṭafâ Kâshitf al-Sîlahdâr, the latter three being attached to Murâd Bey’s household, were elevated to the rank of sanjaq bey. When Ghâzi Ḥasan Pasha left Egypt in late 1787 he took with him three hostages to guarantee the good behavior of Ibrâhîm Bey and Murâd Bey, who were pardoned by the imperial government. These were ‘Uthmân Bey al-Murâdî al-Tamburjî, ‘Abd al-Raḥmân Bey al-Ibrâhîmî, and Ḥusayn Bey al-Shift, who were incarcerated in Limiyya Fortress in the region of the Dardanelles. Ḥusayn Bey died there. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 122, 239-240, 300; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.
Mustafa Beg Silkhtar (Mustafa Bey al-Silahdar), Georgian

Big Evi Beg (Ayyub Bey al-Kabir), Georgian

Takhtavi Asa Beg (Hasan Bey al-Tahtawi), Georgian

Qasum Beg (Qasim Bey), Russian

Abduraman Beg (Abd al-Rahman Bey), Bughdan

Little Evi Beg (Ayyub Bey al-Saghir), Circassian

Elfi Mahmad Beg (Muhammad Bey al-Alfi), Circassian

82. Muṣṭafā Bey al-Silahdār, one of Murād Bey’s retainers, was raised to the beyliciate in July, 1783 along with four other kāshīfs. He is reported in November, 1786 to have died in battle against the Ottoman forces of Ghāzī Ḥasan Pasha, who drove the rebellious Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey into Upper Egypt. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 122, 217; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

83. Ayyūb Bey al-Kabīr, the mamluk of Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab, had been made a sanjaq bey by his master, but was deprived of his position by the mamluks of ‘Ali Bey (Ismā‘īl Bey and Ḥasan Bey al-Jiddāwī) until Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey were returned to power. He lived a quiet life in Cairo, collecting valuable books and ordered many copies of the Qur’ān, as well as books of fine calligraphy. He had the reputation of being dignified and just and served ably on several occasions as amīr al-ḥājī. He died near the end of the French occupation of Egypt in 1800-1801. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 695; II, p. 35; III, p. 267; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

84. Ḥasan Bey al-Ṭaḥṭāwī is mentioned only once by al-Jabarti. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt III, p. 270; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

85. Qāsim Bey was raised to the rank of sanjaq bey in 1783. He married the widow of his khusbās ʿHasan Bey al-Ṭaḥṭāwī. Kachkachishvili asserts that he was the son of the Cossack ataman/chieftain of Bahmut in the modern Ukraine. According to another Russian archival source, his name was Simon Kirillovich Rushchenkov. See Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 30, and Markova, Russia, p. 175, note 127. See also Veselovskii, Djaparidze, Silagadze, “Qāsim Bey, p. 120-125, and in Valerian Gabashvili 80, p. 292-301.

86. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Bey, the former khażīndār of Ibrāhīm Bey al-Kabīr, was one of the five kāshīfs raised to the rank of sanjaq bey in 1783. He was one of the three beys taken as hostage by Ghāzī Hasan Pasha to the prison in Limiyya. He later returned to Egypt and perished in the period of the French occupation and the death of Murād Bey. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 122; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

87. Ayyūb Bey al-Ṣaghir (the younger) had been the khazīndār of Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab. He was mentioned as sanjaq bey as early as 1776. He was dismissed from this rank when the Muḥammadiyya were temporarily expelled from Cairo, but was restored to his rank in June, 1778 when Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey drove the ‘Alawiyya from Cairo. He was the brother of Husayn Aghā Shanān. Al-Jabarti does not record the date or circumstances of his death. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 695; II, p. 1, 35; III, p. 91, 93; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

88. Muḥammad had been brought by a trader to Cairo in 1189/1775-1776 and was bought by Ahmad Jawīsh al-Majnūn, who sold him to Salīm Aghā al-Ghazzawi, who was known as Tamerlane. Salīm Aghā gave him as a present to Murād Bey, who gave Salīm Aghā in return the gift of 1,000 ardabbs of grain. Thus Muhammad received the name al-Alfi (1000). He became a favorite of Murād, who made him his çukhudār, then freed him and made him kāshīf of al-Sharqiyya province. He was made a sanjaq bey in 1778. He became a rich, powerful and feared amīr. He fled into Upper Egypt when Ghāzī Ḥasan Pasha drove the Muḥammadiyya from Lower Egypt in the period 1786-1787 and only returned along with the other exiled amīr-s when the great plague took away Ismā‘īl Bey and the regime left behind by the Ottomans when Ghāzī Ḥasan Pasha departed Egypt in 1787. He went into semi-retirement in his Cairo mansion, but he continued to expand his household, which was estimated to have approximately 1,000 mamluks and up to 40 kāshīf-s, each with his own retinue. He again fled to the south upon the arrival of the French in 1798. He became an intractable opponent of the French for the whole period of their occupation. Following their withdrawal in 1801 he and his followers, after a brief period of cooperation, fell out with the Ottoman authorities who now tried
Charghavi Osman Beg (‘Uthman Bey al-Sharqawi), Abazan
Yahya Mahmad Beg (Yahya Bey al-Muhammad), Chechen

Contemporary sources estimate that some of these Georgian households of high-ranking mamluks were composed of several hundred mamluks, or even, in some cases, up to 1000 mamluks. Volney, for instance, wrote that, “The most powerful house is that of Ibrahim Bey, who has about six hundred mamlouks. Next to him is Mourad, who has not above 400 ... the rest of the beys, to the number of eighteen or twenty, have each of them from fifty to two hundred.” According to Browne, in 1796 Ibrahim Bey’s mamluks numbered 1000, while Muhammad Bey al-Wali was estimated to have between 600-700 mamluks. Once a subordinate mamluk was manumitted, assigned a position within the tax-farming bureaucracy, and married, he was permitted to begin to build his own household. Each bey had kāshif-s. Each kāshif would have had his own household. Given that the great majority of the beys cited in the lists by Lusignan and Kachkachishvili were Georgian and surrounded themselves with mamluks of their own ethnicity, even of their own family relatives (see below), it becomes clear just how dominant the Georgians had become over Egypt in the second half of the eighteenth century. We offer just two examples of how these mamluk households, at least at the top, were almost entirely Georgian.

In 1765 Ismā‘īl ‘Azaban al-Qazdughlī, a Georgian amīr, endowed a waqf of a large palace in Khāṭṭ al-Madābigh al-Qadīma in Cairo. The document identifies him as Ismā‘īl, the katkhudâ of the ‘Azaban regiment and retainer (tābi‘) of Ibrāhīm Katkhudā Mustaḥfazān to exterminate the household. He spent the rest of his life fighting Ottoman governors, the Albanians under Muḥammad ‘Ali and the remnant amīr-s of his own faction. He died while on campaign against Muḥammad ‘Ali Pasha in 1807. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt IV, p. 38-61; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

89. ‘Uthman Bey al-Sharqawi, so named because he had been the kāshif of al-Sharqiyya province, was one of the chief mamluks of Muhammad Bey Abūl-Dahhab. This Abazan (Abkhaz) is mentioned as a sanjaq bey in 1776. He maintained this position until he died of plague in Syria following the French invasion of 1798. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt, numerous citations, but especially vol. I, p. 695; II, p. 1; III, p. 267; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

90. Yahyā Muḥammad, the khazīndâr of Murād Bey, was raised to the beylicate. Cited as a Chechen by Kachkachishvili, he married the daughter of Şālıḥ Bey. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 35, 94, 191, 250; Macharadze, Georgian Documents, p. 23.

91. Volney, Travels through Syria and Egypt, p. 166-167.


93. Cezzar Ahmed Pasha, Ottoman Egypt in the Eighteenth Century, p. 33, stated, “The racial origin of the previously-described Emirs, Kasifs, and Iḥtiyars of the seven corps is for the most part Georgian. A very few of them are Abaza and Circassian.”

94. Waqf of the amīr Ismā‘īl ‘Azabān al-Qazdughlī, Number 929 in the Ministry of Awqaf, Cairo. The authors thank Professor Nelly Hanna for providing to them information on this waqf.
al-Qazdughli. He endowed the waqf to himself during his lifetime, then one-third of the waqf to any children he may have and to their children, but he endowed two-thirds of his waqf to his enfranchised slaves. These were the amir Ismāʾīl Odabashi (Georgian), the amīr Muṣṭafā ʿAbdallāh (Georgian), the amīr Husayn ʿAbdallāh (Georgian), the amīr Ṭāhir Kāshif (Georgian), the amīr Muṣṭafā Siliḥdār (Georgian), all of whom had been permitted to grow a beard, the amir Yūsuf al-Ṣaghīr ibn ʿAbdallāh (Georgian), the amīr Yūsuf al-Kabīr al-Kilarji (Circassian) the amīr Sulaymān Afandi al-Siliḥdār (Georgian), the youth Jawhar ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Asmar, the boy Maḥmūd ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Asmar, the lady Maḥbūb Khātūn bint ʿAbdallāh al-Bayḍā, the wife of the amīr Ismāʾīl Odabashi, and the lady Shaʿlān Khātūn bint ʿAbdallāh al-Bayḍā who had given birth to a child by the founder of the waqf.

What is of note in this waqf is how the founder, a dominant officer of the ‘Azaban regiment, had surrounded himself with Georgian slaves, whom he had manumitted and who now were moving up through the military ranks to assume leading positions of their own. Here is a hitherto unknown household of Georgian mamluks clustered in the ‘Azaban regiment in Cairo.

We know from numerous sources that these Georgian amirs remained in contact with the land of their origin in the second half of the eighteenth century. A growing human stream composed not only of youths destined for servitude in Egypt, but also of the relatives of Georgian mamluk grandees flowed from Georgia to Egypt in the second half of the century. Fathers, brothers, sisters and other relatives freely visited their mamluk sons or family members who had established themselves securely in Egypt. The visitors took up residence for periods up to several years before returning home with gifts for their families in Georgia; some remained in Egypt and became part of the mamluk social structure. Mamluk amīr-s often sent gifts for the use of their relatives or for constructing needed structures, such as a defensive tower or even a church, in their villages of origin. Some amirs, having reached a high position within mamluk society, called for their brothers (and sisters) or other relatives to join them in Egypt. We have numerous examples of brothers or other relatives being part of the mamluk social/military society in Egypt. We also have evidence that at least a few of the leading beys, namely ‘Alī Bey al-Kabīr and Ismāʾīl Bey al-Kabīr, called for their fathers to visit

95. This identification of two high ranking ocak officers indicates that the Qazdughli amīr-s had control of the two most important Ottoman regiments in Egypt, the Janissary (Mustaḥfaẓān) and the ‘Azabān, hence control of the most lucrative urban tax farms in Egypt, especially over the customs of the ports, including Būlāq and Old Cairo.


97. In a report of February 10, 1786 the British ambassador in Istanbul noted the arrival of a Russian ship bringing eight Georgians from Alexandria on their way home. The leader of the group was said to be related to Murād Bey, with whom he remained for two years. See Public Record Office (London), Foreign Office 261, volume 2 (1785-1787), 10 February, 1786, cited by Crecelius and Djaparidze, “Relations of the Georgian Mamluks of Egypt with their Homeland”, p. 336, note 54.
them in Egypt and to share in their good fortune, and that Ibrāhīm Bey built a household composed at the top of relatives and others from his native village of Martkofi.

Letters, written in Georgian, that Ibrāhīm Bey and members of his household sent to King Erekle II and other Georgian lords, not only reveal the close ties that these mamluk grandees maintained with their families in Georgia but also demonstrate the family ties that Ibrāhīm Bey maintained among relatives in Egypt. Ibrāhīm Bey and Sulaymān Aghā al-Ḥanafi were not only from the village of Martkofi, but were related to one another. After manumitting him, Ibrāhīm Bey appointed his nephew Sulaymān Aghā al-Ḥanafi, who was the former peasant of the Georgian feudal lord Solomon Avalishvili, as his katkhudā. Salīm Aghā, commander of the Mustahfaẓān corps, was also from Martkofi. Ibrāhīm Bey also appointed his young son, Marzūq, to the beyliciate long before he was qualified to hold that rank. Ibrāhīm Bey went beyond Ismāʿīl Katkhudā ʿAzaban, who had surrounded himself with mamluks of Georgian origin, by appointing immediate relatives and others from his home village to some of the most important positions within the military hierarchy, thus consolidating the strong hold that Georgians had over the extensive system of tax farms in Ottoman Egypt while surrounding himself with individuals who he felt were particularly trustworthy because of their personal attachment to him through family or village ties.

98. ‘Ali Bey was said to have been visited by his father who, because of ill health, returned to Georgia. When Ismāʿīl Bey became shaykh al-balad it was rumored that his Georgian father arrived in company with the parents of several other beys. It was later said that Ibrāhīm Bey was also the son of a priest of the Greek Orthodox Church, an assertion made more acceptable because Ibrāhīm Bey himself mentioned that he remembered serving mass in his youth. See Lusignan, A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey, p. 86; Quai d’Orsay (Paris), Correspondance consulaire et commercial, Rosette, vol. 4 (1774-1807),folio 110, August 1777.

99. See footnote 73. Descendants of Ibrāhīm Bey’s brother Basil Shinjikashvili still live in Martkofi.

100. Crecelius and Djaparidze, “Relations of the Georgian Mamluks of Egypt with their Homeland”, p. 339. His Georgian surname was Dzananashvili, a name used only by residents of the village of Martkofi. (The surnames Dzananashvili and Knotishvili do not survive in modern Martkofi.) It is revealed in a letter in Georgian he sent to his brother-in-law Lazare Chitrikashvili in June, 1798 complaining of Lazare’s seizure of the contents of a package that Salīm Aghā had sent to other family members in Martkofi. Salīm Aghā is mentioned on occasion by al-Jabartī and apparently went into Sudanese refuge with Ibrāhīm Bey, for al-Jabartī (al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt IV, p. 346) claims he died in Dongola in 1231/1815-1816.
To this point, reference as only been made to those members of the military/administrative establishment who were males, but female slaves also played an important role in the ruling society of Egypt and were necessary to maintain a sense of community within mamluk circles. Consider, for instance, that we frequently find the sisters, daughters, or favorite female slaves, of high ranking mamluk amirs being given in marriage to the slave manumitted by their brothers or masters. We can cite numerous occurrences of this phenomenon. ‘Ali Bey, for instance, was married to a freed slave of his master Ibrāhīm Katkhudā. When he became shaykh al-balad he presided over the marriage of his khūshdāsh Ismā‘īl Bey to the daughter of their master, Ibrāhīm Katkhudā. He then gave his own sister in marriage to his favorite mamluk Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab. Abū-l-Dhahab in turn later gave his sister, Zulaykhā, in marriage to his favorite, Ibrāhīm Bey. In 1792 Ibrāhīm Bey gave one daughter, ʿAdīla Hānim, in marriage to Ibrāhīm Bey al-Wālī, a manumitted mamluk of Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab who had attached himself to Ibrāhīm Bey’s household following the death of his master. Ibrāhīm Bey gave another daughter, Zaynab Hānim, to Rashwān Bey, then upon his death, to Rashwān’s mamluk Ismā‘īl Kāshīf. These marriages have been viewed as a way of creating a firm bond between master and manumitted mamluk, but upon further inspection it becomes apparent that they were also appropriate because the wife was of the same ethnicity as the husband. They therefore spoke the same language and shared a common culture with their husbands. We find so many examples of Georgian mamluks marrying Georgian women that we believe it must have created a large circle of households in which the main language spoken within the residence was Georgian. Sisters and daughters of the leading Georgian amīr-s almost always were married to high-ranking Georgian mamluks within the household of their brothers or fathers. Children of these Georgian couples, assuming the parents spoke Georgian within their residences, must also have spoken at least a form of


105. When this husband died in the battle of Imbaba in 1798 she was given to Sulaymān Kāshīf, the mamluk of her deceased husband. When he died ‘Adila was married to Ahmad Bey al-Alfī, who went into refuge with Ibrāhīm Bey in Dongola. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt II, p. 375; III, p. 304; IV, p. 347-348. One of ‘Adila Hānim’s grandsons, Ahmad Bey b. Nūr al-Dīn Bey, was still alive in 1886-1887. See ‘Ali Bāshā Mubārak, al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfīqiyya II, p. 149-150.

106. On Zaynab’s marriages, see al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt III, p. 268, 411. Upon the death of her previous husbands, she was married to Nu‘mān Bey. al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt IV, p. 74.

107. The famous Sitt Nafīsa, the wife of ‘Ali Bey al-Kabīr and Murād Bey, and the most famous woman of her age in Egypt, was thought to be herself Georgian. See Mengin, Histoire de l’Égypte sous le gouvernement de Mohammed-Aly II, p. 62; Delaporte, “Abrégé chronologique de l’histoire des Mamlouks d’Égypte”, p. 353, also identifies her as a Georgian. According to al-Jabarti (al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt IV, p. 370), she died 20 Jumādā I, 1231/18 April, 1816, but the inscription on her tombstone near the graves of ‘Ali Bey al-Kabīr and Ismā‘īl Bey al-Kabīr offers the date 27 Jumādā I, 1231/25 April, 1816.

108. Fay has found examples of mamluk donors’ endowment deeds (waqfyyāt) clearly stating that beneficiaries were not to marry anyone from outside the household. See “The Ties that Bound”, p. 162-163.
the Georgian language, but unfortunately, not many of these children born in Egypt reached maturity. As we have seen in the household of Ibrāhīm Bey al-Kabīr, there were retainers who could also read and write the Georgian language. But we find virtually no mention of this phenomenon in the contemporary manuscript histories of Ismāʿīl al-Khashshāb, al-Jabartī, or Muṣṭafā al-Qalʿāwī. Yet such a Georgian sub-culture must have existed in Egypt, given the predominance of such a large number of male and female Georgian slaves.

These slaves, particularly the males, were arriving in Egypt in their teens, which explains why they retained a knowledge of their mother-tongue, why they maintained ties with their families, and their king, in Georgia and often sent for family members to join them in Egypt, and why, as we shall now see, they understood the geo-political situation that developed in the second half of the eighteenth century that offered them the opportunity to establish the autonomy of the province over which they had gained almost complete control. While it was the early Qazdughli amīr-s, the leaders of the Janissary regiment such as ʿUthmān Katkhudā, Sulaymān Katkhudā, and Ibrāhīm Katkhudā, who were responsible for the rise to power of their households, it was the group of Georgian sanjaq bey-s of the second half of the eighteenth century who transformed the relationship of Egypt with both the Ottoman central government and the European powers in their efforts to establish the autonomy of Egypt under their leadership. This process began with the audacious new policies undertaken by ʿAli Bey al-Kabīr in the 1760s.

First of all, ʿAli Bey consolidated the control of his own household over the administrative and military institutions of Egypt by murdering, exiling or forcing rivals to flee from Egypt. He appointed mamluks of his own household or mamluks from the households of his own mamluks to the important positions within the bureaucracy, the regiments and the beylicate that had been made vacant by his aggression against his rivals. Soon important positions such as the officer ranks of all the regiments, including the Janissary and Azaban corps, and the important revenues they controlled, and the highest offices of the Ottoman administration in Egypt, such as the positions of amīr al-bajj, daftardār (treasurer) and even qaʿim-maqa&m (acting governor in the absence of the Ottoman governor), were filled by amīr-s, usually Georgian, of his own choice. He soon had control of virtually the entire revenue system in Egypt. And when he refused to tolerate even the presence of an Ottoman governor, he acquired responsibility for all Ottoman institutions in Egypt through his position as qaʿimmaqa&m. He soon was

---

109. Al-Khashshāb, who served the French on one of their diwans, composed two short treatises, Taḏkira li-aḥl al-baṣāʾir wa-l-abṣār maʿa wajh al-iḥtiṣār, BNP, Ms. Arabe 1858, and A Short Manuscript History.
111. This was not enough, for he also increased the extortions on the foreign merchant community and the indigenous minorities and guilds, thus beginning a process that his successors intensified and that would drive many foreign merchants, particularly French, from Egypt and bankrupt most of the French trading houses. The excesses of Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey in particular would do much to provoke not only the Ottoman expedition of 1786-1787, but also the French invasion of 1798.
redirecting revenues from numerous parts of the Ottoman financial administration, such as the pilgrimage, and ultimately withheld entirely the ʾirsāliyya, the annual surplus of income over expenditures the governor of Egypt was expected to dispatch to Istanbul. His unchallenged dominance of Egypt’s military establishment and administration made him a serious threat to the Ottoman Empire’s tenuous remaining authority in this, the most important province of the empire, and led him ultimately into a rebellion against the empire.

ʿAlī Bey had surrounded himself with a quartet of Christian advisors who urged upon him an aggressive new foreign policy whose purpose was to expand the European transit trade across Egypt and hence produce greater customs revenues to sustain his ambitious programs. The aforementioned Cypriot merchant S.K. Lusignan, the Venetian Carlo Rosetti, the Copt Muʿallim Rizq, and the Greek Catholic merchant Anṭwān Farʿawn Qassīs were themselves interested in obtaining a role in the expanding trade of the Red Sea, Egypt’s most important trade route, and urged ʿAlī Bey to ignore Ottoman bans on the movement of European ships from India north of the port of Jidda. Their ambitions were stimulated when the Ottoman central government authorized the dispatch of an Egyptian force under the command of Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhahab in 1770 to give support to an Ottoman candidate as sharīf, or ruler, of Mecca. ʿAlī Bey opened an intense rivalry by most of the European powers, including England, France, Venice, the Hapsburg Empire and even Russia, when he instructed Muḥammad Bey to invite European merchants he might find in the harbor of Jidda to bring the goods of India and the East directly to Suez. It was a rivalry that ended a century later with the opening of the Suez Canal by the Khedive Ismāʿīl. In this economic zone so important to both Egypt and the Ottoman Empire ʿAlī Bey had initiated a policy that would be embraced by all his Georgian/Qazdughlī successors. 114

It was claimed by al-Jabartī that ʿAlī Bey read the history of his mamluk predecessors, which suggests that he was interested in recreating the classical Mamluk Empire, which included the Red Sea coast of Arabia, including the ḥaramayn, and greater Syria. 113 He went into open rebellion against the Ottoman Empire when he launched an unauthorized military campaign against Palestine and Syria in late 1770, allying with Shaykh Zāhir al-ʿUmar of Gallilée. In this serious threat to the Ottoman Empire’s control of its most important Arab provinces, ʿAlī Bey sought an alliance with the Russian Empire which under Catherine the Great had territorial ambitions in the Caucasus and which was then at war with the Ottoman Empire. 114 An Ottoman scholar who was in Cairo in 1768 claimed that ʿAlī Bey

112. The early work by Charles-Roux, Autour d’une route, still maintains its value.
113. See al-Jabarti’s History of Egypt I, p. 381. ‘Abbūd Ṣabbāgh, the historian of Shaykh Zāhir al-ʿUmar, also noted this desire. See al-Rawḍ al-Zāhir fī Taʿrīkh Zāhir, BNP, F.A. 4610, folio 15.
114. See Crecelius, “Russia’s Relations with the Mamluk Beys”, p. 55-67. ʿAlī Bey also sought the help of a number of European artillery experts whom he dispatched with his forces into Syria. Thereafter, it became common practice for his successors to engage the services of such European military advisors.
wanted to ensure Abkhazian supremacy in Egypt and that he had exclaimed: “There cannot be a more favorable time for assumption of power (tasallut) than this.”\textsuperscript{115} His forces, under the command of Muhammad Bey Abū-l-Dhabah and Ismā‘īl Bey, captured Damascus in June, 1771, but withdrew in haste only eight days later and quickly returned to Egypt. It was the end of ‘Alī Bey’s grand schemes, for six months later he had a falling out with his favorite mamluk and son-in-law, Muhammad Bey, who was driven into exile in Upper Egypt. From there Muhammad Bey rallied the dissident beys who had previously sought refuge in the south. ‘Alī Bey had eventually to abandon Cairo in 1772 and seek refuge with Shaykh Zāhir al-ʿUmar in Palestine. ‘Alī Bey’s unsuccessful attempt to regain his position in Egypt, which ended in his own death and the death of a number of prominent Georgian amirs at the battle of al-Ṣāliḥiyya in April, 1773, ended the most serious rebellion the Ottoman government had to face, for Muhammad Bey quickly made his submission to the central government and accepted the renewed presence of an Ottoman governor in Cairo, but one of his own choosing. He maintained control of most of the revenues of Egypt and embraced virtually all of ‘Alī Bey’s audacious programs, including the attempt to open the port of Suez to European ships and to maintain Qazdughlī control of Egypt’s vast revenue system. Muhammad Bey offered a formal treaty to James Bruce guaranteeing the safety and security of English merchants to transit their goods at Suez and again led an expedition of conquest into Palestine/Syria in 1775.\textsuperscript{116} It was on this expedition that he died suddenly on June 10, 1775.

The death of Muhammad Bey Abū-l-Dhabah sent Egypt spiraling into chaos for the next three decades as the leading Georgian amir-s engaged in almost constant conflict for control of the beylicate and the vast revenue system in Egypt. Egypt was to change dramatically as Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey in particular tried to entice the European to bring their ships to Suez and to ensure Georgian supremacy in Egypt under the aegis of Russian protection. Although the Qazdughlī leaders no longer thought of sending expeditions into neighboring provinces, they did seek to establish the autonomy of Egypt from Ottoman central authority. During the periods Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey were in control of Cairo, they refused to respect or obey Ottoman authority. They drained the budget of Egypt of vast sums, affecting such important functions as the provisioning and dispatch of the annual pilgrimage caravan to Mecca and Medina, the dispatch of foodstuffs to provision the Sultan’s kitchen, or the maintenance of religious institutions. They even withheld the irdāliyya for a period of eleven

\textsuperscript{115} This conclusion by Şemdanizade Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi is cited by Hathaway, The Politics of Households, p. 104.

\textsuperscript{116} On the treaty proffered to the English by Muhammad Bey and two other treaties later offered to the French and English by Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey, see Crecelius, “Unratified Commercial Treaties”, p. 67-104. Unwilling to trust the mamluk amir-s, whose regimes the Europeans thought to be too unstable, and also unwilling to risk the profits from their commerce spread throughout the rest of the Ottoman Empire by treating the amir-s as rulers of an independent regime having the right to enter into such bilateral treaties, the European government, despite the urgings of their merchants in Egypt, refused to consider the treaties sent to them by the Qazdughlī amir-s and never formally responded to them.
years between 1777 and 1786. Their increasing extortions upon the merchant communities in Egypt provoked the concern of European governments who pressed Ottoman authorities to invoke European treaty rights in Egypt and to protect their merchants and trade against the demands and extortions of the Qazdughlī duumvirs. But while pressing the French merchant houses for ever greater sums, they also offered a commercial treaty in 1785 to encourage the French to bring their Indian trade through Suez. As noted above, the arrival of the emissary Kachkachishvili from King Erekle II of Kartli and Kakheti in 1786 demonstrates the clear understanding the Georgian amirs had of the king’s attempts to use Russia’s drive into the Caucasus to free his kingdom from Ottoman control. And the promises of aid made by the Russian vice-consul the Baron de Thonus in his attempt to bring the Egyptian amirs into alliance with Russia finally provoked the Ottoman central government to send an expedition to Egypt in 1786 under the command of the grand admiral Ghażi Hasan Pasha, himself from Georgia. Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey and their allies were chased to Upper Egypt, but were not exterminated as planned. They ultimately gained pardon with the promise that they would remain in Upper Egypt, while the regime that Ghażi Hasan Pasha established in Cairo under the leadership of the Georgians Iṣmā‘īl Bey and Hasan Bey al-Jiddāwī maintained a tenuous hold on Lower Egypt until it was swept away by the great plague of 1791. Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey returned to Cairo and resumed their drive for Egyptian autonomy. They again acted as leaders of an independent state by continuing to ignore Ottoman authority or to countenance the presence of an Ottoman governor, by refusing to grant European merchants their capitulatory rights, and by offering a final commercial treaty to the English in 1794. They also continued to provoke European governments by their incessant demands against the foreign merchant houses, most of which were bankrupted in the 1790s. Finally, the revolutionary French government sent an expedition under Napoleon Bonaparte to redress the situation and to kill or expel the Georgian amirs from Egypt.

For several centuries after the Ottoman conquest of 1517, Egypt had been shielded from the interference of European nations by the might of the Ottoman Empire. Ties with Europe even remained limited during the first half of the eighteenth century. The substantial trade between Egypt and Europe was managed by the few hundred foreign merchants who maintained residence in Cairo and Alexandria, but their movements and contacts were severely restricted. Few European travelers or pilgrims visited Egypt while the Ottoman central government continued to cast the shadow of its power over this vital province and the surrounding territories. But in the second half of the eighteenth century, due largely to the drive by ‘Alī Bey and his Qazdughlī successors for autonomy and by the new policies they initiated, a wide range of social, economic and political contacts was established between Egypt and the European states. A human tide of merchants, military advisors, adventurers, travelers, explorers, and pilgrims brought new interest in, and new knowledge of, Egypt to the West. The Qazdughlī

117. See Crecelius, “Unratified Commercial Treaties” for English copies or translations of the three treaties Muḥammad Bey, Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey offered to the Europeans.
attempt to open the port of Suez to the ships of European trading companies helped to focus European attention on this long neglected province just at the time when worldwide imperial rivalry between England and France gave impetus to both to think of Egypt as a transit point between Europe and their empires in India, particularly at a time when it appeared that Russia was about to overwhelm the Ottoman Empire and seize large territories along Mediterranean shores. Qazdughlī tyranny and the impositions the Georgian amirs made upon the foreign merchants bankrupted the traditional trading houses long established in Egypt and helped to convince the French government to send an expedition in 1798 to redress the situation and guarantee French hegemony over a strategic area of the eastern Mediterranean region. In all of these decisions, the policies of the Georgian amīr-s of the second half of the eighteenth century had played an important role. The names of ʿAlī Bey, Ismāʿīl Bey, Muḥammad Bey Abū-l-Dhaḥab, Ibrāhīm Bey, Murād Bey and others became well known in the courts of Europe whether or not the merchants who traded in Egypt or the statesmen of western Europe who debated their policies knew that they came originally from the small kingdom of Georgia.
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