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On the 23rd of Jumādā II 504/4th December 1110, Sidon, after forty-seven days of sea and land siege, fell into the hands of Baldwin I (1100-1118) King of Jerusalem. The city was abandoned by its Muslim officials and dignitaries. Its capture by the Crusaders added a new barony (referred to as the Seigneurie de Sagette) to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, and it was entrusted as a fief to Eustance Garnier, Lord of Caesarea. Several members of his family succeeded to its lordship and distinguished themselves in impressive diplomacy with their Muslim counterparts. The city changed hands between Muslims and Crusaders and consequently suffered massive damage.


Following his decisive victory over the Crusaders in Acre on the 17th of Jumādā II 690/May 18, 1291, Sultan al-Ashraf Salāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl (689/1290-693/1293), despatched amīr ‘Alam al-Dīn Sanjar al-Shujā’ī al-Manṣūrī4 (d. 693/1293) to occupy Sidon. The news of his advance reached the Franks of the city who deserted it to take refuge in the nearby island citadel. Consequently, it was easy to capture the city, and build a quay which would enable Sanjar’s army to lay siege to the citadel. Again it was deserted by its helpless occupants who had no choice but to sail to Cyprus. Following his victory on Rajab 15th 690/14 July 1291, Sanjar issued orders to demolish its fortifications5.

The Mamluks, as new masters of Egypt, Yaman, Ḥijāz and Bilād al-Shām, succeeded not only in eliminating the Crusaders as an occupying power, but also in forcing the Mongols back to the Tigris which became a dividing line between the two powers. Inspite of this, Bilād al-Shām was frequently exposed to Mongol raids and the Mamluks treated it as a frontier province, taking upon themselves its defence until the Ottomans defeated the Mamluks in 922 A.H./1516 A.D.

During Mamluk times, Bilād al-Shām was divided into seven niyābās or provinces (sometimes referred to as mamlakās), the niyābah of Damascus6 being the most prominent. In addition, to the city of Damascus and its neighbourhood, its niyābah was made up of four šafqās (districts). Sidon, with its many surrounding villages and its dependent iqllums (counties), was part of the northern

---


6 For these administrative divisions, see al-Qalqashandī, vol. IV, of Subḥ for Sidon, see the same volume p. 111, see also Aḥmad b. Shihāb al-Dīn b. Fadl-Allāh al-‘Umārī, (d. 742/1341) al-Ta’rīf bi al-Muṣṭalah al-Sharīf, Cairo, 1894, p. 179.
Şafqah of the ni‘yabah of Damascus. Its mutawallî (governor) was amīr of the rank of tablakhānah and sometimes an amīr of ten. The Mamluks restored the sea-citadel where they stationed bahriyyah force (Seasoldiers), cavalry, sea-watchers (Kashshāfah) and other groups of labourers (wa‘āfīf min al-mustakhdamīn). Correspondance with the governor of Sidon was made possible through the governor of Damascus and the governor of Sidon was addressed as «azza Allāh nṣira al-jānab al-‘āsir» (may God give power to this noble excellency).

Our sources do not furnish us with the names of those who occupied the post. Yet it seems that indigenous personalities such as certain members of the Buḥturids and the Ḥanash Family8 were entrusted with that office. It is worth noting that the Buḥturids, «Lords of the Gharb» in al-Shuf mountains, were charged with the task of watching the coast from the Dog River (Lycus), north of Beirut, to the Dāmūr River. (Tamyras), south of the town, for any expected Frankish pirates or any organized attacks by sea9. In return, during Mamluk times, the Buḥturids were usually reinvested in their iqta‘ after each Mamluk rawk (survey), the purpose of which was to redistribute arable lands among the Mamluks. It is interesting to note that part of their iqta‘ included some areas of land in Sidon and its dependent villages10; requiring the presence of some members of the family there. This arrangement was necessary because Sidon as a sea port of Damascus was attacked several times from the sea. In 706/1307, a Frankish group of ships occupied Sidon, and succeeded in pillaging the city and capturing a sizable number of its people. The governor of Safad, Shihāb al-Dīn b. Șubh al-Kurdi11

10 Şālīḥ b. Yaḥyā, Ibid. pp. 73-165.
(d. 771/1369) volunteered to free the prisoners by paying the Franks 500 dirham per head. The number of prisoners was so large that he had to borrow thirty thousand dirhams from the Prisoners' Bureau (Dīwān al-Asrā)\(^\text{12}\). Again, in 784/1382 Sidon witnessed a devastating attack by a Genoese fleet which pillaged Beirut\(^\text{13}\). After reconciling themselves with the King of Cyprus, the Genoese, in 806/1403, repeated their attack on Beirut and Sidon. They were able, with their large fleet (46 vessels) to land occupy the small island facing Sidon and to spend the night there. Local and tribal forces were mobilized to defend Sidon since they feared that the Genoese would pillage the city as they had done in Beirut. Faced with this large, local mobilization, the Genoese most likely decided not to attack the city and sailed away\(^\text{14}\).

Sidon, during the Mamluk period, had its Sunni qādī (judge) who was appointed by the grand judge of Damascus as part of the latter's prerogative. It is probable that most of those who held the post were of local origin. This post remained in existence during the sixteenth century. Shaykh Najm al-Din al-Ghazzi (d. 1061/1650) mentioned in his biographical dictionary a certain Shaykh Chalabi (d. 987/1579)\(^\text{15}\) who had served as a judge in Sidon. The Turkish title, «Chalabi», indicates that during the Ottoman period it was possible to find non-locals holding the post.

From available Sultani, hülküms (Royal orders), during the early Ottoman times, it is obvious that the function of the judge was not confined to judicial cases presented to him. He was also asked to cooperate with his colleague in Beirut and with the governor of Damascus to execute certain orders sent by the Sultan. Their orders included instructions to collect overdue revenues and confiscate fire-arms held by the local people, especially the Druzes. He was sometimes asked to help in recruiting archers for the Ottoman military force\(^\text{16}\).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\) Şali\(b\). Ya\(h\a\)ya, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 29.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{13}}\) Şali\(b\). Ya\(h\a\)ya, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 30-31.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{14}}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 33.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{16}}\) See for example the following hülküms, M.D. VI, No. 54, year (972) p. 27, M.D. VII, (975) No. 400, p. 155, No. 1728, (976), p. 616.
Biographical dictionaries do not help us in elucidating the intellectual life of Sidon and its neighbourhood during the period under consideration. Al-Ghazzi mentions, in passing, a certain 'Umar al-Mubayyid as being a piousman in Sidon\(^\text{17}\). Al-Khalidi al-Şafadî (d. 1043/1624), the Ma'ńid court historian, recorded that two Shaykhs, Muḥammad al-Ḥadî (d. 1042/1632)\(^\text{18}\) the Shafî'i muftî of Sidon and Maḥmûd al-Mammûdî, both from Sidon, were commissioned by Fakhr al-Dîn in 1022/1613, in addition to other Sunni dignitaries, to form a delegation to intervene on his behalf\(^\text{19}\) with the governor of Damascus Muzzin Zadeh Ḥafiz Pāsha\(^\text{20}\) (d. 1041/1631). Inspite of these few names it appears that the intellectual life of Sidon was lull, even during the eighteenth century. Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâbulsi (d. 1143/1731), who takes pleasure in recording names of 'Ulamâ he met, on visiting Sidon in 1112/1700 mentions only a muftî by the name of Riḍwân who apparently did not impress him. Ironically, he mentions a pseudo learned man by the name of Ibn al-‘Alîmah (son of the learned). On visiting the governor of Sidon, Muḥammad Qabalan Pasha, he refers only to the head of the Arabic chancery (Kātib al-‘Arâbi) a certain Luṭfî Châlâbî who happened to be al-Nâbulsi's friend\(^\text{21}\).

Having in mind that Sidon was a Sunnite town surrounded by Shiîte and Druze communities, one expects to find a more active


intellectual and religious life. Our sources do not reveal the inter-communal relationship in Sidon and its environs, since several military expeditions were directed by the Mamluks and the Ottomans against the Shiite and Druze areas. 

In spite of all these severe measures, Shiite doctrine was able to preserve itself in the countryside of Sidon. It seems that it reached such an alarming state that on 25 Jumādā II 764/11 April 1363 the Mamluk Sultan sent an urgent warning (manshūr) to the people of Beirut and Sidon (as well as to their dependent villages and hamlets) expressing his worry about the spread of Shiism among the people of those places. His circular contained a theological attack on Shiism and specific instruction were given to put an immediate end to such «heretical» doctrine. It appears, from the available literature, that Shiites were forced to yield to the authority in contrast to the Druzes who were well organized, disciplined and remained a source of trouble to the authorities. Since their early days in Bilād al-Shām, it was a matter of routine for the Ottomans to send military expeditions against the Druze Villages, towns and hamlets. Yet this brave minority managed to survive, The 'Ulama' of Damascus wasted no time in inciting the authorities and the public against the Druzes. In 930/1523 they re-issued the famous fatwā of the learned savant Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbdul-Ḥalīm b. Ṭaymiyyah (d. 728/1328) against the Druzes and other «hertical» sects.

The Ottoman Sultanate, in theory, did not recognize either the Druzes or the Shiites or the Alawids, but, as part of its administrative «Real-Politik», it dealt with them according to the prevailing circumstances. On registering the population, the Shiites and the Druzes were recorded in the Tapu Defters of Bilād al-Shām, as Sunnite Muslims. In some parts of Palestine, a certain tax, resm-i rijāliyyah was collected from registred Muslim who were most

22 For an account of these military expedition, see K. Salibi, Muntalāq, pp. 132-141.
likely non-Sunnite. However, no such tax was levied from Druze villages during the sixteenth century in the Sancak of Damascus.

According to five26 available Tapu Defters of sixteenth century Sidon, the city was comprised of three quarters: Maḥallat Qalah (Citadel Quarter), 2. Maḥallat Daḵākīn (Market Quarter), 3. Maḥallat Balḵr (Sea Side Quarter). It is interesting to note that the Jews, who were small in number, had their own quarter, while the few Christians in the city did not constitute a community and therefore did not have their own separate quarter. The Tapu Defters, which reflect the growth of the population of Sidon, were enumerated on the basis of the Khānah, (household, h), mujarrad (bachelor, alien -b), disabled people(d), (see table on p. 60).

The increase in the population of Sidon during the sixteenth century is noticeable. There had been no sharp drop in the number of the inhabitants as has been noted in some parts of Bilād al-Shām27. This is, perhaps, due to the fact that Sidon and Beirut served as seaports of Damascus, and consequently attracted more people to work there. This, also, may account for the steady increase in the number of households of the seaside quarter. It must be remembered that the Maʿnīds treated Sidon as their seat where they gave protection to European merchants especially to the French who had a consul and a khān in the city28. Recurring references point out that European ships (French, Flemish, and from the Italian cities) visited the port to buy cotton, silk and other commodities bought by European merchants from Damascus29. Ottoman officials had the habit of sailing to Sidon in order to travel from there to Damascus30, or to collect overdue taxes, or frequently to impose extra-


30 al-Muḥībbī, Khulāṣat, vol. IV, p. 427
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citadel Quarter</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 — — —</td>
<td>180 7 1 —</td>
<td>276 20 1 —</td>
<td>287 11 2 —</td>
<td>233 80 — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Quarter</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 — — —</td>
<td>142 8 1 —</td>
<td>197 12 2 —</td>
<td>151 50 — —</td>
<td>150 54 — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea-Side Quarter</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 — — —</td>
<td>161 11 1 —</td>
<td>199 7 1 —</td>
<td>280 — — —</td>
<td>294 — — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Quarter</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Group</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 — — —</td>
<td>3 — — —</td>
<td>3 — — —</td>
<td>3 — — —</td>
<td>3 — — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Muslim</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
<td>h. b. r. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>126 — — —</td>
<td>483 26 3 —</td>
<td>672 39 4 —</td>
<td>718 61 2 —</td>
<td>677 134 — —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ordinary levies. Sometimes they held the port of Sidon in return for gifts.\(^{31}\)

Extant historical literature indicates that the city of Sidon had the following mosques\(^{32}\) during the early Ottoman period:

1— al-Jāmi‘ al-Kabīr, (The Grand Mosque) in the Citadel Quarter over looking the sea. It was endowed with a number of pieces of land and gardens\(^{33}\) Shaykh ‘Abdul Ghānī al-Nābulṣī classified it as «‘Umarī», he described both its ornamental pool and its domed fasqiyyah. In addition, he referred to a well outside of the mosque whose water was slightly salty.

2— Jāmi‘ al-Kīkhyā, which may have been Ottoman since early endowment deeds do not mention it.

3— Jāmi‘ Ibn Qūṭaysh, which was, in the words of al-Nābulṣī, a new one, had a pool and a small marble fasqiyyah. These three mosques all had marble minbars (niches).

4— Jāmi‘ al-Balṣir (Sea-Side mosque) over-looked the sea, had its pool and similar to the other mosques it was endowed\(^{34}\).

5— Tapu Defter 602, refers to a second mosque in the Sea-Quarter by the name of al-Muḥtasib Mosque\(^{35}\). When Shaykh ‘Abd-al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī visited it, he stated that it was close to the Saray of the Pāsha. This mosque, which was the smallest in Sidon, had a running pool, and like other mosques had its own endowments.

6— al-Baṭṭāḥ Mosque, which was known as al-Sūq (Market) Mosque. It was constructed on the tomb of a certain Shaykh ‘Alī al-Ghazzī who was considered by the people of Sidon to be a «saint». Comparatively speaking, its endowments were the largest\(^{36}\) after those of the Grand Mosque.

Sidon, during the early Ottoman times, had two Zawiyas:

\(^{32}\) For these mosques see al-Nābulṣī *al-Riḥlah al-Ṭarabulsiyyah*, pp. 33-4
\(^{34}\) *Ibid*, p. 144.
1— Ibn ‘Aqīl Zāwiyyah in the Sea-Side Quarter which had its own endowments37.

2— Shaykh ‘Umar al-Mubayyid’s Zawiyah in the same quarter but with richer endowments38.

Tapu Defter 602 enumerates endowments of a school by the name of al-Furūsiyyah(?)39, school in the citadel Quarter. It is not known when this school came into existence nor when it ceased to function.

Two types of waqf deserve attention in Sidon. The revenues of the first were devoted to purchasing burial shrouds for the poor and strangers to the place40. The second was designated to the Khandaq Well to provide drinking water to the city41. In addition, a waqf was given by a certain Khalīl b. ‘Urayqāt for reciting the Holy Koran42 and a second one by Shams al-Dīn al-‘Adawī to recite Sahīh al-Bukhrāī in the Sea-Side Mosque43.

We find that a certain Mūsā b. Mubārak b. Ḥamrā had a school in the village of ‘Ayn Traz, in the Shuf District, where he endowed it44. It is interesting to find a zāwiyyah built in 901/1495 in the Druze village of Dayr al-Qamar. It appears that it was richly endowed to buy books on various religious subjects and to feed visitors and the poor especially during the month of Ramaḍān45.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Sidon had three public baths. The smallest was in the market place, the second was known as Shaykh’s bath and the third, known as al-Amir bath was largest and the most luxurious46. It was built by Amir Fakhr al-Dīn the Ma‘nīd.

37 Ibid, p. 143.
38 Ibid, p. 143, see also Ghazzī, Kawākīb, vol. I, p. 59. It is obvious that Shaykh ‘Umar b. al-Mubayyid as a pious man was living in Sidon towards the end of the 9th century Hegirah/Path century.
40 T.D. 602, p. 142.
41 T.D. 602, p. 142.
42 T.D. 602, p. 143.
43 T.D. 602, p. 143.
44 T.D. 602, p. 144, unfortunately the date of this endowment is not mentioned.
45 T.D. 602, p. 135.
46 Nabulsī, Ibid, p. 34.
It is worth recording here that the image of Sidon as portrayed by the English traveller George Sandys who visited the area in 1611, was a gloomy one. He states «The town now being, is not worth our description, the walls neither fair not of force, the haven decayed, when at best but serving for gallies. At the end of the Pier Stands at a paltry block-house furnished with suitable artillery. The Mosque, the Bannia (most likely the house of Fakhr al-Din) and cane (khan) for merchants, the only building of note»

Sidon as the second port of Damascus after Beirut, was connected with Damascus with two over-land routes.

1— Damascus-Khan Maysalūn - Zibdul - Ḫuṣayn - Beirut - Sidon

2— Damascus - Dārayyah al-Kubrā - Kafr Qiq al-Dibs - Rāshayyah - Mashgharah - Kafr Malkā - Sidon

The town was protected by two watch-towers (burj), manned by soldiers, sea patrols, cavalry, scouts and other employees. In 1070/1660, for example, there were fifty three muṣṭahfīzān, (guards) in Sidon.

The Kanunname of the Province of Damascus of the sixteenth century enumerated : Beirut, Sidon, Tyre and Jaffa as ports in the province where customs on exports and imports were levied under the name of Müjib Bāb Minā (Dues collected at the port-gate). For a more comprehensive understanding of the Ottoman taxation system in Sidon, it is necessary to list the following types of taxes and the amounts accrued from each müqātā'a in Sidon during the sixteenth century.

48 Ibn Fajullah al-'Umarī, Ta'rif, p. 194.
Annual Revenues collected in Sidon as *muqāṭā'a* on the basis of the *akçe*

المحصول السنوي لمناطق نسم صيدا

المجموعة بالإجابة

I. Revenues of the Port

II. Revenues of the Slaughter House

III. Revenues of the Dyeing House

IV. Revenues of markets inspection, measuring, molasses

V. Revenues of market for horses, donkeys, etc.

VI. Revenues of treasury, absent and missing persons and running away slaves in Sidon and its dependents.

VII. Revenues of miscellaneous irregular taxes and marriage fees.

VIII. Revenues of taxes collected from «infidel» (Christian) pilgrims arriving via sea to visit the Holy Sepulcher each was charged three *paras*.

٦٤
IX. Taxes collected on wine shops, and bāj on wine brought to Sidon by Christians and Jews, provided that they do not sell it to Muslims in accordance with the old custom.

محصول میخانه نفس مزبوره کنندی نفساری ایپون کتورید کاری خردان عادت قد مه اوزره بناہ ائلوب من بند مسلمانه بیع ایلامار.

X. Revenues of the soap shop, comprised four doors.

محصول رسم خان مصنّعة در نفس صیدا باب عدد ۴.

XI. Revenues collected on Oxen each two to be charged ten akçes annually.

محصول ممادیة نفس صیدا تابع مزبورة بحترفان در سنة ۱۰۰.

XII. Toll-tax collected en route near Wādī Zanni Pass.

محصول غنارة درید وادی زاپی (٥).

XIII. Toll-tax collected en route near Wadi Mayli, known as Wādī Ḥabīs.

محصول غنارة وادی میلی (٥) نام دیگر وادی حابیس تابع مزبوره.

XIV. Revenues of house of wine and of brokerage of Sidon.

محصول میخانة وسماریة نفس صیدا تابع مزبوره.

XV. Taxes on winter-pasturage on the basis of one sheep or its equivalent price for each one hundred sheep.

محصول قشلاق متر وغم خارجدن کلوب قنفوذ دیویونده برتنوی بیان پیا بسی الدور در سنة.

XVI. Poll-tax on Jews.

جزیه بودیان در نفس مزبوره.

XVII. Taxes on olives presses : twenty doors, each to pay six akçes.

رسم معاصر زیت باب ۲۰۰ فی ٦.

XVIII. Taxes on silk wheels : ten in number.

صرر دوالیپ حرر ۱۰.

XIX. Taxes collected for night-watching of the city.

محصول عمسیة نفس صیدا.

Forma : ۵
XX. Taxes collected on salt produced near al-Burj al-Barrani.

XXI. Taxes collected on buffaloes.

XXII. Taxes collected on bees and goats.

Following the flight of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ma‘nī, in 1613, to Tuscany, the Ottoman carved out Safed, Sidon, Beirut and Ghazîr and created a new province. With this arrangement, they intended to watch carefully the behaviour of the Druzes. This shortlived experiment was most likely an antecedent to the later arrangement whereby, in 1660, Sidon became the seat of a new province. Again, the attempt was planned in order to crush local Arab power groups. In the words of İstifan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704)

«In order to twist the arms of the Arabs, he (governor of Damascus, Aḥmad Pāsha Köprülü) made Sidon a Pashāviyyah (province)». This started a new chapter in the history of Sidon during Ottoman times, which deserves a separate treatment.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>26.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The general observation to be noted is the obvious increase in the amount of money collected under each tax on the basis of the akce.