1 Introduction

1.1 Book Goals

In 1830, the printshop Typographie de Feissat ainé et Demonchy, located at Rue Cannebière 19 in Marseilles, published a slim volume called *Dictionnaire de la langue franque ou petit mauresque, suivi de quelques dialogues familièrs et d'un vocabulaire de mots arabes les plus usuels; à l'usage des Français en Afrique* [Dictionary of Lingua Franca or Petit Mauresque, followed by a few familiar dialogues and a vocabulary of the most common Arabic words, for the use of the French in Africa] (Anonymous 1830a; the *Dictionnaire*). This work would effect a permanent change in the bleak documentary landscape that underlies our knowledge of Mediterranean Lingua Franca (LF), a language which has fascinated generations of scholars:

> Forse nessun altro pidgin ha tanto eccitato la fantasia degli studiosi: le lingue di scambio dell'Africa nera, o il pidgin usato in età moderna fra balenieri baschi ed eschimesi di Groenlandia, o il russenorsk, non mi risulta che abbiano mai stimolato a questo punto l'immaginazione di quelli che se ne occupavano. (Cifoletti 2004: 9–10)
>
> [Perhaps no other pidgin has so excited scholarly imagination: the exchange languages of Black Africa, the pidgin used in the modern age between Basque whalers and Greenlandic Eskimos, or Russenorsk do not seem ever to have stimulated the imagination of those who dealt with them to quite such an extent.]

Despite the sustained interest in LF reflected in the above quotation and evidenced by a steady trickle of publications, there remain considerable lacunae both in our knowledge of the *Dictionnaire*, "la nostra fonte principale di lingua franca algerina (e di lingua franca *tout court*)" [our main source of Algerine Lingua Franca (and Lingua Franca period)] (Cifoletti 2004: 32) and in our understanding of LF, in particular, its place in the taxonomy of the outcomes of language contact. This book engages with both these issues, while combining a descriptive with a theoretical goal.

The descriptive goal of the book is a linguistic and philological study of the *Dictionnaire*, with the focus on its authorship, the models that have served as its blueprints and sources of inspiration, and the structural characteristics of the

LF variety that it describes and documents. The book's theoretical goal is to contribute to our understanding of the "typology of contact outcomes" (Winford 1997: 3) by situating the LF variety captured by the *Dictionnaire* in relation to the structural-typological features of LF's Romance lexifiers, on the one hand, and those of pidgins, with which LF has been routinely classified, on the other.

The organization of the book reflects its dual goals. The remainder of this chapter provides general overviews of LF (in Section 1.2) and this volume (in Section 1.3). Chapters 2–4 are devoted, respectively, to the authorship, models, and practical orthography of the *Dictionnaire*; and Chapters 5–8 engage in a detailed study of the various structural components of the *Dictionnaire*'s LF, situating each in relation to those of LF's lexifiers and those of pidgins. The taxonomic status of the *Dictionnaire*'s LF is the focus of the last chapter, Chapter 9, which revisits the key structural features of LF and separates those which may be due to pidginization from those which receive a better explanation within the framework of koineization.

1.2 Lingua Franca

The ethnonym *Frank* and the glottonym *lingua franca* "the Frank language" reflect an outsider, Byzantine Greek and Muslim, perspective on Western European peoples and languages (Castellanos 2006: 13). As observed by Coutelle (1977: 538), "[s]euls des non-Francs ont pu penser que tous les Francs parlaient le même idiome" [only non-Franks could have supposed that all Franks speak the same language]. Depending on the context, period, and area, the label *Frank* could be applied to Westerners in general, Romance language speakers in particular, or simply foreigners. As a common designation of European Christians it gained currency in most Muslim states between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries (Lapiedra Gutiérrez 1997: 249). This last sense is reflected, e.g., in the eighth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*:

> FRANK, the name by which the Turks, Greeks, Arabs, &c, designate a Christian. It probably originated during the crusades, in which the French (descendants of the German Franks) particularly distinguished themselves. Europe itself, too, was named *Frankistan*, or the country of the Franks. (*The Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1856: 287)

In the *Dictionnaire*, the word *franco* is listed as a translation for French *franc* (*étranger*) 'Frank (foreigner).' The far-flung currency of the term is apparent from contemporary travel accounts; for example, Paul Theroux reports hearing it in Sudan and Ethiopia ("Almost the entire time I spent in Harar, I was followed by children chanting, 'Faranji! Faranji! Faranji'") (Theroux 2003: 104).

The glottonym *lingua franca* is understood as a (Latin) calque on Arabic *lisān al-faranǧ* "language of the Franks" (Schuchardt 1909: 448; Tagliavini 1932: 373–383; Kahane and Kahane 1976: 26; Aslanov 2006: 16–20); the corresponding calques in other languages include *hablar franco* (Haedo 1612), *Frank Language* (Shaw 1757), and *langue franque* (Anonymous 1830a). By absorbing the polysemy of the ethnonym *Frank*, the label *lingua franca* was, over time and space, applied to a variety of linguistic realities (Cortelazzo 1965: 108–109; Kahane and Kahane 1976: 26ff.; Castellanos 2006: 13). Thus, in the Levant, it could cover a gamut of Romance speech, from a Romance-derived pidgin to rudimentary L2 Italian and to regional Italian (Vianello 1955; Cortelazzo 1977: 524–528; Cifoletti 1978: 208). Aslanov (2002) suggests that such indiscriminate use may be explained by the appearance of homogeneity of Romance speech for non-Romance speaking outsiders. Since the Middle Ages, this language label could refer to the languages of the Crusaders and, by extension, auxiliary languages that facilitated communication between the Easterners and Westerners (Aslanov 2006: 16–19; 2010: 105). Its application to the Romance-based contact vernacular a version of which is recorded in the *Dictionnaire* became fixed sometime between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries (Castellanos 2006: 14–15).

The period of existence of *lingua franca* in the last-mentioned sense is bookended by the earliest and the latest textual samples believed to reflect this language. The earliest is a composition with the first line "Oi Zerbitana retica!" (known as *Contrasto della Zerbitana*).[1] This piece, written in what its first editor identifies as a "dialetto franco delle isole Gerbe" [Frank dialect of the Djerba Islands] (Grion 1890–1892: 183), is included in a manuscript written shortly after 1353; based on historical considerations, Grion pushes back its composition to 1284–1304 (see also Minervini 1996a: 249–252; Lang 2000: 28–29; Cifoletti 2004: 17). The latest textual samples in Arends's (1998)

[1] Cifoletti (1978: 209n14) expresses reservations about identifying the language of the *Contrasto* as LF based on its structural and chronological distance from the other known LF samples and suggests that "la lingua qui usata pare semplicemente un italiano del Sud parlato male" [the language used here appears to be simply southern Italian spoken badly]. Whinnom (1965: 523) characterizes the language of the *Contrasto* as "an inconsistently pidginized Italian," and Minervini (1996a: 250) as "una varietà ritenuta affine alla lingua franca" [a variety considered akin to Lingua Franca]; see, most recently, Baglioni (2018: 75–81). There is also a lack of consensus as to whether pre–sixteenth century texts are to be included in the LF corpus at all: while this is done by some researchers (cf. Arends 1998, Couto 2002), Cifoletti (1989: 220), for instance, considers the earliest LF text to be Juan del Encina's jocular *Villançico contrahaziendo a los mocaros que sienpre van ynportunando a los peregrinos con demandas*, dating from about 1520 and written "in imitation of the donkey- and camel-boys who plagued Christian pilgrims with their sales-talk" (Harvey et al. 1967: 572), while Minervini (2010) points to Haedo (1612) as containing the first documentation of LF. Scholarly opinion is also divided with respect to the LF samples generated outside the Maghreb; compare, for example, the differing assessments of Goldoni's LF in Zago (1986) and Camus Bergareche (1993a).

annotated bibliography of LF date from 1887. A letter from the Semiticist Marcel Cohen to Hugo Schuchardt, dated 13 November 1909 and prompted by the publication of the latter's article on LF,[2] establishes definitively that LF was no longer spoken in early twentieth-century Algiers. Cohen, whose research in Algeria was conducted in 1908–1909, writes:

> Comme vous l'avez très bien vu, la Langue franque peut être considérée comme morte; il n'existe plus de langue *neutre* parlée au cours de relations entre des gens qui ont respectivement d'autres langues maternelles (arabe et français s'entretenant en sabir à base d'espagnol ou d'italien – tel qu'on le voit dans la relation d'Haedo ou dans des oeuvres écrites aux environs de 1830–1840, comme les mémoires de Léon Roche). (cited in Swiggers 1991–1993: 273, emphasis original)

> [As you saw very well, the Lingua Franca may be considered dead; there no longer exists a neutral language spoken in the course of dealings between persons with different native languages (Arab and Frenchman conversing in Spanish- or Italian-based *sabir*, such as we see in Haedo's account or works written around 1830–1840, such as the memoirs of Léon Roche.[3])]

The LF samples that emanate from the Maghreb between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries stand out in terms of their quantity and the structural consistency of the LF they represent. Guido Cifoletti has argued extensively (e.g., Cifoletti 1978, 1991, 2000, 2004) that this is not fortuitous but is inseparable from the social and demographic conditions that obtained in that area during the period in question. He does not question the presumed existence of LF in other parts of the Mediterranean (cf. Cifoletti 1991, 2000, 2004: 18–19), however, he hypothesizes that it was only in the Maghreb that LF was able to achieve sufficient independence from its Romance lexifiers to acquire structural stability.[4] Cifoletti (2000: 15–16; 2004: 14, 18–19) argues that the stabilization of LF in the Maghreb became possible owing to the fact that, in the linguistic and social ecologies of the Maghrebi societies, the North Africans and Middle Easterners were in the right social position to be able to impose this vehicular language on the subordinate population of Europeans:

> Dunque la conoscenza della lingua di prestigio per la maggior parte dei Mediorientali e Magrebini si fermava allo stadio di pidgin: ma nei porti dei pirati barbareschi i Musulmani si trovarono ad avere un enorme prestigio sugli Europei capitati laggiù (che erano per lo più prigionieri o schiavi), per questo motivo poterono imporre anche a questi ultimi la variante pidginizzata che era a loro usuale, e così la lingua franca divenne bilaterale e si stabilizzò. (Cifoletti 2000: 16)

[2] See Schuchardt (1909). Schuchardt's seminal article is available in English (Schuchardt 1979, 1980) and Italian (Venier 2012) translations, the latter supplied with an extensive commentary.
[3] See Roches (1904).
[4] Chaudenson (2001: 127) refers to this process (in relation to creoles) as *autonomization*.

[Thus the knowledge of the language of prestige by most Middle Easterners and Maghrebis stopped at the pidgin stage, but in the ports of the Barbary pirates Muslims came to have an enormous prestige over the Europeans found there (most of them prisoners or slaves), and for that reason were able to impose even on the latter the pidginized variety that was usual for them, and this way Lingua Franca became bilateral and was stabilized.]

A contributing factor in the imposition of LF on the population of European captives, as discussed by Davis (2003: 114), may have been the fact that many of the slave owners were renegades (Christian converts to Islam) with Romance language backgrounds. Between the late sixteenth and the end of the seventeenth centuries, the elite of Algiers was dominated by converts as well as Andalusians[5] (Muslim refugees from Spain) (McDougall 2017: 30). Converts occupied an important place in Algerine society, serving as rulers of Algiers, as bodyguards and administrators to rulers of Algiers, as corsair captains, and as slave owners (Clissold 1977: 87). Additional factors for the popularity of LF may include the fact that some local slave owners had Christian wives or had themselves been once enslaved by Europeans, which suggests their prior familiarity with LF (Clissold 1977: 55), as well as the fact that Christian slaves were often employed as domestic servants by European consuls to the regency (McDougall 2017: 30, 34).

Outside the Maghreb, the position of LF is less clear-cut. The literary sources through which the Venetian variety of LF has been handed down leave it up to the reader to figure out whether the language they portray is LF, L2 Italian, or L2 Venetian, with differences in scholarly opinion: thus, while Camus Bergareche (1993a) views Goldoni's *lengua de levantinos* as an imperfect L2 variety, Cifoletti (2000: 15) suggests that the differences between Goldoni's and Maghrebi LF may be due to the existence of "una variante locale, un 'dialetto veneziano' della lingua franca" [a local variant, a 'Venetian dialect' of LF].[6] The existence of LF in Egypt in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries appears certain in view of its mention in Frederic Norden's account

[5] Epalza and Slama-Gafsi (2010: 36) use the terms *andalusí* (Andalusian) and *morisco* (Morisco) "para designar a los últimos musulmanes de España y a sus descendientes en el Mágreb" [to designate the last Muslims of Spain and their descendants in the Maghreb].

[6] "Non mi sentirei di affermare d'altra parte che la lingua franca di Venezia fosse soltanto una serie di casi di mancato apprendimento dell'italiano (o del veneziano): alcuni dei parlanti potevano avere imparato nel loro Paese il pidgin a base italiana, ed essersi fermati a quel livello; ma certo a noi che disponiamo solo di documenti letterari appare difficile separare nettamente la loro realtà da quella di stranieri che semplicemente difettavano nella padronanza della lingua locale" [I would not assert, on the other hand, that the Lingua Franca of Venice was only a series of cases of failed acquisition of Italian (or Venetian): some of the speakers could have acquired the Italian-based pidgin in their country and stopped at that level; but certainly for us, who have only literary documents at our disposal, it appears difficult to clearly separate their reality from that of foreigners who simply lacked mastery of the local language] (Cifoletti 2000: 16).

of his voyage there (Norden 1755: 40) and in a letter written from Cairo by Gérard de Nerval (Nerval 1911: 132) (Sammarco 1937: 148; Cifoletti 1983: 1262; Mallette 2014: 338).

Aslanov (2010: 105–108) suggests that LF did not exist outside Western Mediterranean, and views the sources in which LF is placed in the mouths of Levantines as "une projection de la réalité linguistique prévalent en Méditerranée occidentale à un contexte levantin" [a projection of the linguistic reality prevalent in Western Mediterranean onto the Levantine context] (Aslanov 2006: 23). He hypothesizes that the basis of LF was laid with the beginning of commerce, after the twelfth century, between Pisa, Genoa, Venice, and the ports of the Maghreb and Moorish Spain, and finds it significant that the aforementioned *Contrasto della Zerbitana* is recorded in an island off the coast of Tunisia (Aslanov 2006: 23–25).

Castellanos (2006, 2007) expresses similar views with respect to the origin of LF, dividing its evolution into three phases. The initial phase (*Lingua Franca Originària*) would have taken place between the tenth and fifteenth centuries in the context of Western commercial expansion in the Western Mediterranean, which brought Romance-speaking peoples into contact with Berbers and Arabs. The second phase (*Lingua Franca Evolucionada*) took place between the sixteenth and early nineteenth centuries in the context of a large-scale confrontation between the Ottoman Empire and the West and involved stabilization of LF and its evolution into local varieties. During this period, LF emerges as more Italianized east of Algiers and more Hispanized in its central and western domains. The third phase is conventionally counted from 1830, the year of the French military occupation of Algiers. During this period, LF is also known as *petit mauresque* and *sabir*; Castellanos (2007) suggests that these labels refer to ways of speaking the colonial languages by the local populations, though they may have contained remnants of LF.

The division into three periods is also present in the work of Cifoletti (1989: 22–23). It is primarily based on written documentation from the Maghreb, mainly Algiers, whose LF variety is "di gran lunga la più tipica, la meglio conosciuta e più coerente" [by far the most typical, the best known, and the most coherent]" (Cifoletti 2000: 16–17). Cifoletti identifies the three periods as "il periodo delle origini" [the period of origins], "il periodo dei pirati barbareschi" [the period of the Barbary pirates], and "il periodo del sabir" [the *sabir* period].

The earliest period is documented in the handful of texts that predate Haedo (1612) and reflects the use of LF in travel and commerce and in European-controlled Muslim territories such as Djerba. The second period contains the bulk of the extant documentation of LF. It begins and ends with our two most important documentary sources on this language, both of which were composed by outsiders temporarily residing in Algiers: Haedo (1612) and

Anonymous (1830a). Haedo's *Topografia e historia general de Argel*[7] [Topography and general history of Algiers] contains approximately twenty sentences in LF totaling about a hundred lexical types and presents a snapshot of the LF of Algiers in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Its value for the study of LF is enhanced by the accompanying metalinguistic commentary, which informs us about how this language fit within the polyglot city's linguistic ecology. This work was published in 1612 by the abbot of Frómista Fray Diego de Haedo, who attributed its co-authorship to his uncle of the same name, Archbishop of Palermo and President and Captain-General of the Kingdom of Sicily (Camamis 1977: 63–64). Based on a detailed analysis of the *Topographia*, Camamis (1977) concluded that this work was likely to have been composed between 1578 and 1581, in Algiers rather than Sicily, and by an eyewitness rather than someone writing from second-hand accounts. As the true author of this work he identified the priest Antonio de Sosa, whose captivity in Algiers partly overlapped in time with that of Cervantes (Camamis 1977: 124–150; see also Medina Molera 2005: 37).

The second period reflects structural stabilization of LF and a certain degree of prestige: as emphasized by Cifoletti (1994b: 146), in written sources from the period LF is depicted as being used by individuals of high social standing, such as corsair captains and various Turkish dignitaries. This period incorporates within its span "the 'golden age' of the privateer economy," which ran from the late sixteenth until the end of the seventeenth century (McDougall 2017: 30). It coincides with the Ottoman domination of the Maghreb and with the rise of Italian to the status of the default language of communication between Ottoman authorities and Western Europe (Cremona 1996, 2002; Minervini 2006; Cifoletti 2007; Baglioni 2010, 2011, 2016).

The last, or *sabir*, period is documented in post-1830 sources (Cifoletti 2004: 261–292). Linguistically, it reflects gradual Gallicization of LF; Cifoletti (2004: 19) speaks of the term *sabir* as capturing a "post-pidgin continuum" that resulted from LF's contact with French. This period also reflects a sharp decline in the social status of the typical users of LF, whom Cifoletti describes (1994b: 146) as "indigeni tra i più ignoranti" [some of the most ignorant natives].

Following the Muslim conquest of Spain in the early eighth century, there had been continuous human movement between the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa, leading to the creation of ethnically and linguistically mixed populations in North African cities like Algiers (Clissold 1977: 20). In Haedo's time, the majority of Algiers's population was born nonlocally; as remarked by McDougall (2017: 30), "the defining feature of Ottoman Algiers

[7] Available online at http://purl.pt/14495.

was perhaps the significance of its immigrants, who may have constituted a majority of the total population in the period 1580–1640." The complex and stratified society of upward of 60,000 souls included an estimated 16,000 Arabs and Berbers, 10,000 Levantines, 6,000 Andalusians (Iberian Muslims), 5,000 Jews, and 30,000 converts, the majority of whom hailed from Italy, Spain, Provence, and the Balkans.[8] The distinctive social/occupational groups in the Barbary Regency period included janissaries (infantrymen recruited from outside North Africa), *raïs* (corsair captains), *spahis* (cavalrymen), and *kuluglis* (sons of janissaries and native women). In addition to its other residents, the city housed about 25,000 Christian captives, most of whom were speakers of Romance languages including Spanish, Italian, Catalan, Occitan, French, and Portuguese (Clissold 1977: 27; Hess 1978: 254–255; Cifoletti 1989: 17–18; Medina Molera 2005: 37ff.).

The linguistic situation of Algiers was characterized by widespread bi- and multilingualism, and simultaneous use of Berber, Arabic, Turkish, various European languages, and LF (Couto 2002: 29, citing Morsly 1996; Planas 2004). To this should be added the "international" languages of the port societies of Western Mediterranean (Spanish, Catalan, Occitan, French, Italian) as well as the languages of religion and culture: Latin, Hebrew, and Classical Arabic (Epalza and Slama-Gafsi 2010: 67–108). Each language was characterized by a variety of contact effects and multidimensional internal variation. The former include, for example, reciprocal influence between Arabic and Berber (Sayahi 2014) and koineization in Judeo-Spanish (Minervini 2002); and the latter includes a distinction between the Muslim and Jewish dialects of Arabic (Cohen 1912: 7; Larzul 2010: 91; Khan 2016; Tirosh-Becker 2019). The languages nonautochthonous to the area also differed with respect to their entrenchment in its linguistic ecology: for example, while Spanish was "[t]he third oldest language of continuous presence in the Maghreb after Berber and Arabic," Turkish "did not filter through to the general public and remained a language of the governing elite" (Sayahi 2014: 46, 50; see also Meouak 2004; Benkato 2020).

The domains of use of LF are known from contemporary eyewitness accounts (Planas 2004). From these we learn that LF was known to all the inhabitants of Algiers and was used by them for communication with the numerous European captives and slaves; in the absence of a shared language, it was also used by the latter for communication among themselves. The condition of being a slave in the Maghreb included the ability to understand orders in LF. Newly captured Europeans were allowed a brief breaking-in

[8] See Shuval (1998: 39–55) and Cresti (2005) concerning the difficulty of estimating the population of Algiers during this period and Borg (1996: 131n11) regarding the presence in Algiers of numerous Maltese.

period to facilitate their adjustment to the local ways and slave life. This included communication with more experienced slaves who, among other things, introduced the new captives to LF (Davis 2003: 57).

Davis (2003: 15) estimates that at the peak of the corsair activity, between 1580 and 1680, the average number of European slaves held in the Barbary regencies at any given time was about 35,000, with around 27,000 held in Algiers and its dependencies, 6,000 in Tunis, and 2,000 in Tripoli and the smaller centers. The sources of the slaves included captured European vessels and corsair raids on the coastal villages of Europe, particularly those populated by Romance-speaking peoples (Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, France, Spain, the Balearic Islands), as well as Greece, the British Isles, and occasionally as far north as Iceland. A glimpse at the ethnic composition of the slave population is afforded by the following eyewitness account:

> As to the slaves of both sexes that are in Barbary today, there are a quantity of them from all the Christian nations, such as France, Italy, Spain, England, Germany, Flanders, Holland, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Slovania, Russia, and so forth. The number of these poor captives reaches about thirty-six thousand, according to the enumeration that I have carried out on the spot and to the records that have been furnished and sent to me by the Christian Consuls who live in the Corsair Cities. (Dan 1649: 318; the English translation cited here is from Davis 2003: 15)

Some of the captured Christians were sold to private individuals while others were owned by the state. The living and working conditions of the state-owned slaves were particularly harsh. During the day, the state slaves worked in heavy construction or rowed the galleys, while during the night they were incarcerated in slave prisons known locally as *bagnos* 'baths' (Davis 2003: 12); Clissold (1977: 56) describes these as "a cross between a Nazi concentration camp, an English debtors' prison, and a Soviet labour camp." Successful escapes were rare. The slaves' only hope of returning home was through the agency of one of the ransoming orders, and they also could try to improve their lot by converting to Islam. Hard labor, beatings, malnutrition, and plague outbreaks resulted in the annual mortality rate of about 17 percent in the slave population (Davis 2003: 17–19). At least 90 percent of the Maghreb slaves were men, and they were denied access to slave or free women and prevented from raising families (Davis 2003: 15, 25, 113). These conditions help explain why LF, "the pidgin of slaves and masters in the Mediterranean" (Davis 2003: 57), was able to survive for centuries without becoming anyone's native language (Operstein 1998, 2007).

Outside slave/slave and master/slave interactions, LF was used for communication between European consuls, naval officers, and other Franks arriving in Algiers on business, and Algerine authorities. Unlike in some other linguistic ecologies (see, e.g., Minervini 1996b; Mufwene 2014), the availability of

dragomans[9] apparently did not override or interfere with the use of LF in these exchanges. The French diplomat Laugier de Tassy, writing from personal observation, informs his readers on this point:

> Tous les étrangers qui arrivent dans la Ville d'Alger, sont conduits, dès qu'ils ont débarqué, devant le Dey par le Capitaine du Port ou un de ses Officiers. Le Dey leur donne la main à baiser, & leur demande en langue Franque d'où ils viennent, ce qu'ils viennent faire, & des nouvelles du lieu de leur départ & de la route qu'ils doivent suivre; après quoi ils sont renvoyez. Ordinairement le Truchement de leur Nation est avec eux, pour leur servir de Guide & d'Interprête. (Laugier de Tassy and Philippe 1725: 103)

> [All foreigners who arrive to the city of Algiers are taken, as soon as they have landed, before the *dey* by the captain of the port or one of his officers. The *dey* gives them his hand to kiss and asks them in Lingua Franca where they come from, what they are here for, and the news from their place of departure and the route they will follow; after which they are sent back. Usually the dragoman of their nation is with them, to serve them as a guide and interpreter.]

Laugier de Tassy's testimony is echoed nearly a century later by Mrs. Broughton's (1840). The daughter of the British Consul General in Algiers refers to the period between 1806 and 1812:

> Shortly after our going to Algiers, one of our naval friends accompanied my father to an audience of the Minister of Marine, to lay claim to a vessel, which had been taken and condemned by the Algerines, previous to my father's arrival. The vessel was, I believe, a Maltese or a Sicilian, which had some claims to British protection. It had been on its way from Sicily to Valetta, laden with wheat. Captain _____ considered himself a good Italian scholar, and therefore dispensed with the aid of an interpreter, as did my father also, for Sidi Yussuf, the Minister of Marine, spoke *Lingua Franca* perfectly in all its eloquent and terse abruptness. (Broughton 1840: 281, emphasis original)

In the 1820s, the demographic situation in Algiers was changed compared to what it had been in Haedo's time. Anonymous (1830b) estimates the city's population in 1823 at 40,000; of these, this source describes 4,000 as Turks ("l'aristocratie du pays" [the country's aristocracy]), 10,000 as *kuluglis* (descendants of Turkish men and Algerian women),[10] 20,000 as Moors,[11] and 6,000 as Jews (Anonymous 1830b: 32–38, 66). The number of European captives dropped steadily over the period that separated Haedo (1612) from Anonymous (1830b), with an estimated 500 at the end of the 1780s and 122 discovered in the *bagno* upon the French capture of Algiers in 1830

[9] Ross (1991: 34) notes that, in the period 1785–1830, "[t]he Dey . . . provided [Consuls] with a janissary guard and a dragoman who served as an interpreter and fixer."

[10] See Shuval (2000: 331–336) and McDougall (2017: 36) regarding this term and its transliterations.

[11] See Harvey (2005: 2) and Epalza and Slama-Gafsi (2010: 101n182, 104) on the use of the term *Moor* (Sp. *moro*) to refer to North Africans / Maghrebis.