

Under Mehmed ‘Alī’s Impact:
Dispatching Students to Europe in the Reign of
Maḥmūd II (1830–1839)

Muratcan Zorcu

A thesis presented to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
at Boğaziçi University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

July 2021

Declaration of Originality

The intellectual content of this thesis, which has been written by me and for which I take full responsibility, is my own, original work, and it has not been previously or concurrently submitted elsewhere for any other examination or degree of higher education. The sources of all paraphrased and quoted materials, concepts, and ideas are fully cited, and the admissible contributions and assistance of others with respect to the conception of the work as well as to linguistic expression are explicitly acknowledged herein.

Copyright © 2021 Muratcan Zorcu.
Some rights reserved.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

Abstract

Under Meḥmed ‘Alī’s Impact: Dispatching Students to Europe in the Reign of Maḥmūd II (1830–1839)

Muratcan Zorcu, Master’s Candidate at the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, 2021

Dr. Ramazan Hakkı Öztan, Thesis Advisor

The transformation of the Ottoman Empire throughout the nineteenth century certainly grew out of the earlier discussions of reforms. While initial steps were taken to restructure the Ottoman military, these reforms had far-reaching consequences, manifesting themselves in political and legal realms, also with clear consequences in daily life. The reign of Maḥmūd II and his reformist agenda provide a good opportunity to understand the extent of the transformation of the Ottoman Empire in this period. Traditional historiography has examined this era by emphasizing the Janissaries and the local dynasties, often seen as “obstacles to reform.” However, these internal dynamics had relationships between both themselves and the ruling elite in Istanbul. The relationship between semi-independent Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha in Cairo and Istanbul is a subject that needs further academic investigation. When Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha dispatched the first large mission composed of students of different identities in May 1826, the administrative power in Istanbul also sent the four members from the household of Hüsrev Pasha on December 14, 1830. These two actions by the those who ruled different parts of the empire show how common interaction between Cairo and Istanbul interacted with one another. When explaining the interaction, this thesis will discuss the lists of students both from Istanbul and Cairo and their identities, departure, and return dates, compiled from the archival documents. Finally, the research will contextualize the Ottoman case within a global moment of sending students abroad as exemplified by Iran and Japan.

24,000 words

Özet

Meḥmed ‘Alī Paṣa Etkisinde II. Maḥmūd Saltanatı’nda Avrupa’ya Öğrenci Gönderilmesi(1830-1839)

Muratcan Zorcu, Yüksek Lisans Adayı, 2021

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü

Dr. Ramazan Hakkı Öztan, Tez Danışmanı

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun on dokuzuncu yüzyılda yaşadığı değişimler daha önceki yüzyıllardaki reform mirasıyla birlikte askerî niyetlerle başlayarak siyasî, hukukî ve gündelik yaşama dek uzanan birçok sahada kendini göstermiştir. On dokuzuncu yüzyıl boyunca devam eden bu değişimlerin vasıflarını ve sınırlarını anlamak için, II. Maḥmūd dönemi ve bu dönemde icra edilen reformlar önemli bir araştırma fırsatı sunmaktadır. Geleneksel tarihyazımı, Yeniçeri Ocağı ve yerel hanedanları “modernleşme çabalarına mâni olan dâhilî güçler” bağlamında incelemiştir. Aslında bu süreçte odaklanılması gereken konu, yereldeki işbu dâhilî güçlerin hem kendi aralarında hem de yönetici elite ilişkisi olduğudur. Kahire’de yarı-bağımsız Meḥmed ‘Alī Paṣa ile İstanbul arasındaki münasebet de akademik anlamda daha fazla incelenmeye gerekli bir konudur. Bu şartlar altında, Meḥmed ‘Alī Paṣa ilk geniş öğrenci kafilesini Mayıs 1826’da Paris’e sevk ederken İstanbul’daki yönetim de Hüsrev Paṣa’nın dört kulunu 14 Aralık 1830’da yine Paris’e sevk etmiştir. İmparatorluğun farklı bölgelerinin liderleri, Kahire ve İstanbul arasındaki müşterek etkileşimi paylaşırlar. İşbu tez, hem Meḥmed ‘Alī Paṣa hem de II. Maḥmūd tarafından Avrupa başkentlerine gönderilen öğrencilerin kimlikleri, sevk ve dönüş tarihleri arşiv belgeleri ışığında listelenecektir. Son olarak araştırma, özellikle yurt dışına öğrenci gönderme konusunda İran ve Japonya’nın ilk hareketlerini göstererek konunun küreselliğini ortaya koymaktadır.

24.000 kelime

To the sultānī-yegāh maqam song by Münir Bey,
Bu Hülyalar Diyarında

Table of Contents

List of Tables	<i>xii</i>
List of Figures	<i>xii</i>
Abbreviations and Acronyms	<i>xiii</i>
Acknowledgements	<i>xiv</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Sending Students to Europe—A Global Movement	4
1.2 Literature Review	10
1.3 Argument and Structure	18
2 OTTOMAN-EGYPTIAN RELATIONSHIPS IN THE EARLY DECADES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	23
2.1 The Early Nineteenth Century in Egypt	23
2.2 The Ottoman-Oriented Campaigns	28
2.3 The Conflict Against the Ottoman Imperial Power	32
2.4 Conclusion	35
3 ORIENTAL STUDENTS IN EUROPE	37
3.1 Egyptian Students Abroad	38
3.2 The Egyptian Impact on the Ottoman Policy of Sending Students Abroad	43
3.3 Ottoman Students Abroad	48
3.4 Conclusion	53
4 CONCLUSION	55
APPENDICES	
A Table I	59
B Table II	64
C Table III	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79

List of Tables

Table 1	The Dispatched Students Abroad until 1828 in Egypt	59
Table 2	The Egyptian Students Abroad Between the Years 1828 and 1836	64
Table 3	The Ottoman Students Abroad in the Reign of Maḥmūd II (1830-1839)	74

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Jomard and Egyptian students in 1831	29
Figure 1.2	The initial four students in 1830	48

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BOA	Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Directorate of State Archives: The Ottoman Archives Türkiye Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi
HAT	Imperial Rescripts (in the Ottoman Archives) Hatt-ı Hümayun
İÜK	Istanbul University Library Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi
SOLL	Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures (at Harvard University) Doğu Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Kaynakları
TDK	Turkish Language Association Türk Dil Kurumu
TDV	Turkey Religious Affairs Foundation Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı
TSMA	Topkapı Palace Museum Archives (in the Ottoman Archives) Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi
TTK	Turkish Historical Association Türk Tarih Kurumu
TY	Turkish Manuscripts (in the İÜK) Türkçe Yazmalar

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Dr. Cengiz Kırılı and Dr. Ramazan Hakkı Öztan, for their support during my writing process. My defense committee's members and my supervisors have contributed immensely to my master's thesis by providing invaluable recommendations through countless e-mails and the Zoom meetings during the coronavirus circumstances. They put forward their supportive suggestions and referrals about many significant published analyses, which kept continuing during the difficult times.

Since 2010 in my high school years in Kocaeli and my undergraduate years in Istanbul, many people have encouraged me to improve my intellectual knowledge and world perspective with their precious conversations. First and foremost, Prof. Dr. Gönül Tekin, the inspirational role model of our curious generation, gave endless invaluable recommendations during our discussions in Sapanca. She provides her insightful comments through the long and enlightening phone calls between us. I am deeply indebted to Gönül *Hanım* for her recommendations. Prof. Dr. Selçuk Esenbel, one of the leading figures in Turkish historiography, also gave me a seat in her lectures and helped me in one-to-one deliberations every time I needed some guidance. I also would like to thank the following people for helping me complete my master's thesis process: Prof. Dr. Sevtap Demirci, Prof. Dr. Edhem Eldem, Prof. Dr. Vahdettin Engin, Prof. Dr. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, Dr. Ozan Kolbaş; Kasım Bolat, Arzu Enver Eroğan, Mustafa Karagüllüoğlu, Harun Korkmaz, Aslıhan Karay Özdaş and her mom, and Orçun Üçer. With my conversations with these distinguished people,

I have had illuminating guidance and mentorship. Therefore, I would like to extend my gratitude to all these people.

At the same time, the Turkish Touring Automobile Club (TTOK) and Boğaziçi University Foundation (BUVAK) helped me out with economic support in my graduate years at Boğaziçi University. My sincere gratitude to these organizations for providing me with this opportunity. Although an intensive quarantine was inevitable due to the coronavirus pandemic, my writing process lasted without in high spirits with my dearest friends: Aydın Ata, Feyzi C. Bağbozan, Berk Cıçık, Hülya Ersoy, Sadık H. Gül, Ertuğrul Karagöz, Semiha Karaoğlu, Ece Konuk, Alparslan Mimaroglu, M. Celal Özdemir, Z. Engin Pekel, and Bahadır Ülgey. Last but not least, my deepest thanks go to my precious parents Şevket Zorcu and Huriye Fidan Zorcu, as well as my angelic sister Damla. Again, I would like to express my appreciation to my dearest family members.

I finally must express my very profound gratitude to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who is one of the most significant figures among the founding staff of Modern Turkey. The great leader Atatürk enabled the writing of the *Republic* of Turkey on this thesis cover.

NOTE: The in-house editor of the Atatürk Institute has made detailed recommendations with regard to the format, grammar, spelling, usage, syntax, and style of this thesis.

“С одной логикой нельзя через натуру перескочить! Логика предугадает три случая, а их миллион! Отрезать весь миллион и всё на один вопрос о комфорте свести! Самое легкое разрешение задачи! Соблазнительно ясно, и думать не надо! Главное –думать не надо!”

– Фёдор Миха́йлович Достоевский,
Преступление и наказание.

“You cannot divert the course of nature by logic alone! Logic can anticipate three possibilities, but there are millions of them! Cut out all the millions and you bring it all down to the question of comfort!”

– Feodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*,
trans. Jessie Coulson (New York & London: W. W.
Norton & Company, 1989), 217.

Introduction

“Efendim, kulunuzu tohumluk olarak alıkodular.”

– *Maḥmūd Baba*¹

In the final years of the 1830s, Sultan Maḥmūd II visited his namesake, Maḥmūd *Baba*— a recent Naqshi sheik converted from Bektashi sheikhdom in his dervish lodge located on a hill near Rumelihisarı. During his visit, the Sultan asked, “I [ordered to] exiled all *Babas* there, how have you stayed?”. Maḥmūd *Baba* replied “Sir, they retained your servant just as seed is kept for sowing.”² In a literary sense, the answer by Maḥmūd *Baba* reminds the readers of the Maḥmūd regime in the 1830s and his long-standing legacy during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of Turkey.³ Understanding this legacy necessitates an investigation

¹ Ali Birinci, *Tarihin Alacakaranlığında: Meşâhir-i Meçhûleden Birkaç Zat-2* (Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2010), 59.

² Ibid, 58–59. For a description of *tohumluk* which is a Turkish word, *Kubbealtı Lugatı* (Istanbul: Kubbealtı Neşriyat, 2020), 3: 3217; <http://ingilizce.cagdassozluk.com/kamus/osmanlica-ingilizce-sozluk-madde-16922.html>, accessed October 26, 2020. For variations of this story, Günay Kut and Edhem Eldem, *Rumelihisarı Şehitlik Dergâhı Mezar Taşları* (Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010), 50–51.

³ For one critique of Westernization with using this notion, *seed*: Ali Yaycıoğlu, *Partners of the Empire* (California: Stanford University Press, 2016), 5–7.

of the Maḥmūd regime, his reforms in their respective scope, and the imperial vision of the Sultan.⁴ Such an investigation will help better understand the circumstances surrounding the late Ottoman period, particularly the activities of the empire's the ruling elite. First, the state-centered ideology and the policy of centralization pursued by Sultan Maḥmūd II continued uninterrupted during the late Ottoman period and even into the Republican eras. During the same period, the Sultan, fought against the provincial elites to achieve a centralized power based on his divine figure and resilience against his regional enemies. Second, the modernization attempts of the late Ottoman period, which reached its peak in the early Republican era, were also the characteristics of the reign of Maḥmūd II.⁵ Third, the last characteristic of the regime of Sultan Maḥmūd II was the autocracy of the Sultan, which also sheds light on the authoritarian aspect of the early Republican period.⁶ These three qualities briefly described above characterize the regime of Maḥmūd II. As such, processes of centralization, modernization, and autocracy have shaped the fundamentals of modern Turkish history, which goes well beyond the bounds of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Ottoman bureaucracy and ruling elites, as well as the most prominent figures of Republican Turkey continued to apply the policies that dated back to the times of Maḥmūd II, with comparable legacies and consequences. These three

⁴ In the Maḥmūd regime in the 1830s, the Sultan attempted to create a new imperial vision under the nationalist atmosphere in certain parts of the empire, with reforms based on the Sultanic figures like the Western type of monarch. For instance, his Sultanic portrait (*taşvîr-i hümayûn*) was exhibited in the administrative bureaus. Hakan T. Karateke, *Padişahım Çok Yaşa: Osmanlı Devletinin Son Yüzyılında Merasimler* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 6.

⁵ As the modernization vocabulary of the late Ottoman and the early Republican periods is extensively substantial, the historical word of *icâb-ı 'aşra inṭibāk* (adaptation to [the contemporary] necessity of the century) refers to a modernization notion as quiet and salient. İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010), 36.

⁶ One significant feature of the Maḥmūd regime was called autocracy in the academic investigation. Bernard Aldras Lalor, "The Politics and The Reforms of Sultan Mahmud (1826-1839)" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1975), 33-46.

predominant characteristics of the Maḥmūd regime were the starting points of many reforms that were carried out by Maḥmūd II during the late 1820s and 1830s. These reforms were described as the early attempts of the Ottoman modernization process in the existing literature, paving the way for the *Tanzīmāt* reforms.⁷

Following the three principal features of the Maḥmūd regime, the main premise at that time was the Sultan's legitimacy. When he was accessing the Ottoman throne in 1808, he ordered to kill his brother, Muṣṭafā IV, and the Sultan has left a solely male person among the dynasty.⁸ The solely male person among the royal family was himself and his duty was to continue the dynasty, according to the imperial succession. At the same time, there was imperial instability in different parts of the empire under the nationalist and separatist atmosphere during his rule. Thus, the Sultan came face-to-face with his own legitimacy problem due to these unstable conditions and power struggle among different groups within the imperial center and across the provincial settings. In order to overcome his legitimacy gap, he attempted many reformist policies within the three main schemes. At this point, the reforming package of the Maḥmūd regime became a more significant phase; was this reform package unique or was it a result of interactions? The global and internal interactions, I argue, were important markers of the Maḥmūd regime.⁹ To capture this interactive aspect of modernization, this thesis will examine the impact of Mehmed 'Alī Pasha on the decision-makers of Istanbul in

⁷ Cemal Kafadar, "Sunuş" In *Paşanın Adamları: Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Paşa, Ordu ve Modern Mısır* (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010), x. For methodological criticism about the early *Tanzīmāt* reforms as the modernization process' initial steps, Rifaat Abou El-Haj, *Formation of the Modern State* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2005), 68–72.

⁸ Deniz Türker, "Ottoman Victoriana: Nineteenth-Century Sultans and the Making of a Palace, 1795-1909" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 65. Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2017), 5: 96.

⁹ While the word international connotes the national features of the countries, the *ancien régime* of the Ottoman Empire was imperialist and did not rely on them. For this reason, this thesis will use the word, global.

the 1830s by particularly looking at the educational policies of the Maḥmūd regime, and particularly sending students abroad.

§ 1.1 Sending Students to Europe—A Global Movement

It is imperative to note that dispatching students to different cities of the world is still a policy lasting up until modern times. The Erasmus program within the European Union or exchange contracts among many universities in different countries provides students necessary' experience abroad, supported by their own government as well as the EU. In this process, the exchanged students often get rid of one-way education in their own country and gain many different experiences abroad. At this point, it is also possible to include the early decades of the twenty-first century into the periodical framework if one considers the continuation of the Turkish legal code in the Turkey Republic to send students to "foreign countries," enacted with Article no 1416.¹⁰ Actually, this legal code was a relatively final step in the process of sending students abroad because the Ottoman Empire had for long dispatched their own subjects to receive education in different fields ranging from military technology to science and engineering. Yet, the Ottomans were not alone in doing so. In fact, the policies of non-European governments from the Near East to the Japan Sea helps understand sending students abroad (particularly to European capitals and cities) as a global movement. As such, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, sending students to European cities has been a significant and widespread practice among non-European countries.

That being said, the scope of this master's thesis does not include the colonized territories by the Portuguese, Spanish, and Anglo-Saxon world such as Brazil and Mexico (for instance, Latin American colonies). The reason is that the present thesis attempts to emphasize the differences of non-colonized powers within the "old-world" context rather

¹⁰ For the law enacting the dispatching of students to foreign countries, "Ecnebi Memleketlere Gönderilecek Talebe Hakkında Kanun" *T.C. Resmî Gazete* (1169) April 16, 1929.

than exploring the practices of the colonized administrations in the Americas. Within this context, this section demonstrates the different actions concerning the steps to dispatch students to Europe by non-colonized bureaucracies. This concept was constructed with the relatively independent decision-making bodies and processes among non-colonized powers. In what follows then, I will accordingly investigate namely Qajar Iran, Egypt under Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha, Ottomans in Maḥmūd regime, as well as Tokugawa and Meiji Japan. Again, the main reason for conducting this research is also to draw attention to the commonalities among the non-European world by bestowing such global examples rather than establishing a novel theoretical background.

In the nineteenth century, Qajar dynasty initially sent students of the Near East. These students are conceptualized since Iran is one of the non-colonized countries that established student facilities in London in the early decades of the nineteenth century among non-European countries. Some people in the administration of the Qajar Iran, such as 'Abbas Mirza who occupied the position of the crown prince, considered to follow "necessities" of a new age (*asr-i jadid*) when adapting the know-how, information, and technology of the British Industrial Revolution.¹¹ The emerging developments in the neighboring governments, particularly the New Order of the Ottoman Sultan Selīm III, as well as the expansionist policy of Russia had an unavoidable impact on the administration of Qajar Iran.¹² 'Abbas Mirza's court contributed to Iranian history in terms of adapting new improvements abroad "for training as means to improve the military against foreign threats" specific to the policy of sending students.¹³ They would receive education abroad in the early decades of the nineteenth century by 'Abbaz Mirza, also supported by the reformist Prime Minister Mirza Issa Qaem Maqam.¹⁴ Within this framework, he

¹¹ Nile Green, *The Love of Strangers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 6–7.

¹² Ibid, 7.

¹³ Nikkie R. Keddie, *Modern Iran, Roots and Results of Revolution* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006), 40.

¹⁴ M. H. Azizi & F. Azizi, "Government-Sponsored Iranian Medical Students Abroad (1811–1935)" *Iranian Studies*, 43 (2010): 354.

began to send eight students who were of Muslim background.¹⁵ These students were called *karevan-e ma'refat*.¹⁶ Moreover, Sir Harford Jones, the British ambassador to Iran, took two young Iranians back to London in 1811.¹⁷ The first dispatched student in London under the supervision of a British ambassador, Muhammad Kazim received medical education and passed away during his time in London.¹⁸ Another dispatched student from Iran to London, Hajji Baba Afshar, received training in medicine.¹⁹ In 1815, the second batch included five people. 'Abbas Mirza also dispatched the second group.²⁰ Mirza Riza was one of these students sent abroad and received education about artillery.²¹ He also established the printing press upon returning to Iran and printed at least one book after the first publication of Zayn al-'Abidin's first printing press in 1817.²² The second student was Mirza Ja'far who specialized in chemistry. Muhammad Ali was the third student among these students who had training in blacksmithing. Mirza Salih of Shiraz, whose diary will be illustrated in the following paragraph, was another student in London who mastered the English language and became a translator for the Iranian government in the following years. Mirza Ja'far Husayni, who received an education in engineering, was the fifth student on the first Iranian voyage to London. In addition to that, the Iranian experience, like the Turkish experience, continued dispatching their citizens as international students abroad to

¹⁵ Green, *The Love of*, 2. The originating countries of students from various non-European countries will be called "the national background" throughout the thesis since the thesis will distinguish all students who were Muslim and came from different countries. In other words, I will use the "national persona" to characterize the students' background and identity throughout the research, even though religious identity was more potent than "national identity" at that time.

¹⁶ "The caravan of understanding" Farhang Rajaei, *Islamism and Modernism: The Changing Discourse in Iran* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), 8.

¹⁷ Green, *The Love of*, 4.

¹⁸ Ibid, 4.

¹⁹ Ibid, 35. Azizi & Azizi, "Government-Sponsored", 354.

²⁰ Green, *The Love of*, 7.

²¹ Ibid, 3.

²² Ibid, 305-306.

have them educated in science during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which continued well into the aftermath of the Pahlavi dynasty. For instance, dispatched students to the USA published *Payam-e Mojahed* newspaper, which supported the Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic political thought from June 1972 until September 1978.²³

Providing an example of a microhistorical study, Nile Green examines Mirza Salih's diary where he initially narrated the sites he visited, ranging from the Oxford Madrasas to the botanic gardens as well as watermills.²⁴ Although Green preferred to translate *'ulum-i jadid* literally as "new sciences," this word means contemporary sciences, and etymologically, this word possibly came from Ottoman *Nizām-ı Cedīd* (the New Order) period. There is also a plethora of pro-modernization words within non-colonized world. These words reflect their relations with the ideological currents of the nineteenth century, even though there has been a tendency to criticize the intensive modernist investigations about "new sciences" during the nineteenth century in the literature. The Iranian students' acquisition of new sciences, and languages is another theme of Mirza Salih's diary. It also covered the activities in the high and ordinary social life of London with concrete illustrations. The locations Persian students lived in London, the visits they received from different religious or academic groups such as Unitarians, their trips to the diverse parks of the city.²⁵ These students' relationships with the opposite sex and foreigners such as Professor Samuel Lee are different themes of the diary.²⁶ Touching upon the financial circumstances, elaborated on the economic situation of students and its impact on their educational process are its interesting points.²⁷

²³ "Message of soldier of the holy war" http://www.iranianoralhistory.de/allg/printed_collection_link.html, accessed January 29, 2021, Rajee, *Islamism*, 137.

²⁴ Green, *The Love of*, 319. Mirza Salih's observations about the English degree ceremony in Oxford: Green, *The Love of*, 89–93. For madrasas, 117–121. For watermills, 121–128.

²⁵ For Unitarians, *Ibid*, 133–176, for parks in London, 283–288.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 288–299.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 30–40, 43–46, 48–50, 60–61, 69, 301.

Similar policies were adopted by the *Tokugawa Bakufu*, the government of the *ancien régime* of Japan, as well as the later Meiji governments which sent students to European and Russian capitals in the last half of the nineteenth century. Some research examined and revealed how the Japanese *Bakufu* government dispatched students to the British Empire and the United States.²⁸ The reasons in dispatching students to different parts of the world, just like the Iranian example, were mostly political. According to Takeshi Inoue, sending students abroad was part of the larger process of importing Western culture and civilization to Japan, since, when they were abroad, the students had the opportunity to observe Western civilization. Another means of importing the Western mentality and ideology was through assigning Western scholars and engineers to work within Japan. The third and final approach is the translation process of Western books.²⁹ At that time, it is inevitable to state that the Japanese *ancien régime* continued the *Sakoku* policy, which means the period of national isolation of the ancient Japanese history during the *Tokugawa shogunate*.³⁰ Even under the Japanese isolation period, the policy of sending students abroad continued. There was the idea to dispatch students or members of diplomatic missions abroad and the government declared the proclamation on May 21, 1866, that enacting the sending students abroad.³¹ This decision was taken in the period to relax and loosen of the *Sakoku* policy which was the *ancien* policy of Japan to stay away from the other countries.³² After the first declaration, the new government in Tōkyō, namely the Meiji administration, issued *kaigai ryoko kisoku* (a proclamation) on May 28, 1869, about the policy in sending students abroad.³³

²⁸ Takeshi Inoue, "Japanese Students in England and the Meiji Government's Foreign Employees (Oyatoi): The People Who Supported Modernisation in the Bakumatsu-Early Meiji Period" *Discussion Paper Series*, 40 (2018): 1–30.

²⁹ Ibid, 3.

³⁰ <https://jisho.org/search/%E9%8E%96%E5%9B%BD>, accessed June 26, 2021.

³¹ "Those who want to travel overseas for purposes of study or commerce will be allowed to do so when they ask for permission," Inoue, "Japanese Students", 4, footnote: 9.

³² Ibid, 4.

³³ "Rules on Traveling Overseas" Ibid, 6, footnote: 10.

However, the first five students sent to London from the Chōshū domain constituted the first group in 1863 under the diplomatic mission. These students were Hirobumi Ito, Kaoru Inoue, Kinsuke Endo, Masaru Inoue, and Yozo Yamao.³⁴ Likewise, the Satsuma domain of the *Tokugawa* Shogunate dispatched fifteen students under two supervisors in 1865.³⁵ Tomoatsu Godai, who was one of these two supervisors, scheduled this plan.³⁶ In 1862, the *Bakufu* government started to engage in international cultural and intellectual exchange with Holland. The *Tokugawa* shogunate sent students to Holland. Furthermore, these students received education on “the practical aim of acquiring knowledge of military technology.”³⁷ Driven by the same motivations, similar educational missions began to spread to Russia, England, and France in the following years. Final impressions and points about the Japanese sending policy can be summarized in three points which are as follows: first, there were some improvement policies for the Japanese students abroad during the Meiji government. The second is the tendency that the location of the dispatched students was spreading from the Western European capitals to the Russian capital, St. Petersburg. Japan considered St. Petersburg as a Western part of the globe, based on its geographical location and global perspective. The last impression is the use of the diaries and letters written by the students in studies describing the Iranian and Japanese experiences. This contrasts to the Ottoman experience, where the documents from the Ottoman archives are the only available primary source that could help us reconstruct the experiences of Ottoman students.

In conclusion, the discussion summarized above in broad strokes the initial activities of the non-European as well as non-colonized governments in terms of their educational missions abroad. The crown prince of the Qajar Iran, ‘Abbas Mirza, for example, dispatched six students to London to attain *‘ulum-i jadid*. Similar motivations characterized

³⁴ Ibid, 7.

³⁵ For detailed information, Andrew Cobbing, *The Japanese Discovery of Victorian Britain* (London & New York: Routledge, 1998), 24–25.

³⁶ Inoue, “Japanese Students”, 8.

³⁷ Ibid, 8.

the decision of *Tokugawa* and Meiji Japan in “the Far East” to dispatch students abroad. While these two contexts a commonality of governmental mentalities from Iran to Japan, similar educational missions also took place during the reign of Maḥmūd II. In the Ottoman case, however, Istanbul came to compete with Cairo in sending students abroad.

§ 1.2 Literature Review

The subject of sending students to Europe to provide them with the opportunity to become educated in the latest scientific formation has been a popular topic of inquiry in Turkish historiography. Until recent studies, the historiography has been under the influence of decline paradigm—which was a very prominent theme in Bernard Lewis’ investigations.³⁸ Ottoman history narratives from the administrative perspective as well as the biographical studies handled this topic for the first time.³⁹ Furthermore, the dissertations written in consideration with the primary sources of the Ottoman Archive in the early 2000s illuminated different aspects of this subject.⁴⁰ Besides, the continuation of the classification process in the Ottoman Archive contributed to the current studies with invaluable documents.⁴¹ In other words, the classification process

³⁸ Alp Eren Topal, “From Decline to Progress: Ottoman Concepts of Reform 1600-1876” (PhD diss., Bilkent University, 2017), 1. Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: McGill University Press, 1998), 111–112. Bernard Lewis, *The Middle East and the West* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964), 39. Nurdal Agras, “II. Mahmud Dönemi Islahat Hareketleri ve II. Mahmud’un Eğitim Öğretim Faaliyetleri” (MA thesis, Selçuk University, 2010), 113–114.

³⁹ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 162. Midhat Sertoğlu, *Mufasssal Osmanlı Tarihi* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2011), 5: 2924. İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadrazamlar* (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), 1: 600–636. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, “İbrahim Edhem Paşa Âilesi ve Halil Edhem Eldem (1861-1938)” In *Halil Edhem Hâtıra Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2013), 369–382.

⁴⁰ Aynur Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusunun Sosyolojik Çözümlemesi” (MA thesis, Istanbul University, 2009). Adnan Şişman, “Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa’ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri (1839-1876)” (PhD diss., Istanbul University, 1983).

⁴¹ Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışına”, 4–5.

involves newly emerging research as well, enabling researchers to consult previously ignored or unexamined documents. The present section will examine two of such theses written to unearth the Ottoman policy from the 1830s until the Republican Era, next to the reviews about the same educational policy by Mehmed 'Alī Pasha. Given the organic relations emerging between these investigations, this thesis marks a new step in unearthing and unveiling the Ottoman experience based on the latest documents in the Ottoman Archive; however, this master's thesis is not the final step. Neither is it a conclusive piece of research.

The first remarkable piece of research is Adnan Şişman's study which was completed at Istanbul University in 1983. In 2004, the Turkish Historical Association (TTK) published this dissertation as a monograph.⁴² This thesis comprehensively analyzed students sent to Paris, France, between 1839 until 1876 by the *Tanzīmāt* governments. At this point, the novelty of his work is the usage of extensive documentation; however, it lacks an overall argument. The introductory part of the book provides background information. One of the most significant points of this study is that it uncovered the initial years when students were sent to Europe, a topic that remained obscure until his research. Şişman also defined the precise date of sending the first students abroad as December 14, 1830, a conclusion supported by the archival documents.⁴³ Previously, different years ranging from 1826 to 1831 were given by several historians as the year when students were first sent to Europe. In particular, the year 1827 gained outstanding recognition among scholars.⁴⁴ This was largely because Bernard Lewis, a prominent scholar, master, and expert on historical studies in the English language revolving around Ottoman

⁴² Adnan Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa'ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri* (1839-1876) (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2004).

⁴³ BOA. CH. 6708. Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*, 5.

⁴⁴ Ercüment Kuran, "Sultan II. Mahmud ve Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Paşa'nın Gerçekleştirdikleri Reformların Karşılıklı Tesirleri" In *Sultan II. Mahmud ve Reformları Semineri* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1990), 109. Sertoğlu, *Mufasssal Osmanlı*, 5: 2924. Osman Zahit Küçükler, "Osmanlı Devletinde Eğitimde Modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş" (Phd Diss., Ankara University, 2016), 27.

history, suggested 1827 as the correct year.⁴⁵ As such, Lewis had an inevitable influence on the following generation of scholars, misguiding the non-Turkish historiography regarding this subject. As an illustration, one of the relatively new studies, *Science Among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge*, suggested 1827 as a consequence of the impact of Lewis.⁴⁶ Similarly, the famous book, *Tanzimat*, printed in the commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of Gülhâne ıhtıfâ hümayûn, pointed to 1827.⁴⁷ Providing different insight, Mustafa Cezar and Uzunçarşılı claimed the year 1829 as the correct one.⁴⁸

Within this study, another point to discuss is a claim about a student named 'Alî dispatched in the 1820s.⁴⁹ The archival documents reveal the date of the dispatching as 1836. However, the claim regarding the 1820s as the correct year information is a point that needs emphasis and correction. According to Erdoğan's thesis which is next in line, 'Alî individually went to Paris in the 1820s, which showed a contradiction in Şişman's thesis.

The most important matter on this topic is dispatching of one hundred and fifty Muslim students to Europe with the *irāde-i şāhāne* (written order of the Sultan) of Maḥmūd II.⁵⁰ Karal put forward this claim using the historiography of Aḥmed Lutfî *Efendi*.⁵¹ However, Lutfî *Efendi* explained the postponement. At this point, Karal used Lutfî *Efendi*'s

⁴⁵ Lewis, *The Middle*, 39.

⁴⁶ Miri Shefer-Mossensohn, *Science among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015), 79–80, 189.

⁴⁷ Cavit Baysun, "Mustafa Reşit Paşa" In *Tanzimat* (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1940), 736–737.

⁴⁸ Mustafa Cezar, *Sanatta Batı'ya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi* (Istanbul: Erol Kerim Aksoy Kültür, Eğitim, Spor ve Sağlık Vakfı Yayını: 1995), 1: 378. Uzunçarşılı, "İbrahim Edhem", 269.

⁴⁹ Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*, 4.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 2. Lewis, *The Middle*, 39. Maḥmūd II enacted this order. However, in the investigation process in the Ottoman Archive, it was not possible to find this document. Aḥmed Lutfî's related input dates this order with its previous and following inputs. Therefore, it is predictable that the relevant dates of this document are between September 1829 and February 1830. Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi, *Vak'anüvîs Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi Tarihi* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları & Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 2-3: 444.

⁵¹ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 162.

explanation though not entirely and this usage misguided the historians. He and his followers continued to write on sending one hundred and fifty Muslim students to Europe without questioning. Bernard Lewis, a prominent historian, and Turkish popular academics such as Erhan Afyoncu, repeated this information without questioning.⁵² The Ottoman system started to send the four students to Paris on December 14, 1830, according to the Şişman's analysis. Finally, Şişman's work on the student identities, their departure and return date, their employment situation in the following years, and their schools in the various European cities are the cardinal parts of the work. The table created based on this information about the students should exist in this analysis with the much-needed reevaluations and corrections.

Following this substantial study, another study is Aynur Erdoğan's theses written under in the sociology department at Istanbul University. This master's thesis also discusses the impact of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha on the Ottoman policy to send students to Europe in the nineteenth century. While Adnan Şişman's method proceeds to explain the nineteenth-century conditions of the topic, Erdoğan's study does not show a remarkable difference from that of its precedents. The main difference is that Erdoğan used documents in Ottoman intensively and corrected information in this way. The content of the study remained more or less the same in this manner. Her study encapsulates the Ottoman policy regarding the topic from 1830 until the Hamidian regime in 1876. At this point, the elaboration of the Maḥmūd regime within the *Tanzīmāt* context is significant to explain the details of the pre-*Tanzīmāt* period. In other words, Erdoğan did not limit the *Tanzīmāt* policies and articulated the dispatching students to the European capitals like Paris and London during the reign of Maḥmūd II. Throughout her thesis, she fixed up many problematic issues in historiography by using a diversity of primary sources from the Ottoman Archive. She shed light on many questionable points in her thesis, such as the dispatching date of the first group of the Ottomans.

52

Lewis, *The Middle East*, 39. Erhan Afyoncu, *Sorularla Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2008), 6: 67–68.

Erdoğan also presented the document, used for the first time in the literature by Şişman, within the framework of the problematics. Erdoğan also gathered, classified, and argued the reasons behind the dispatching of students based on four categories in the Introduction part of the study. These four categories are the officers for the newly Europeanized army, the instructors for the novel Europeanized schools, the personnel for the foreign relations with Europe, and the personnel for the new industrial field.

When Erdoğan explains the period during the *Tanzīmāt* process, she does not narrate the reforms of the Maḥmūd regime but discusses them using many important archival documents. Similarly, Erdoğan's claim that the actions of this period were noninstitutionalized, contributed to different arguments regarding the analyses of the topic.⁵³ On the other hand, Erdoğan's thesis had two points that are open to criticism. The first one is the use of the decline paradigm as the chief argument in her thesis. In this matter, the discussion of the establishment of the Ottoman printing office is an excellent example to understand the decline paradigm because the traditional historiography had politically highlighted and problematized this example on the printing office. The latter is the claim about Egyptian relations with the Ottoman world. According to her study, the dispatching of students by Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha did not lead to an interact with the Ottomans.⁵⁴

Erdoğan expanded her discussion in her doctoral dissertation which analyses the same policy, the sending students to Europe. She covers the time range from the late-Ottoman period, the Hamidian regime, and its legacy on the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) until the period that witnessed the emergence of the Kemalist ideology. Her initial study summarized the dispatching of students to Europe during the Maḥmūd regime. Her doctoral dissertation is a continuation of her master's thesis and presents an integral part of the Ottoman experience of dispatching students to Europe. In conclusion, Erdoğan has contributed

⁵³ Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Yurtdışına", 4-5.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 47.

to the topic with her informative and illuminating pieces based on the primary sources.

In short, Istanbul-centered literature did not take into account the developments in Egypt. Nor did it question the possible impact of the policies of Meḥmed 'Alī on the reform policies in Istanbul. Meḥmed 'Alī of Egypt initially began to send the Turkish, Armenian, and Arabian students to different cities of Europe, Rome, London, and Paris. One of the fascinating studies about the Pasha and his activities in the Egyptian territory is D.A. Cameron's book named *Egypt in the Nineteenth Century*.⁵⁵ Cameron constructed a narrative that centered Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha's policies and heritage covering the period from the Mamluks period of Egypt until the British occupation in 1882. This study like the other analysis at that time did not claim one overall argument and demonstrated historical narratives; therefore, this historical narrative was written within the colonialist intention, according to the publication date of his book. He referred to his policy of dispatching students to Europe in a general way: "between 1825 and 1834 about a hundred pupils were sent to France; after that, date several went to England, and most of such students entered the public service."⁵⁶ He did not include detailed information. However, this attempt contributed to J. Heyworth-Dunne's understanding that studied the Pasha's policy to dispatch students abroad in his book. Because of his collection having ex libris figure of Heyworth-Dunne, it would be possible to say Heyworth-Dunne used Cameron's book.⁵⁷

Like Cameron's investigation, Henry Dodwell explored the dispatched students in different European cities in a general way. The first large student mission was assessed like other studies; on the other hand, he showed primary sources in his footnotes particularly those from the British Foreign Office.⁵⁸ Dodwell also wanted to deal with the modern

⁵⁵ D. A. Cameron, *Egypt in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1898).

⁵⁶ Ibid, 212.

⁵⁷ <https://archive.org/details/egyptinnineteen00camegoog>, accessed June 27, 2021.

⁵⁸ Henry Dodwell, *The Founder of Modern Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931), 203, 238. "So early as 1826 no less than forty-five young men, the sons of Arab

times of Egypt under Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha's policies and new direction among the non-European powers. He mentioned that "In 1835 the Shah of Persia had contemplated the despatch [dispatch] of an envoy to Cairo. In 1838 a member of the Persian mission at Constantinople visited the vice-roy. In the next year the Shah was reported to be going to send fifty young Persians to Cairo to be educated, and early in 1840 a Persian messenger arrived with valuable gifts."⁵⁹ In both Dodwell's and Cameron's studies, their explanation of the policy of sending students to Europe in a general way is critical because the understanding of the early and middle of the twentieth century in the historiography consider this policy as a stimulus part of modernization (possibly, "Westernization"). Not only Anglo-Saxon historiography but also Turkish historiography took into account this sending movement abroad as an essential part of the modernization periods. It is also possible to review Bernard Lewis' studies within this mentality as mentioned in the following lines.

J. Heyworth-Dunne is the most important study to reveal the Egyptian student mission in different cities of Europe within the Egyptian educational history. He investigated the education system of Egypt from the traditional system in the eighteenth century until the last decades of the nineteenth century.⁶⁰ Because of the traditional education system related to religious knowledge and identity, the author considered the different religious groups and their relations with the education process. In this manner, his notice on the Muslim society and its education process in mosques and madrasas, the non-Muslim communities such as Jews, Copts, Greeks, and Franciscans, continued their education process within religious frameworks like the Muslim community in Egypt. According to Heyworth-Dunne, the Western impact which shaped the traditional Egyptian system was termed as a penetration process of Western

shaikhs [sheikhs] and others, were sent to France to be educated there and rendered less unfit for public employment."

⁵⁹ Ibid, 143.

⁶⁰ J. Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt* (London: Luzac & Co., 1938).

culture.⁶¹ These educational missions were elaborated within three sub-themes: the first mission in 1809 and its the following decade, the second mission between 1837 and 1843, as well as the third mission betwixt 1844 and 1849.⁶² The most significant piece of this study is giving the students' names, biographical data, and schedule in weekday and weekend times with detail for this present thesis. The author also used many different sources written in Arabic, English, and French. This diversity contributed to show the biographical data of the Egyptian students and their living conditions in hometowns and abroad. Again, this study did not argue any overall argument.

Bernard Lewis investigated the relationship between "the West" and "the East" when emphasizing political, cultural, and economic differences between the two spheres of the globe. Within the context of the Egyptian reform movement, he argued that the first batch of students departed in 1809 upon the decision of Meḥmed 'Alī. The destination of this mission was Italy, since, according to Alain Silvera, the Italian language was the lingua franca in the Levant during that period.⁶³ This process lasted until 1818, and from that moment on, the total population of Egyptian students abroad reached twenty-three.⁶⁴ According to Lewis, the first large student group, consisting of forty-four students, departed to Paris in 1826. Lewis also wrongly continues to argue that Sultan Maḥmūd II started to send students in 1827 as discussed in the previous lines.⁶⁵ Lewis attempted to summarize the dispatching policy of the Near Eastern powers without detailed information. On the other hand, Silvera studied the first mission comprehensively in the 1980s because the author not only showed the descriptive information but also criticize Heyworth-Dunne's and Lewis' studies. Silvera also narrated the history of the first large mission that included students. The significant point of this article

⁶¹ Ibid, vii, 96, 105–115.

⁶² Ibid, 104–111, 221–223, 243–264.

⁶³ Lewis, *The Middle*, 39. Dodwell, *The Founder*, 238. Alain Silvera, "The First Egyptian Student Mission to France under Muhammad Ali" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 16 (1980): 7.

⁶⁴ Lewis, *The Middle East*, 39.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 39.

is to use the documents which were written in different languages, especially French. The article consults the French language and French documents to a large extent, though the author also considered the Ottoman context and perspectives into his discussion.⁶⁶

§ 1.3 Argument and Structure

The literature has not paid enough attention to the conflicts among the interests of provincial notables' powers like *a'yān*, as well as the leaders of religious groups on the way the Ottoman reforms evolved over time. In fact, because of the pronounced tendency to understand the relation between the Ottoman reforms and the transformations of the Kemalist regime as linear, these interest conflicts did not find enough voice in scholarship. However, the recent historiography put forward the imperial provinces' impact on the imperial center in terms of surviving their political powers and adapting the new mentality of Western knowledge and science. At this point, it should be revealed that the trajectories of Cairo and Istanbul in terms of modernization were discussed in the literature; however, I disagree with this perspective about the exclusive modernization processes of the Egyptian and Ottoman. Isa Blumi's perspective in his book, *Foundations of Modernity*, framed the Ottoman modernization process as a "by-product of these very locally-rooted regimes," for instance.⁶⁷ In other words, the Ottoman reforms like *Tanzīmāt* were by-products of local leaders of the Ottoman provinces, 'Alī Pasha of Ioannina and Mehmed 'Alī Pasha in Cairo.⁶⁸ Similarly, his point about the association of the Egyptian and Ottoman worlds explained that "the role of those who could mobilize the necessary work crew to build a new bridge and dredge the Nile delta marshes was as much a component of an Age of Ayans or the period of transformation as Napoleon or Selim III."⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Silvera, "The First Egyptian" 1.

⁶⁷ Isa Blumi, *Foundations of Modernity* (New York & London: Routledge, 2012), 17.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 17.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 22.

By building upon this critical literature, this thesis will also argue that the Egyptian impact on the Ottoman political world in Istanbul is one aspect of the interaction among the central empire and political elites in the provinces. This present thesis will investigate the Egyptian interaction with the Ottoman reform movement until the *Tanzīmāt* period (conceivably also within the *Tanzīmāt* period until 1876). Inevitably, the thesis admits the scope and range of its research and as such revealing all the interaction between the Egyptian and the Ottoman powers is beyond the purview of a master's thesis. Therefore, the analysis will only focus on the educational missions abroad. Did Mehmed 'Alī Pasha have an impact on Maḥmūd II's policy of sending students to Europe? In answering this question, I argue that a Cairo impact was present on the decision-makers of Istanbul regarding the policy to send students to European capitals and cities.

That being said, one should note that the Ottoman modernization period and its policy of sending students abroad can be approached from a number of different angles and questions. Was there any Anglo-French impact on the specific reforms at the time? Or, given the Iranian and Japanese reforms—can we consider the reforms of the Ottomans as reflective of a large “international” trend? Finally, another possible inquiry can be to trace the possible networks among the bureaucrats in the state apparatus and their impact in shaping reforms? Such questions could certainly help overcome nationalist history writings by tracing the global trends. Although these beneficial questions can illustrate many different results, this present thesis will focus attention on the Egyptian impact on the decision-makers in Istanbul during the 1830s.

The next chapter provides a historical background of the relationships between the Maḥmūd regime in Istanbul and Mehmed 'Alī in Cairo during the initial decades of the nineteenth century after the fall of French occupation in 1801. Three main sections reveal the historical accounts of the links between Cairo's and Istanbul's powers: the establishment of Mehmed 'Alī regime in power and his succession, its Ottoman-oriented policies until the final years of the 1820s, and the confrontation period during the 1830s until the 'Abdūlmecīd's order in 1841. This

categorization of the Ottoman-Egyptian relationships as such will help contextualize their actions at different times. Doing so will also demonstrate the competition between these two governments.

The third chapter will examine the Meḥmed 'Alī's policy of dispatching students who were composed of not only Arabs from Egypt but also Turkish, Circassian, and Armenian students from Anatolia to European cities like Rome and Paris. In other words, this chapter will analyze the dispatch and return dates of students, while also giving background information on students as well as the schools they attended. This chapter helps demonstrate the interactions between Istanbul and Cairo of the 1830s in dispatching students in European capitals by revealing Meḥmed 'Alī's reform and the list of his students abroad.

The following section discusses the impact of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha on the Maḥmūd regime based on arguments such as the bureaucratic competition between the cadres of Cairo and Istanbul, the conflict process during the 1830s, as well as the timing of the policies of Meḥmed 'Alī and Maḥmūd II. Ultimately, this chapter argues that Meḥmed 'Alī's reform to assign students abroad in 1826 had an impact on the implementation of the same reform in Istanbul due to shared authoritative arguments and deliberations. The present chapter also examines the dispatching of students to Europe by the Maḥmūd regime during the 1830s, with recourse to archival documents. Ḥüsrev Pasha sent four students to Paris among his slave upon Sultan's consent on December 14, 1830. From this point on, the students mentioned will be referred to as semi-official students with another student sent by Ḥüsrev Pasha in 1831. In the following years, the Ottoman Empire sent students to Europe from the Engineering Schools, the Military School, and the Medical College. This process continued to uninterrupted during the Maḥmūd regime as well as its successors. The chapter explores the students from the Ottoman new-type schools during the 1830s and their dispatch and return dates, their schools in the European capitals, by using archival investigations and secondary sources. Şişman's study will exhibit the main list of students dispatched during the Maḥmūd regime, with some corrections provided thanks to the archival documents from the Ottoman Archive.

Explaining the sources consulted for this present thesis necessitates a categorization of the sources as primary and secondary sources. The former includes mainly the documents from the Ottoman Archives. The documents belonging to the different departments of the archives unveil the Ottoman reform within the possibilities of the research. The imperial edicts, named *ḥaṭṭ-ı hümāyūn*; *Cevdet Askeriye* and *Cevdet Maarif* classified by Mu'allim Cevdet in the Archive, were collected and consulted with in order to advance the arguments of this thesis.⁷⁰ Other primary sources include newspapers and articles published in journals of the respective periods. For instance, the scanned issues of *Taḳvīm-i Veḳāyi'* in the Latin scripts was one of the primary sources. Furthermore, the elaboration of the Orientalist Edme-Francois Jomard's article in the magazine *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* on Meḥmed 'Alī's policy dispatching students policy Cairo to Paris was another primary source. Another significance of the present thesis is in its use of cultural elements of the respective period. A plethora of political and military data from the Ottoman Archives helped create the historical narrative of the related topic within the Turkish academic literature. On the other hand, Gönül Tekin opines that the existing research did not put enough emphasis on cultural elements of the respective historical periods.⁷¹ The present thesis reveals such cultural elements as compositions and verses by the Sultan during his reign to unveil the cultural aspects of the period. Furthermore, the research also includes personal and artistic details about the Sultan himself. The latter are the secondary sources and evaluated in the literature review section of the thesis, as mentioned previously. Finally, one should note that the transcription method will be the primary means to decipher characters from the Ottoman Turkish language.⁷² A significant

⁷⁰ *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi* (Istanbul: BOA Yayınları, 2017), 268.

⁷¹ Private Correspondence, May 24, 2014.

⁷² The main transcription method of this master's thesis relies on Şemsī Aḥmed Paşa, *Şehnâme-i Sultân Murād* (The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University: SOLL 56, 2003), 87.

description of the transcription method of the Ottoman documents also helps illustrate this detail further.⁷³

⁷³ Mübahat Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2018), 13. Also, this article clearly demonstrates the ill-structured of the transcription method within the studies about the Turkish literature. Günay Kut, ““Budinli Hisâlî Dîvânî’ Yayını Üzerine” *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 43 (2015): 71–115.

Ottoman-Egyptian Relationships in the Early Decades of the Nineteenth Century

This chapter aims to display the historical background of Ottoman-Egyptian relationship in the first half of the nineteenth century. The growing power of Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha at that time was the main theme in the history of Ottoman Egypt; moreover, his contentious interactions with the imperial center has been significant to understand not only the making of Egypt but the understandings among the imperial elites in the 1820s and 1830s—in fact, informing well into the *Tanzīmāt* period. Now, this chapter traces the relationships between the Ottoman center and Meḥmed ‘Alī of Egypt under different sections: the early nineteenth century in Egypt, the Ottoman-oriented campaigns, and the conflict against the Ottoman imperial power.

§ 2.1 The Early Nineteenth Century in Egypt

Ottomans conquered different parts of the “old-world” extending from the eastern-European parts to the Near Eastern provinces accessed to Africa, the imperial power in Istanbul used provincial notables to rule

the provinces in the following years under the Ottoman control.¹ Again, this traditional practice of the Ottoman rulers was carried out after the conquest of Egypt in 1517 by Selīm I, and the Mamluk's existence in the Egyptian administration continued until the first years of the nineteenth century.² During this process, the power in Istanbul only sent the governor from the Ottoman bureaucratic system. The Ottoman official historians who narrated any activity about Cairo also mentioned the political conditions of these Mamluk notables, namely *Mısır beğleri* (Egyptian governor) or *kölemen* (slave soldier).³ As a result, the Mamluk notables in Egypt remained until the massacre of them by Meḥmed 'Alī. At this point, the most prominent event in the threshold between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the French expedition to Egypt. The French military mission at Napoléon Bonaparte's command initially invaded the island of Malta on June 12, 1798, and accessed the port of Alexandria on July 2 of the same year.⁴ The main motivation of the French was to compete with the British interests on the Near Eastern geography and gain a colony in the Eastern Mediterranean.⁵ At this time, when Sultan Selīm III and the Sublime Porte agreed with the Russian and British empires, they ordered Mamluk notables to defend themselves, and immediately did not declare war against the French expedition because the imperial center was in the midst of a fight against Pazvandoğlu, a local powerbroker in Vidin located in modern Bulgaria. At that time, Istanbul also tackled the initial incidents by the Wahhabi group in the Near East to overcome.⁶ While the Ottomans secured diplomatic backing from London and St.

¹ For the illustrate of Karaman province, Halil İncalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest" *Studia Islamica*, 2 (1954): 118.

² Feridun Emecen, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kurulu ve Yükseliş Tarihi (1300-1699)* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015), 225–227.

³ Câbî Ömer Efendi, *Câbî Târihi: Târih-i Sultân Selîm-i Sâlis ve Mahmûd-ı Sâni* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2003), 40–41. *Kubbealtı Lugatı* (Istanbul: Kubbealtı Neşriyat, 2020), 2: 1785.

⁴ Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2017), 5: 27.

⁵ Ibid, 27.

⁶ Ibid, 30–36. Nicolae Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi (1774-1912)* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2009), 5: 114–124, 127–140.

Petersburg, the Napoléon Bonaparte's army started invading Syrian territories, because geographic position of Egypt necessitated control of Syria in order to conserve French existence in Egypt.⁷ Following the French defeat by Anglo-Ottoman cooperation in Acre of 1799, Napoléon returned to France due to the Austrian attack on the French army in August 1799; the French troops withdrew with the Treaty of Paris on August 30, 1802, after the British army's landing troops to Alexandria in March 1801.⁸ The Ottoman power consequently conserved its sovereignty rights on Egypt, and the Russian navy crossed the Straits of Istanbul and Dardanelles for the first time.⁹ British interests reached the island of Malta in the context of the results of French occupation in Egypt and the British military base stayed in Egypt under General John Hutchinson.¹⁰ In Egypt, the withdrawal of the French, there were two groups left, namely the Ottoman army under Hürşid Pasha and the Mamluk notables.¹¹

The main significance of this occupation process by the French troops was the arrival of Mehmed 'Alī from Kavala to Egypt. The Ottoman center had called the Kavala governor collect a military unit consisted of 300 men as part of the larger bid to face the French, and accordingly the governor dispatched a military unit under the command of 'Alī Āğā. This force from Kavala included Mehmed 'Alī. During the expedition, Mehmed 'Alī from Kavala became the head of this military group.¹² In 1801, he was also one of two leaders of the Albanian troops in the Ottoman force of Egypt with Ṭāhir Pasha.¹³ As a result of the ongoing political struggles involving the Albanian troops, Mamluk *beğleri* as well as the Ottoman army, with different collaboration and conflicts, Mehmed 'Alī finally

⁷ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 39.

⁸ Ibid, 41–42. Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2011), 7: 100–103.

⁹ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 42–43.

¹⁰ Stanford J. Shaw, *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III 1789–1807* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 276.

¹¹ Henry Dodwell, *The Founder of Modern Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931), 13.

¹² Ibid, 10.

¹³ Ibid, 11, 13.

gained the upper hand.¹⁴ The Sublime Porte assigned him as the governor of Egypt in order to stabilize the governance of this geography in 1804.¹⁵

One of these different political struggles is the extermination of the Mamluk notables. In the words of Dodwell,

“...and Muhammad ‘Ali resolved to make an end of these fallen tyrants of the country. To achieve this[,] it was desirable to assemble as many as possible in some secure place from which they could not escape. On March I the pasha’s son was to be invested with a dress of honour as Pasha of Jidda and commander of the troops to be despatched [dispatched] against the Wahabi heretics in the Hijaz. All the Mameluke chiefs were invited to the ceremony, and encouraged to bring with them as many followers as they chose. Entirely deceived, they thronged to the citadel, to take part in the procession which was to march to camp by the Gate of Victories—the Bab-al-Futuh. From the platform of rock on which the chief buildings of the citadel were erected there ran down to the Bab-al-Azab (by which you pass to the Maidan Rumelia) a steep winding passage, cut in the rock, and commanded at every point for the destruction of any enemy who should force the gate. Down this path the troops moved—first some bodies of Ottoman soldiers, then the Albanians, then the Mamelukes, and then another body of infantry and horse. But when the foremost party of the troops had reached and passed the gate, the Albanian commander ordered the gate to be shut and barred, and his men turned and opened fire on the descending Mamelukes. The passage was speedily blocked by dead men and horses.”¹⁶

With “the Beneficial Event” of Egypt, one of the strongest traditional groups was destroyed and Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha consolidated his own political power across the region. After this event, he managed to stay in Egypt as the governor by using the Cairene ‘ulemā’ consisted of the

¹⁴ For detailed information of this political struggle process, Ibid, 10–19.

¹⁵ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 126.

¹⁶ Dodwell, *The Founder*, 34–35.

religious member of the courts, although the imperial center, Istanbul appointed him to the Thessaloniki governorship.¹⁷

The new order was constructed after this contentious process. The following lines narrate the economic, social, and educational aspects of these reforms spearheaded by Meḥmed 'Alī of Egypt. On the one hand, he combated the corruption when constructing new bureaucracy; on the other hand, he managed the cadastral survey on the lands, while destroying the tax farming system (*iltizām*).¹⁸ With the members of a new bureaucracy, he established many institutions, schools, streets, and towns in the modern sense with the "enframing devices" which was termed by Mitchell Foucault, including laws, blueprints, maps, plans.¹⁹ It is possible to review these reformist policies carried out by him under six themes.²⁰ First, the codification process by Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha was one of the significant reforms. For example, *Qānūn al-Filāḥa*—regulated penal codes for the first time, was one of these codification laws.²¹ The second policy of Meḥmed 'Alī was the creation process of the army and the navy. His making exertions from conscription to the army's discipline process were important to understand the Meḥmed 'Alī policies.²² In the existing literature, scholars have proposed that his navy shaped not only Egypt itself but the Mediterranean maritime relations as well.²³ Third, the new-type institutions in Egypt organized by the European models were. Clot-Bey who established the Medicine School as a French doctor insisted that "Mehemet Ali is the first of Egypt's governors, since the French

¹⁷ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 126–127.

¹⁸ Khaled Fahmy, *All the Pasha's Men: Mehmed Ali, His Army and the Making of Modern Egypt* (Cairo & New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 1997), 9.

¹⁹ Ibid, 30–31.

²⁰ P. E. Caquet, *The Orient, the Liberal Movement, and the Eastern Crisis of 1839-41* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 61–62.

²¹ Fahmy, *All the Pasha's*, 134–141. Gabriel Baer, "Tanzimat in Egypt—the penal code" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 26(01) (1963): 29.

²² Fahmy, *All the Pasha's*, 76–159.

²³ John Houghton, "The Egyptian Navy of Muhammad Ali Pasha", *The Mariner's Mirror*, 105:2 (2019): 162–182.

expedition [...] to organise his government more or less along European lines.”²⁴ Fourth, his achievement to construct canals in different parts of Egypt, was part of infrastructure reforms. The *Maḥmūdiyye* canal was a significant one among these projects in Egypt, for instance. The fifth was to boost the Egyptian economy by improving agriculture, hydraulic attempts, and the arts of mechanical.²⁵ According to the document in the Foreign Affairs of the British Empire, his agricultural feat was mentioned as constituting a stark contrast elsewhere in the region:²⁶

“The causes of the general stagnation of agricultural and manufacturing improvement in the East will be found to be deeply seated and widely spread; for though some evidences of progress may be here and there discovered, they must be considered as presenting a striking contrast to the almost universal result.”²⁷

The last of Meḥmed ‘Alī’s reformist policies was to promote education, science, and public health.²⁸ The dispatched students were one of the main examples of these features of him which will be examined in detail in the following chapter. Importantly, however, his political rule in Egypt and its hinterland in the following years was consolidated to a greater degree thanks to his continued service to the Ottoman Empire, to which we now return.

§ 2.2 The Ottoman-Oriented Campaigns

After the emergence of Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha in Cairo as a new powerbroker in the region, the new regime, his new regime eventually began to fight against the imperial centers’ “enemies”: i.e., the Wahhabi Wars, the *rūm fesādı* and the Battle of Navarino were the main common

²⁴ Caquet, *The Orient*, 61, 86.

²⁵ Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot, *Egypt in the reign of Muhammad Ali* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 137–195.

²⁶ John Bowring, *Report on Egypt and Candia* (London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1840), 10–39.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 10–11.

²⁸ Caquet, *The Orient*, 61–62.

interactions among Istanbul and Cairo at that time.²⁹ The Pasha “flirted” with the Ottoman-oriented policies to get hereditary autonomy in Egypt and expand his towards Syria. Similarly, the Pasha said in one sentence in his own letter to Necib *Efendi* who was his agent in Istanbul during the *rûm fesâdı*: “Shall I be grieved at the calamity of the Sublime State (*devlet-i 'aliyye*) or at my own lost effort?”³⁰ This sentence dated October 6, 1827, clearly shows his state of mind; therefore, it is possible to say that the Pasha regarded the Ottoman power as an allied power at that time.

Before the introduction of the New Order by Selim III, the Wahhabi movement in the Holy Lands started to control this geography and even restrained the Ottoman convoy to pilgrimage Mecca and Medina.³¹ While Selim III ordered Baghdad and Syrian governorships to attack Wahhabis in 1804, Sultan Maḥmūd II appointed the Pasha to quench the rebellion in 1812.³² The imperial center continued to order the Pasha and his army commanders about restraining against Wahhabis.³³ During the Pasha's campaign against Wahhabis, he also targeted taking over Syria a way of compensating himself for supporting the Sultan against the Wahhabis.³⁴ His other aim was his wish to gain reputation when securing the holy cities of Islam.³⁵ The last desire is to dispose of undisciplined troops in his army during this campaign.³⁶ Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha and his sons İbrāhīm and Ṭosūn Pashas as his commanders suppressed the Wahhabi rebellion;

²⁹ “The Greek Revolution” and “the Greek Rebellion” exist in political terms used in national historiographies. Therefore, this thesis will use *rûm fesâdı* (the depravement of the Greeks) to overcome this political positioning and emphasize a historical notion from the perspective of the imperial center.

³⁰ Fahmy, *All the Pasha's*, 24.

³¹ Câbî Ömer Efendi, *Câbî Târihi*, 112–113.

³² Fahmy, *All the Pasha's*, 40. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 127.

³³ BOA.HAT343.19585B.

³⁴ Fahmy, *All the Pasha's*, 40.

³⁵ Ibid, 40.

³⁶ Ibid, 40.

consequently, the leader of Wahhabis, ‘Abdullāh bin Su‘ūd Āl Su‘ūd was executed in Istanbul with the order of Sultan Maḥmūd II.³⁷

After the French Revolution in the eighteenth century, namely under the *Age of Revolutions*, the Ottoman Empire came to face nationalist rebellions in different parts of the empire.³⁸ Serbians are the initial ethnicity that wanted to gain their independence in the Balkan geography in the 1800s and 1810s under the reign of Selīm III and especially Maḥmūd II. The reasons to be independent were evaluated in traditional historiography in Turkey as “provocations” of the European intellectuals and Russian imperialist policies.³⁹ However, the studies in the historiography exhibit the political struggles between the imperial center and ‘Alī Pasha of Ioannina, who was born in *Tepelenë*, in modern Albania as well as the political vacuum which was caused by it.⁴⁰ This political instability in this territory contributed to the desires of the Greek population. The Greek subjects of the empire which was in the Orthodox sect in initially Morea and following Thessaly started to rebel for their own independence with the support of their religious leaders in their locality. After the successes of the Greek population in the Morea peninsula, Sultan Maḥmūd II ordered to hang Saint Gregory V, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople between 1818 and April 1821 because of his inefficient attempts to suppress “the Greek Rebellion.”⁴¹ Although the foreign policies of Istanbul achieved to halt the interventions by the Russian or European powers, the nationalist local assembly in Epidaurus (*Epidor* in Turkish) brought together the revolutionaries’ political leaders.⁴² This revolutionary assembly declared the independence of Greece and Alexandros

³⁷ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 127. Eyyüb Şabri [Paşa], *Tārīḥ-i Vehhābiyye* (Istanbul: Kırk Anbar Matbaası, 1296 [1878-1879]), 283-287.

³⁸ This term was initially organized by Eric Hobsbawm.

³⁹ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 107-112.

⁴⁰ Dennis N. Skiotis, “The Greek Revolution: Ali Pasha’s Last Gamble,” in *Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation (1821-1830) Continuity and Change*, ed. P. D. Nikiforos (Institute for Balkan Studies, 1976) 97-109.

⁴¹ Jorga, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, 5: 224-225.

⁴² Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 114-115.

Mavrokordatos who was one of receiving education in northern Italy came into power as the prime minister.⁴³

While sustaining revolutionary activities in southern Greece, the Ottoman center decided to cooperate with the Cairene Pasha due to his successes before. Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha agreed to collaboration, provided that the control of Crete and Morea was given to him and sent his son, İbrāhīm Pasha to Morea. Under the command of İbrāhīm Pasha, fifty-four warships, sixteen thousand soldiers and one hundred field guns were sent from Alexandria to Morea, uniting with the Ottoman powers in Rhodes in July 1824.⁴⁴ With help of the Pasha, the revolutionary movement in Greece was smothered by the coordination of Cairo and Istanbul armies; on the other hand, the European powers started to intervene in the successive events. Due to the expansion of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha across the Eastern Mediterranean via Morea and Crete, the British administration and the Russian Empire's new tsar were upset and signed the Protocol of St. Petersburg in 1826.⁴⁵ In the following year, the Prussia and Austrian empires opposed the protocol, while France agreed with it; therefore, the Russian and English empires with France agreed with the London Treaty in July 1827.⁴⁶ Although the descriptive information of the *rūm fesādı* was important, the most significant detail in this process is the competition between the Ottoman and Egyptian bureaucracies during the suppression of the revolutionary activity in Greece.⁴⁷

The last obvious example of the cooperation between the imperial center and Egyptian powers in the Greek peninsula is the Navarino Battle, which can also be read as a result of the *rūm fesādı*. The allied armada

⁴³ Dionysis Tzakis, "Epirus" in *The Greek Revolution a Critical Dictionary*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides & Constantinos Tsoukalas (Cambridge & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2021), 213–218.

⁴⁴ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 115. In Karal's study, the date of the protocol was incorrect. See Loyal Cowles, "The Failure to Restrain Russia: Canning, Nesselrode, and the Greek Question, 1825-1827" *The International History Review*, 12:4 (1990): 688.

⁴⁵ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 116–117.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 116–117.

⁴⁷ Yüksel Çelik, "Hüsrev Mehmet Paşa Siyasi Hayatı ve Askeri Faaliyetleri (1756-1855)" (PhD diss., Istanbul University, 2005), 221–226.

that consisted of warships of Russia, England, and France attacked the Egyptian-Ottoman armada, the former consequently destroyed the latter in November 1827. In the aftermath of Navarino, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha withdrew İbrāhīm Pasha's forces, and the Ottoman Empire was left to defend itself against the Russian attacks during the years 1828 and 1829.⁴⁸ When the British Empire halted the expansionist policies of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha, the Russian Empire gained the right to cross the Straits for the Russian trade ships. Istanbul also approved the Protocol in 1826. This condition was apparent in the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829. In June 1830, France in turn landed troops to Algeria and made it part of its empire.⁴⁹

§ 2.3 The Conflict Against the Ottoman Imperial Power

After the interventions on the *rūm fesādi* by the allied powers according to the decrees of the Protocol in 1826, the tension between the Istanbul's administration and Cairo only increased, bringing the competition out to the open. During the Russian attacks on the Ottoman territories, for example, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha sought to appoint himself as the Anatolian army commander and his son as the Rumelian army commander in exchange for his help; however, Istanbul rejected this proposal because of the Sultan's motive to halt the growing influence of the Pasha.⁵⁰ After the Treaty of Adrianople, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha wanted to be appointed as the governor of Crete, Syria, and Tripoli as promised before by Maḥmūd II; however, the Sultan only appointed him as the governor of Crete due to the political instability that was seen in many parts of the empire.⁵¹ In this process, the Ottoman imperial center began to frame the Pasha as a *ḥā'in* (traitor), as the official Ottoman documents started describing him as *ḥā'in ḥerifñ ... ḥabīṣ-i merķūmuñ ... ḥiyānet ve ḥabāseti*.⁵²

⁴⁸ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 118.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 118–119.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 128–129.

⁵¹ Ibid, 129.

⁵² "... of the traitor guy...the treachery and betrayal of the [said] villain" Reşat Kaynar, *Mustaḥfa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2010), 146.

In the late part of the year 1831, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha sent Süleymān Pasha, who was one of his own court members, and his son, İbrāhīm Pasha, to march against to the Acre governor, 'Abdullāh Pasha with the troops that consisted of twenty-four thousand soldiers.⁵³ This military campaign resulted in the capture of Jaffa, Gaza, and Haifa and surrounded the city of Acre; it also controlled the city of Damascus.⁵⁴ This military movement shocked the Sultan and Sublime Porte and they dispatched the Adrianople governor Āġā Ḥüseyn Pasha, having appointed him as the military commander and the governor of Egypt.⁵⁵ The Pasha in Aleppo wanted to stop the Egyptian army under the command of İbrāhīm and Süleymān pashas but, the Egyptian military army defeated the Ottoman army under Āġā Ḥüseyn Pasha between Antakya and İskenderun on July 29, 1832.⁵⁶ After the victory, while Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha offered to the Sublime Porte to withdraw the military campaign, on the condition that he was given the Syrian territory to himself, the Sultan rejected this proposal and sent Reşid Meḥmed Pasha against İbrahim's army.⁵⁷

While these events were taking place in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Egyptian campaign reached Konya, having climbed over the Taurus Mountains. Reşid Meḥmed Pasha immediately attacked them in response, after the order of Sultan Maḥmūd II to do so, but the Ottoman army was definitively defeated in the battle dated December 21, 1832.⁵⁸ In this process, Sultan Maḥmūd II approved the Ottomans' traditional enemy, the Russian tsar's proposal for aid, caving into the Ottomans' traditional enemy; therefore, this internal issue became the context for European intervention. The Peace Agreement of Kütahya dated May 14, 1833, was signed between the governor of Egypt and Istanbul under the pressure of the British and French ambassadors, as the Sultan's agreement under the Russians cast doubt on the British and French intentions.

⁵³ Marsot, *Egypt in*, 221–222.

⁵⁴ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 129.

⁵⁵ Ibid, 129.

⁵⁶ Ibid, 130.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 130.

⁵⁸ Marsot, *Egypt in*, 221–224. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 130–131.

Thanks to the agreement, the Pasha gained the Damascus governance with Egypt and Crete governances, when his son, İbrāhīm Pasha have a right to the governances of Jeddah and Adana.⁵⁹

The Pasha and the Sultan during the 1830s had been implemented the reformist policies that overlapped in many ways. In this case, the successive reforms under the administrations of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha and the imperial center are significant examples in order to illustrate the interactions between the two reforming powers. The first similarity was in the publishing process of the new newspapers in both settings. For instance, while the Pasha printed *Veḳāyī'-i Mıṣrīyye* in Egypt in December 1828 for the first time, the Maḥmūd regime issued *Taḳvīm-i Veḳāyī'* in November 1831 with interacted him. The second resemblance was the establishment of the medical schools. *Qaṣr al-'Ainī* Medical School appeared in Cairo in 1827; whereas Istanbul inaugurated *Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye-i Şāhāne* at the same year, which can be seen as a culmination of the interaction between Egypt and Istanbul.⁶⁰

The second stage of the Ottoman-Egyptian confrontation process began in the year 1839. This phase lasted under specifically the British supports with the Treaty of Baltalimanı. Due to the Pasha's requests that aimed to control different governorships of the empire, Sultan Maḥmūd II declared war against the Pasha in Cairo on April 21, 1839.⁶¹ The Ottoman army under *Ḥāfız Aḥmed* Pasha with three Prussian commanders came across the Egyptian troops in Nizip.⁶² On June 29, 1839, İbrāhīm Pasha attacked the Ottoman army, as well as this army was defeated by İbrāhīm Pasha, again.⁶³ On the same days, the Sultan in the Ottoman throne in the imperial center was changed because Sultan Maḥmūd II died on July 1, 1839. Sultan 'Abdūlmecīd forgave the Pasha; Australian, British, French,

⁵⁹ Ibid, 136.

⁶⁰ Khaled Fahmy, "The Anatomy of Justice: Forensic Medicine and Criminal Law in Nineteenth-Century Egypt" *Islamic Law and Society* 6:2 (January 1999), 237. Nil Sarı, "Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye" *TDV İslām Ansiklopedisi*, 1st ed. (Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 2004), 2.

⁶¹ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 140.

⁶² For the battle plan, *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 209 (28 July 1839), 1673.

⁶³ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 141–142.

and Prussian ambassadors also sent a diplomatic note that addressed the Ottomans about not intervening with the Pasha without asking first.⁶⁴ Like the intention that gained the British supports in the Baltalimanı Treaty, Muṣṭafā Reşid Pasha declared *Gül-ḥāne-i Ḥaṭṭ-ı Hümāyūn* on November 3, 1839, as well as the period of *Tanzīmāt-ı ḥayriyye*, was started under his supervision. In other words, the *Tanzīmāt* period should be seen in interactive terms with the developments in Egypt, as suggested by Isa Blumi. Among these European powers, the Convention of London in 1840 was signed, and they attacked the Pasha.⁶⁵ The British dominance particularly compressed the Syrian parts of the Egypt governor and locality of Egypt, Alexandria. At the same time, Istanbul and Cairo agreed to peace under British guidance. As a result, this conflict period finally finished with the Imperial Rescript by Sultan 'Abdūlmecīd.⁶⁶ According to this rescript, the imperial center recognized the position of Mehmed 'Alī Pasha and his hereditary governorship in the territory of Egypt.⁶⁷

§ 2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, three different periods of the Ottoman-Egyptian relationships—that is, the establishment of Mehmed 'Alī's regime, the Ottoman-oriented policies, as well as the confrontation phase among them were narrated as the historical background, while locating the Pasha in the center. This historical narrative helped demonstrate the competition between the power in Cairo and the Maḥmūd regime in Istanbul. Isa Blumi had rightly argued that the policies of the Pasha had clear influence on the decision-makers of Istanbul.⁶⁸ Between the bureaucracies of Cairo and Istanbul, this process of contestation during the 1820s and 1830s included not only the fights and collaborations but also the willpower to carry out similar reforms. Although the Egyptian territory was once part

⁶⁴ Ibid, 196–197.

⁶⁵ For the Turkish text of the Convention, Kaynar, *Mustafa Reşit*, 331–335.

⁶⁶ For its version from the Sublime Porte, HAT.1240.48207C.

⁶⁷ Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 5: 200–202.

⁶⁸ Isa Blumi, *Foundations of Modernity* (New York & London: Routledge, 2012), 17.

of the empire, the Pasha became relatively autonomous with the realist policies, influencing the reformist policies of the Ottoman administration in the center. In the following chapters, the policy of sending students abroad by both bureaucracies will be examined in this perspective. I will accordingly argue that the policy of dispatching students by the Pasha had an impact on the Ottoman bureaucracy in the first years of the 1830s.

Oriental Students in Europe

This chapter will concentrate on the Meḥmed ‘Alī’s policy, dispatching Egyptian and the Ottoman students to European capitals to receive education and familiarize themselves with the contemporary sciences. As stated in the previous chapter, the different stages of interactions between Meḥmed ‘Alī of Egypt and the Maḥmūd regime in the 1820s and 1830s, the Ottoman-oriented period to the period of confrontations—contributed to the opening of a new window of interactions.¹ The political conflicts and military competition escalated considerably during this process. I will argue that these developments had a clear impact on the Ottoman world.

Before going any further, the position of Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha needs additional clarification. Scholars have so far discussed the presence of Meḥmed ‘Alī, while noting what an important figure he was.² In both academic literature and studies driven by the nationalist agenda of Egyptian history, many works discussed the leadership and historical presence of Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha. Was he an Ottoman governor of Egypt, a pro-independence leader of Egypt, or a national founding father? To answer

¹ P. E. Caquet, *The Orient, the Liberal Movement, and the Eastern Crisis of 1839-41* (Cambridgeshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 51–93, 93–135.

² For a detailed discussion, Khaled Fahmy, *All the Pasha’s Men* (Cairo & New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 1997), 26.

these questions, one should bear in mind that the Ottoman administration considered the policy of Meḥmed ‘Alī geared towards achieving independence in the final years of the 1830s. For instance, one document from the Ottoman Archive mentioned the initiative of Meḥmed ‘Alī as the “‘inoperative’ desire [for] Independence [of] Meḥmed ‘Alī” which illustrated Istanbul’s perspective.³ Similarly, İbrāhīm Pasha, who was the son of Meḥmed ‘Alī and a figure in the court in Cairo, mentioned the power in Istanbul as a different structure.⁴ That being said, the thesis defends that Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha and his governance are a part of “the urban elite members of other provinces of the Ottoman Empire,” just like the elites of the provinces in the Balkan and Arab geographies.⁵ Ehud R. Toledano classified this urban elite in Egypt while distinguishing ordinary agricultural people (namely *fallāḥ*). Moreover, it enables the research to confirm the reforming power of this Ottoman-Egyptian elite in Egypt in the following lines. As a result, Meḥmed ‘Alī was one of the urban elites within the Ottoman system and a significant indicator of modernizing Egypt.

§ 3.1 Egyptian Students Abroad

The Qajar Iran was the first government that had dispatched young students to London so that they could receive education on the contemporary sciences in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Like the Qajar experience, the Egyptian government under the leadership of Meḥmed ‘Alī, sent students to European capitals in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The present section of the third chapter

³ “meḥmed ‘alī ḥabīsi[nin] istiqlāl dā’iye-i bāṭilesinden” BOA.HAT.833.37557A. For another example, Hayrettin Pınar, *Babıâli ve Hıdiv İsmail* (Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2012), 2.

⁴ Frank Edgar Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942), 172. F.O. 78/209, Canning to Palmerston, #12, March 7, 1832.

⁵ Fahmy, *All the*, 26.

demonstrates the reform, identities, and expeditions of the students in the Egyptian context.



Figure 1.1 Jomard seated surrounded by students from the Egyptian School of Paris, it was drawing by Charles Bazin in 1831. (The Boselli family Collection). SOURCE: <https://www.polytechnique.edu/bibliotheque/fr/jomard-et-l%C3%A9cole-%C3%A9gyptienne-de-paris>, accessed July 8, 2021.

Egypt sent its first group of students to Italy in 1809. Leghorn, Milan, Florence, and Rome were the cities where received the students sent by Mehmed 'Alī to receive military science, shipbuilding, printing, and engineering.⁶ This decision was taken under not only foreigners' advice on Mehmed 'Alī but also reform and progress ideas of Mehmed 'Alī for Egypt. So why did the Pasha send the students to Italy? According to Heyworth-Dunne, Rosetti, who was one of foreigners surrounding of the Pasha shaped his selection of which country to send students. The geographical

⁶ J. Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt* (London: Luzac & Co., 1938), 105.

position had also influenced the decision. At this point, the shortage of skilled people which was a common phrase among the non-European and modernizing administrations, contributed to the decision by the Pasha, among other reasons.⁷ One of the first students in the first mission was Osmān Nūreddīn *Efendi*, who sent to Pisa and Leghorn in 1809. He received his education during the five years in Italy with the desire of Joseph Bokty, who was chief general of Sweden; and he continued his education in Paris for two years. He turned back to Egypt in 1817. It is impossible to reveal all students' names and biographical data because there are a few sources, according to Heyworth-Dunne.⁸ In 1815, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha sent Nīḡulā Musābikī *Efendi* to Italy for studying printing. In 1818, the Egyptian administration in Cairo also dispatched students to England in different fields like ship-building, the management of ships, and mechanics. Until the year 1818, the number of dispatched students within the policy performed by the governorship in Cairo reached twenty-eight. According to the author, there is no source whether there were dispatched students abroad between the years 1818 to 1826. During this process until 1818, there were solely the names in the context of the policy to send students in Europe: Ḥalīl Aḥmed *Efendi*, Muḥammed *Efendi*, Maḥmūd *Beg*, *Mühendis* (Engineer) Aḥmed *Efendi*, *Mi'mār* (Architect) Emīn *Efendi*, Āḡā Osmān *Efendi*, and Ḥasān *Efendi*. They are Muslim. In July 1826, the first large student group was dispatched to Paris with the selection process of Meḥmed 'Alī himself.⁹ The details of the students in this group are illustrated in Table I in the following lines.

When dispatching students by Meḥmed 'Alī, the advisors of the students were also selected. The first person was *Mühürdār* (Scribe) 'Abdī *Efendi*, who was twenty-nine years old and was from Istanbul. His father was *ket-ḥüdā* (Housekeeper) of Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha, Ḥabīb *Efendi*.¹⁰ He came back to Egypt in January 1831. In May 1826, he had to depart as one

⁷ Ibid, 105–108. In the Turkish context, *kaḥṭ-ı ricāl*, which means lack of [skillful] statemen was a significant phenomenon during the Ottoman and Turkish modernization process.

⁸ Ibid, 105.

⁹ Ibid, 157.

¹⁰ Ibid, 159.

of the three supervisors of the first mission group. Because of his name being in the civil administration field, it is possible to observe that *Mühür-dār* 'Abdī Efendi was responsible not for all the students but only the students who studied civil administration. Furthermore, the text mentioned him as "one of the three heads of the mission."¹¹ Another personality is *Divītdār* (Scribe) Muṣṭafā (el-Muḥtar) *Efendi*, who was twenty-four years old. He came to Cairo on August 1, 1832.¹² His hometown region is Kavala, Rumelia (modern Greece). He worked as the head of the Military Administration.¹³ The last head of the mission was Ḥasan (el-İskendārī) *Efendi*, who was thirty-seven years old. His study field was navigation and maritime studies in Brest, France, and he went to England; he returned to Egypt on July 1, 1833.¹⁴ Describing the profiles of the leaders of the students, it is evident that their age group was not different from the students except for one advisor. In fact, one could say that supervisors and students were peers.

The Egyptian students in Paris attended a plethora of courses related to their fields. As an illustration, the students explained in the following charts took numerous courses such as administrative law by M. Macarel, natural laws, *jus gentium*, and the positive law under the civil administration field.¹⁵ The following year, they studied statistics, political economy, industry, finance, and justice under the same department. Additionally, they traveled to several parts of Europe, studying diplomacy; according to E. F. Jomard's article, Professor Mr. Olivier, a former student of the Polytechnic and an artillery captain previously commissioned in Sweden, organized the courses about engineering and artillery. Mr. Gauthier de Claubry gave lessons on chemistry in the laboratory. The following year, students joined the workshops in chemistry when dyeing, making salts, bleaching, and making pottery. Alongside medical courses,

¹¹ [Edme François] Jomard, "École Égyptienne" *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, (August 1828), 105, 109.

¹² Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction*, 159.

¹³ Jomard, "École Égyptienne", 109.

¹⁴ Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction*, 160. Jomard, "École Égyptienne", 107.

¹⁵ Ibid, 105-106.

students took different classes on navy, geometry, trigonometry, and navigation. Students who studied mechanics and hydraulics took courses in geometry, static, and physics. Some students also studied drawing and started to draw maps and various drawings such as architectural structures and machines. The agriculture students in Paris took courses on physics and botany. Furthermore, they went to the experimental farm in Rville. A professor of natural history in one of the royal colleges of Paris was responsible for students to make sure that they learn the elements of science, prepare for applications, and follow public courses when they continued their classes at school.¹⁶

Mehmed 'Alî Pasha dispatched students not only during the 1820s but also during the 1830s. In conclusion, there are some missing names due to the lack of primary sources. The first massive mission group departed in 1826. The magazine, titled *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* and published by *Société Asiatique*, included *Table I* of the students' names in 1828 when the students were still in Paris.¹⁷

While the dispatched students via the first mission were listed in *Table I* in the Appendix part, the sending students in the subsequent years were also located in the following table (*Table II*).

The existing literature has often discussed the policies of Mehmed 'Alî of Egypt during the 1820s, but the Ottoman documents also make clear that Mehmed 'Alî Pasha continued sending students to Paris for education in later years, as it happened later in 1833.¹⁸ The report of the ambassador of Vienna to the Ottoman Empire, Rif'at *Beğefendi*, also notes that the nine students from Egypt sent by Mehmed 'Alî received education on

¹⁶ Ibid, 105–108.

¹⁷ Ibid, 109–113.

¹⁸ These students departed to Paris via Marseille with the quarantine due to the cholera pandemics. For detailed information: BOA. HAT.954.40958F. Aynur Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusunun Sosyolojik Çözümlemesi" (MA thesis, Istanbul Üniversitesi, 2009), 121–122. Erdoğan's thesis wrongfully interpreted the word of *şibyân* in the document as a small city of Marseille. However, this word means children not city.

agriculture in the French language in Vienna between 1837 and 1838.¹⁹ These examples are ample, and it is possible to increase them by using primary sources.

This section has investigated the dispatching of students to Rome, Italy, by Mehmed Ali in 1809. It has also analyzed the continuation of this policy in Paris, France, and different European cities until the final years of the 1830s. One should recognize that the decision taken by Mehmed 'Alī Pasha was the second instance of sending students abroad by a Near Eastern powers, following the footsteps of the Qajar action. Now, the following chapter helps the reader understand the direction of this interaction, showing how the Egyptian policies had helped pave the way for similar Ottoman reforms.

§ 3.2 The Egyptian Impact on the Ottoman Policy of Sending Students Abroad

This section will prove the Egyptian impact on the Ottoman policy of dispatching students to European capitals. It initially discusses the argumentation of the main argument of this present thesis, the following section will trace the period of the Maḥmūd regime in the context of sending students abroad. In terms of sources, this second section consults merely with the Ottoman sources. Considering this chapter also includes information regarding the students dispatched to Europe, their departure dates, their return dates, and their fields of study. Such information is the principal framework of this chapter.

The previous chapters showed parallelism for the main argument of this thesis. Moreover, they serve as proof to explain the status of Mehmed 'Alī in the Ottoman world. More specifically, the present thesis argues that Mehmed 'Alī influenced the reforming policies in Istanbul.

¹⁹ The document (BOA.HAT.833.37557A) states that the students' field language is *efrenc* which means French and European: <http://www.lugatim.com/s/efrenc>, access on March 20, 2021. However, Erdoğan's thesis indicated only a mention of a foreign language rather than the specific language in the document. Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Yurtdışına", 122.

The period of *Tanzīmāt*, which is the originating point of Ottoman and Turkish secularism, started during the Maḥmūd regime with the educational reforms carried out throughout this period. Metaphorically, based on the variation of “seeds” of the legacy of Maḥmūd in the Introduction part of this thesis, it is imperative to discuss Mahmud’s reforms and who influenced these reforms. The Ottoman historiography has long regarded its reform package as possessing unique characteristics, but Meḥmed ‘Alī and the policies he put forward were one of these influencers. Other reforms of Meḥmed ‘Alī included the transformation of the taxation system and schooling to overcome military backwardness of Istanbul during the same years. The present research argues that the policy of Meḥmed ‘Alī as to this specific reform, namely sending students to Europe for educational purposes, had an impact on the reform resulted in dispatching of students from Istanbul.

The bureaucratic competition between the cadres of Cairo and Istanbul reached a peak point of the confrontations that lasted during the 1830s. For instance, Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha invited Muṣṭafā Reşid *Beg* during Reşid’s sojourn as a member of the Ottoman diplomatic mission to Cairo during June 1830, where he had a chance to observe Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha’s policies.²⁰ Muṣṭafā Reşid later became the patron of the Ottoman *Tanzīmāt* as a Pasha in the subsequent years.²¹ This example is significant to show the direction and the significance of this interaction. Furthermore, one can note that the people in the court of Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha did not only consist of the Arabs of Egyptian descent. It also comprised people of Istanbul and Rumelia descent.²² While the total population of the ruling elites in Cairo is thirteen, the number of people of Ottoman origin (from Kavala, Greece, İzmir, and Istanbul) is eleven (out of thirteen).²³ As such, this transition of the cadres in Cairo and Istanbul contributed to this competition as well. Another aspect of this competition is the personal

²⁰ Reşat Kaynar, *Mustafa Reşid Paşa ve Tanzimat* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2010), 49.

²¹ Ibid, 49.

²² F. Robert Hunter, *Egypt Under the Khedivs 1805-1879* (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1999), 24.

²³ The notion of Turkey was envisaged with the notion of Istanbul.

rivalries among the members of the courts in Cairo and Istanbul. For example, this competition process includes a contest between Hüsrev Pasha in Istanbul and İbrâhîm Pasha in Cairo stemming from the commonly-shared experience during the *rûm fesâdı*. İbrâhîm Pasha's political speech is clear enough to demonstrate this competition among the most important figures in their worlds:

"Turkey still possesses in itself seeds of improvement and strength, but they must be well directed. The Porte have taken civilization by the wrong side; -it is not by giving epaulettes and tight trousers to a nation that you begin the task of regeneration; -instead of beginning by their dress, and dress will never make a straight man of one who is lame, they should endeavor to enlighten the minds of their people. Look at us, we have schools of every description - we send our young men to be educated in Europe. - We are also *Turks*²⁴, but we defer to the opinions of those who are capable of directing our own, -whereas no regard is paid by the Porte to advice that is not their own. -Their men would make very good soldiers, but their officers..."²⁵

İbrâhîm Pasha's political speech enables the reader to interpret that there was a competition among these Turkish-speaking bureaucratic officials that governed Cairo and Istanbul because there were two different powers that carried out policies in ways, whether right or wrong, according to İbrâhîm's perspective. Again, considering this competition between Cairo and Istanbul, these Turkish-speaking bureaucracies that governed Istanbul and Cairo grew up during the period of Selîm III's New Order in the Near Eastern world. In the competition process between the Ottoman bureaucracy under the shadow of Maḥmûd II in Istanbul and "the Ottoman-Egyptian elite" under Meḥmed 'Alî in Cairo, the latter had an impact on the policymakers of the former. Eventually, this bureaucratic competition, which gradually intensified during the 1830s, is a

²⁴ The emphasis does not belong to me.

²⁵ Bailey, *British Policy and*, 172.

prima mobilia. Under these circumstances, Maḥmūd II's policy of sending students started as a way of rivalling Cairo.

Second, the same people took part in these reform efforts, as they handled overseeing the dispatched students not only out of Egypt but also from Istanbul. They were in charge of observing the education periods of students in the European capitals. In other words, the fellow traveler of students and their instructors in Europe responsible for the surveillance of these students are the same people. For instance, French Orientalist Amédée Jaubert was the examiner during the examination process of the students sent by Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha in 1828. Furthermore, he took the Ottoman students with himself as a chieftain in December 1830. He transported four Ottoman students from Istanbul to Paris via Marseille.²⁶ Moreover, as previously mentioned, Jaubert gave a lecture in Paris about the 1830s in Istanbul following the expedition process of students.²⁷ The people working at different positions of the government in the same reform demonstrated that the policymakers of Cairo influenced the administration of Istanbul as a result of the interaction between them.

As the next item, the process of dispatching students to European cities by Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha and Maḥmūd II helps substantiate the argument of this thesis. While Meḥmed 'Alī sent the first large mission group to Paris in May 1826, Hüsrev Pasha dispatched his own four slaves upon the consent of Maḥmūd II on December 14, 1830. The two different enforcement processes of the same reform were consecutive, meaning they were in chronological order. Not surprisingly, it is obvious to predict the impact of the former on the latter.

On the one hand, the competition and chronological order that show how the same reforms were underway in different parts of the Ottoman Empire, and that the organizers were all same speak to the

²⁶ İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadriazamlar* (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), 1: 602.

²⁷ Orhan Koloğlu, *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2014), 25. For this text of the lecture, Amédée Jaubert, "Constantinople En 1830" *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, 15 (February 1835), 137-151.

interaction between Mehmed 'Alī Pasha and Sultan Maḥmūd II. The translators of the Ottoman Sublime Porte followed the students of Mehmed 'Alī and informed the imperial capital about the Egyptian students by mentioning them in the French newspapers in the mid-1830s. According to the different documents from the Ottoman archive, the translators conveyed the news about reaching the Egyptian students to Marseille in France for the Sultan in May 1833.²⁸ Another document showed that the ambassador of the Ottoman Empire to Bec (modern Vienna), Şādiḳ Rif'at *Beğefendi*, informed Istanbul about the nine Egyptian students who specialized in agriculture in the French language in 1838.²⁹ With these documents, it is possible to envisage that the Sublime Porte under Maḥmūd II followed the traces of Egyptian students dispatched as a result of the early actions of the sending policy of Mehmed 'Alī Pasha. The second point is that other successive reforms carried out by Mehmed 'Alī Pasha and the center of the Empire are significant examples that manifest the degree of influence within this context. For instance, the publication of official newspapers and opening of the medical schools in both regions at the same time were already alluded to in the previous chapter.

In conclusion, the foundational points of the reforms carried out by Maḥmūd II reforms stem from these different potent sources concerning the Maḥmūd regime. Among such sources is the internal influence left from the previous attempts, such as the New Order of Selīm III and the “foreign” impact of the Russian Empire, which was the “main enemy” in terms of the Ottoman perspective during the nineteenth century.³⁰ On the other hand, classical Ottoman literature mentioning historical events or figures became staunch for the position of the Sultan every time and praise. Therefore, the reforming power relied solely on the Sultan’s “supreme” decision, rendering him mightier. In other words, it is of utmost significance to approach this issue critically since the Ottoman sources

²⁸ BOA.HAT.954.40958F. Cited in Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışı”, 47-48.

²⁹ BOA.HAT.833.37557A. Cited in Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışı”, 122.

³⁰ H. Şükrü Ilıcak, “Ottoman Context” in *The Greek Revolution a Critical Dictionary*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides & Constantinos Tsoukalas (Cambridge & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2021), 64-66.

and prescriptive historiography envisage “the uniqueness” of the Ottoman reform movement. For instance, ‘Abdülhak Mollâ who narrated the daily program designed by Maḥmūd II at the Rāmī Quarterage during the Russo-Ottoman War in 1828-1830, claimed that there is not any interaction. He also put forward the idea that these changes were born out of “the Sultan’s approved thought force.”³¹ Under the impact of the Ottoman-centered approach, the crucial study of Aynur Erdoğan similarly asserts that the reform movement carried out by Meḥmed ‘Alī in the early decades of the nineteenth century did not influence the Maḥmūd reforms.³² Yet, this thesis has pointed to the impact of the reform movement carried out by Meḥmed ‘Alī on the dispatching of students from Istanbul.

§ 3.3 Ottoman Students Abroad



Figure 1.2 The initial four students: (from left to right) Edhem, ‘Abdüllâṭîf, Aḥmed ve Ḥüseyn (Rıfķı). From French woman painter Flora Géraldy. (The Private Collection of Cenân Sarç). SOURCE: Edhem Eldem, “Bir Biyografi Üzerine Düşünceler. İbrahim Edhem Paşa Rum muydu?” *Toplumsal Tarih* 202, (Ekim 2010), 2.

³¹ “işbu muḥayyir-i ‘uḳûl olan tertibât-ı ḥasene mübârek ḳarîḥa-i şabiḥa-i mülûkânelerinden sünûḥ eyleyüp kimesnenin medḥali olmadığı ḥiddet-i zihn ü zekâ’larına dâldir...” Abdülhak Molla, *Târîḥ-i Livâ: Sultan II. Mahmud Portresinden Farklı Bir Kesit*, ed. Mehmet Yıldız (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2013), 67, 46a. Hakan T. Karateke, *Padişahım Çok Yaşa: Osmanlı Devletinin Son Yüzyılında Merasimler* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 5-6.

³² Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışı”, 47.

According to A. Hamdi Tanpınar, the period of Mustāfa III (1757-1773) was significant specifically in enhancing relationships between Ottoman and the West.³³ This was when some travelers noted how a few students were sent to Europe during the reign of Mustāfa III in the mid-eighteenth century. However, there is no definitive information on this subject.³⁴ For instance, the famous book by Şānizāde Mehmed Atā'ullah Efendi, *Şānizāde Tārīhi* (The History of Şānizāde) mentioned Mustāfa Mes'ūd Efendi who traveled to Europe through the Black Sea to receive education on medicine.³⁵ This example demonstrates that this attempt was not an administrative one. Another example is French traveler A. L. Castellan's claim, who was a relevant figure during the Selīm III period.³⁶ Castellan argues that Sultan Mustāfa III dispatched three students including İshāk Beg and his friends to Europe.³⁷ However, İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, a dominant figure among the Turkish historians, ascertained the life of İshāk Beg. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı falsified Castellan's claim through his article. According to Uzunçarşılı, İshāk Beg was a supporter of Selīm III. He escaped Ġāzi Hāsan Pasha's anger during the reign of 'Abdülhamid I thanks to the help from the French Embassy.³⁸ During his stint in Paris, he taught classes such as geography and the French language.

Some historians and thinkers suggest that the sending of students to Europe by the Ottoman Empire started with the period of Selīm III, which presumably illustrated continuity between his reign and that of Mustāfa III,³⁹ but in fact Sultan Selīm III did not send students to

³³ Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1942), 12.

³⁴ Ibid, 12-13. Aynur Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusunun Sosyolojik Çözümlemesi" (MA thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2009), 23.

³⁵ Tanpınar, *Ondokuzuncu*, 12. Şânî-zāde Mehmed 'Ata'ullah Efendi, *Şânî-zāde Tārīhi* (Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2008), 2: 1006.

³⁶ A. L. Castellan, *Lettres Sur La Morée, L'Hellespont et Constantinople* (Paris: Chez A. Nepveu Libraire, 1820), half-title.

³⁷ Ibid, 2: 132.

³⁸ İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "Selim III'ün Veliaht İken Fransa Kralı Lûi XVI ile Muhabereleleri", *Belleten*, 5-6 (1938): 199-209.

³⁹ Mümtaz Turhan, *Garplılaşmanın Neresindeyiz?* (Istanbul: Bâbîâli Yayınevi, 1961), 115.

Europe.⁴⁰ This deceptive idea finds its origins in a decision by Selīm III and this decision misinterpreted by mention of Mouradgea d'Ohsson, a Swedish ambassador.⁴¹ He argued that the Ottomans embarked on a significant project. This project aimed to dispatch eight to ten young Ottomans and assign them to each embassy in Paris, Vienna, London, and Berlin. Meanwhile, the Ottoman Empire would provide necessary tools as course materials for the European languages, arts, and sciences.⁴² It is critical to note that this project assigned young Ottomans to the embassy delegations to develop their linguistic, scientific, and artistic skills. However, these students did not receive an official education by attending a school in those countries. When d'Ohsson explains this project, he also adds that the Ottoman prejudices delayed the execution of this project.⁴³ However, it is also inevitable that the Ottomans considered conducting this project, according to the documents from the Ottoman archive.⁴⁴ Therefore, this project was not about dispatching students abroad but rather a way of educating the diplomatic staff.

Turkish historiography has, so far, discussed the activities in the field of official education of the Maḥmūd II period. The most outstanding example was that the primary level in education was mandatory all around the empire. However, a careful examination of the primary sources and the famous work of Niyazi Berkes reveal that the necessity of primary education remained limited exclusively in Istanbul.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedit ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2017), 5: 68.

⁴¹ Enver Ziya Karal, *Selim III'ün Hat-tı Hümayunları -Nizam-ı Cedit- 1789-1807* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 1998), 166.

⁴² Mouradgea d'Ohsson, *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman* (Paris: Chez Firmin Didot Péere et Fils, 1824), 7: 513-514. Karal, *Selim III'ün*, 166. I would like to thank my friend, Yiğitcan Aksoy for translating a part of the French book into English.

⁴³ d'Ohsson, *Tableau Général*, 7: 513-514.

⁴⁴ BOA.HAT.266.15425.

⁴⁵ 'Numero 7, ta'lim-i şıbyān hakkında fermān-ı 'ālī': Aḥmed Cevdet, *Tārīh-i Cevdet* (Istanbul: Maṭba'a-ı 'Osmāniyye, 1301[1883-1884]) 10: 277-279. Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: McGill University Press, 1998), 111-112.

With the comments regarding the sending of students to Europe for the first time, the most accurate information suggests that this initiative started with the rule of Maḥmūd II. Even though some previous attempts were certainly of importance, it was, nevertheless, Maḥmūd II who began to dispatch students to Europe. This was when Maḥmūd II enacted *irāde-i ṣāhāne* (the order of the Sultan) and decided to send one hundred and fifty Muslim students to Europe between September 1829 and February 1830.⁴⁶ This study could not find a documentation to substantiate this decision. However, Aḥmed Lûtfi *Efendi*, who was an official historian at that time, mentioned this order in between the first European entertainment in Istanbul in September 1829 and the birth of 'Abdül'azîz in February 1830. However, based on this order, the Ottoman administration could not immediately implement the sending of students during the 1830s. In other words, this order established the legal basis for the dispatching of students. In the context of dispatching students to Europe for the first time, unlike some previous attempts, December 1830 was a notable date,⁴⁷ because Hüsrev Pasha sent *the first semi-official group* on that date.⁴⁸ These students included Hüseyn (Rıfkı), 'Abdüllâṭîf, Aḥmed, and Edhem.⁴⁹ Before the voyage of these students to Paris, Hüsrev Pasha who was the chief of the army, *ser-'asker* during this period

⁴⁶ Many studies used the decision of Maḥmūd II without question. At this point, there are many problematic issues discussed in the previous chapters. Ahmed Lûtfi Efendi, *Vak'anüvîs Ahmed Lûtfi Efendi Tarihi* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları & Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 2-3: 444. Emrullah Nutku, "Türkiye'de İlk Resmî Balo", *Hayat Tarih Mecmuası*, 8 (August 1975): 83.

⁴⁷ The date of dispatching students by Hüsrev Pasha is malleable and contested. There is also another problematic situation, discussed in the previous lines.

⁴⁸ Par Wanda, *Anecdotes Sur La Turquie (1820-1870)* (Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1884), 9. This thesis argues the notion of semi-official was initially with because Hüsrev Pasha sent his vassals to Paris with the supports of the Ottoman Sultan. Later, the official authority undertook the survival, administrative, and financial problems of these students. Hüsrev Pasha sent new students to the different capitals of Europe. The thesis uses the notion of semi-official for five students for the first batch to recognize the initial dispatched group with the support of Hüsrev Pasha and the Sultan.

⁴⁹ BOA.HAT.694.33474, BOA.HAT.701.33726. Adnan Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa'ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri (1839-1876)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2004), 5.

introduced them to Sultan Maḥmūd II in Aynalıkavak Palace.⁵⁰ The Ottoman administration sent these students and French Orientalist Amédée Jaubert from Istanbul to Marseilles for forty days.⁵¹

The first person was Hüseyn, who received an education in engineering and artillery in Paris. He became Artillery Lieutenant General and died in Istanbul.⁵² The name of Hüseyn was present in the archival documents. However, Mustafa Cezar, in his study, mentioned Hüseyn in addition to adding Rıfki.⁵³ Another person in the first group was ‘Abdüllâṭif. He received general military training and passed away in Istanbul when he was in the rank of Brigadier in *Erkân-ı Harbiyye*.⁵⁴ Ahmed was a figure of a semi-official group of the Ottomans. He received military training in the maritime and died in the French Navy in the USA.⁵⁵ The last person in the group was Edhem who was no one other than İbrâhîm Edhem Pasha in the Hamidian era.⁵⁶ At this point, Hüsrev Pasha proceeded to dispatch and added his vassal, Meḥmed Reşîd *Beg* into the first group.⁵⁷ On the other hand, he also sent one principal group in 1839 to Paris. This research suggests that the Ottomans decided to dispatch students to Paris because the London experience was not sufficiently advantageous. Interestingly, the number of students sent and the dispatching preferences (collectively vs. individually) changed during that period.

⁵⁰ Yüksel Çelik, *Şeyhü'l-Vüzerâ Koca Hüsrev Paşa II. Mahmud Devrinin Perde Arkası* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2013), 272-276, 339-344. Halil İnalçık, *İslam Ansiklopedisi* 1st ed., s. v. “Hüsrev Paşa, Koca”. İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 602.

⁵¹ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 602.

⁵² Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışına”, 37. İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 601.

⁵³ *Musavver Medeniyet*, no: 9 [11 Rebi’u’levvel 1293 (April 6, 1876)], 66. Mustafa Cezar, *Sanatta Batı’ya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi* (Istanbul: Erol Kerim Aksoy Kültür, Eğitim, Spor ve Sağlık Vakfı Yayını: 1995), 1: 380.

⁵⁴ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 601, Erdoğan, “Türkiye’de Yurtdışına”, 37.

⁵⁵ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 601.

⁵⁶ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 600-636. Edhem Eldem, “Bir Biyografi Üzerine Düşünceler. İbrahim Edhem Paşa Rum muydu?” *Toplumsal Tarih* 202, (Ekim 2010), 2-12. For current and detailed investigation about him, Salih Erol, “XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Devlet Adamlarından İbrahim Edhem Paşa” (PhD Diss., Anadolu University, 2019), 52-72.

⁵⁷ He is a slave of Hüsrev Pasha like others. Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî* (Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları & Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1996), 5: 1382.

Additionally, the Ottomans dispatched the students from the military college to Paris. When they went to Paris, they entered Institution Barbet to learn the French language.⁵⁸ Hüsrev Pasha named all these students also with a semi-official group due to the conditions they lived in, their administrative and financial situations during the initial period. In the following years, the Ottoman government undertook these expenses upon the consent of Hüsrev Pasha.⁵⁹ Apart from the first group sent to Paris by Hüsrev Pasha, the Empire continued to dispatch students selected among the Sultan's subjects in the following years. The archival documents reveal the information regarding the sending of students by the Ottoman Empire to Europe. It is difficult to establish the historical narration(s) with limited descriptive information about students and their names. For this reason, this section constructs the list about the Ottoman students in the period of Maḥmūd II from Adnan Şişman's book titled *Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa'ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri* (Ottoman Students Sent to France in the Tanzimat Period).⁶⁰ However, this list limited in the context of Maḥmūd II until his death on July 1, 1839. For the present thesis, the following is a list of the students dispatched during the rule of Sultan Maḥmūd II to underscore the significance of this topic.

§ 3.4 Conclusion

Having traced the practices of the pre-Maḥmūd period, this chapter have examined the dispatching activities in the reign of Maḥmūd II based on investigations of the archival documents and primary sources. In this context, the idea of sending students to Europe in the period of Mustafa III started with the order of Maḥmūd II. Hüsrev Pasha dispatched students among his slaves to Paris on December 14, 1830. The literature demonstrated this information only recently.⁶¹ Aynur Erdoğan's thesis explains the exact date of December 14, 1830, in light of the primary

⁵⁸ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 601.

⁵⁹ BOA.HAT.701.33726.

⁶⁰ Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*.

⁶¹ Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Yurtdışına", 36-37.

sources. On the other hand, this section first focuses on different claims regarding the first dispatching date in historiography. Similar to these different sending dates of the first group, the number of students constituted distinct problematic issues in historiography. Various scholars discussed the first semi-official group named by this study and the number of students. This study explains the four students with their biographical accounts based on the information extracted from the archival documents. Related documents include the painting of the first four students.⁶² In other words, the first batch of the first group comprised the initial first students and then Meḥmed Reşid Beg in the following years. This thesis refers to these five students dispatched by Ḥüsrev Pasha as semi-official students. However, a separate classification is necessary to categorize these five students because Ḥüsrev Pasha covered the expenditure of these students and the Ottoman bureaucracy in Istanbul.

⁶² BOA.HAT.694.33474, BOA.HAT.701.33726.

Conclusion

*“Geldi bir tārīḥ-i cevher işbu feth-i a’zama
Kırdı Sulṭān Maḥmūd a’dāsın tamam şimşirle”*

– Kerīmī¹

With the support of *Ruşuk a’yānı* (the local governor of modern Ruse in Bulgaria) ‘Alemdār Muştafā Pasha, Prince Maḥmūd succeeded the Ottoman throne in the year 1808. The same year, Sultan Maḥmūd ordered to kill his brother Muştafā IV; with his brother eliminated, he “remained the sole male heir” among the Ottoman dynasty.² This prerequisite preponderantly created the legitimacy issue of the Sultan’s position on the throne during his rule in later years. Thus, the cultural hegemony of the Ottoman royal literature, made up of the different literary forms based on praise and eulogy during other Sultans, established and sustained the administrative power of the Sultan together

¹ İÜK, TY 5638, 70a. Cited in Harun Korkmaz, *The Catalog of Music Manuscripts in Istanbul University Library* (The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University: SOLL 118, 2015), 185.

² Deniz Türker, “Ottoman Victoriana: Nineteenth-Century Sultans and the Making of a Palace, 1795-1909” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016), 65. Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2017), 5: 96.

with the patrimonial intention. For instance, Kerīmī, who was a surrounding person of the Sultan, cemented the Sultanic legitimacy and position on the throne by using the following expression: *Sultan Maḥmūd [II] destroyed all of his enemies with the sword*.³ The Ottoman royal documents from *Ḥaṭṭ-ı Hümāyūn* Department of the Ottoman Archives also exemplify this praise literature. For example, the word of *pādişāhım*, meaning ‘my Sultan’ is present above the addressing lines in the document. Within this context, ‘Abdülḥaḳ Mollā, who was one of the Sultan’s surrounding people, distorted the Ottoman reforming power as “the unique” reform package of this power. In other words, the general claim stated that the reforms were born out of “the Sultan’s approved thought force.” While ‘Abdülḥaḳ Mollā emphasized the reforms’ “uniqueness,” it is plausible to associate this statement with the praising literature. In this view, different events and thoughts influenced and inspired Sultan Maḥmūd II to tackle the legitimacy problem. One of these interactions is clearly the Meḥmed ‘Alī experience. In the literature, Isa Blumi’s suggestion also assisted to understand the bases of the Ottoman reform package in the Maḥmūd regime and the *Tanzīmāt* period; therefore, my viewpoints recalled about the Egyptian impact on the decision-makers of Istanbul. To be sure, the reformist agendas such as the transition to the modern army and the introduction of modern taxation practices, as well as the publication of the first official newspapers (*Veḳāyi’-i Mıṣrīyye* in Cairo and *Taḳvīm-i Veḳāyi’* in Istanbul) are concrete examples that help illustrate the interaction between Meḥmed ‘Alī Pasha and Sultan Maḥmūd II. A similar dynamic was at play, as I argued, when it comes to the Egyptian impact on the Ottomans to send military and medical students to receive contemporary studies in Europe. In addition, the research also includes the narration of the Iranian and Japanese students like the Ottoman students abroad within the concept of global and non-colonized powers until their colonization period. This concept helps the study unveil the main motives behind the same policies within the category of non-colonized powers.

³ İÜK, TY 5638, 70a. Cited in Korkmaz, *The Catalog*, 185.

With this intention, the present thesis has examined the initial dispatching process of the students to European capitals such as Paris and London by Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha and the Ottoman bureaucracy. This thesis examined whether Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha was an influential figure in this particular reform initiated by Maḥmūd II. In this view, this thesis argued that Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha in Cairo had impacts on the Maḥmūd regime on the dispatching reform. The second and third chapters presented the necessary context and documents to substantiate this argument. Chapter II, for instance, highlighted the competitive interplay between the bureaucracies of Cairo and Istanbul during the 1830s. At this point, the military conflict among them in Syria and the Anatolian peninsula led to the escalation of the conflict to new levels. Hence, the competitive interaction became inevitable and natural, taking place on multiple levels. When Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha restarted sending students in 1826, for example, the Ottomans responded by sending students in December 1830. As they did, often the same individuals were involved in this process. Pierre Amédée Jaubert, who guided the semi-official students from Istanbul to Paris in December of 1830, was also an examiner to study the Egyptian students in 1828.⁴ Besides, the articles published in the official newspapers by the leaders reveal the interaction between the two bureaucracies. For instance, Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha ordered the publishing of sending students and the fields they majored in *Veḳāyi'-i Mısrīyye* in Cairo.⁵ Orhan Koloğlu presents the disputes among the newspaper articles between these two bureaucracies.⁶ Moreover, the Ottoman Foreign Office closely followed the activities of the Egyptian students abroad in the following years. The last interaction is the other shared reforms between Cairo and Istanbul, such as the publication of official newspapers and the inauguration of medical schools. All arguments eventually demonstrate that Meḥmed 'Alī Pasha's dispatching policy where he sent students to European capitals

⁴ [Edme François] Jomard, "École Égyptienne de Paris" *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, (August 1828), 97.

⁵ The 73rd issue of *Veḳāyi'-i Mısrīyye*. Orhan Koloğlu, *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2014), 107–108.

⁶ *Ibid*, 137–237.

to provide them with contemporary education in different fields influenced the Ottoman bureaucracy in formative ways. As such, Maḥmūd II started to send the slaves of Hüsrev Pasha and other students from military, engineering as well as the medical schools in the following years.

Although the Egyptian impact on the Ottoman policy of sending students highlighted the singularity of Ottoman-Egyptian interaction, the nodes of interaction that helped contribute to the Ottoman modernization were certainly much more complex. The imperial center's cooperation and conflicts not only with the provincial dynasties in Balkan and Arab geographies but also with the European powers such as the Russian Empire, for example, can illustrate different channels of interaction. Yet, this my master's thesis solely chose to focus on Meḥmed 'Alī and the particular interactions borne out of Istanbul's relationships with him.

Any further study that will examine the dispatching of students to Europe in the Ottoman context could benefit from two different approaches. First, prosopographic data of students sent abroad could be collected by consulting with the archives of *Mekteb-i Ḥarbiyye-i Şāhāne*. According to Gültekin Yıldız, the *Mekteb-i Ḥarbiyye-i Şāhāne* Archive has recently become inaugurated in the historical archives of the Turkish Military Academy at the National Defense University in Istanbul. Second, future studies could consider to the full extent of interactions between Istanbul and Cairo. Given the different components of the Ottoman provinces, elements such as the Iranian reforming power, possible Anglo-French impact on the same reform, and various impacts they bestow on other reforms can produce fruitful and illuminating results.

Appendix A Table I: The Dispatched Students Abroad until 1828 in Egypt

This table is put together with information from [Edme François] Jomard's article and J. Heyworth-Dunne's study.¹

Student Name	Information	Hometo wn	Dispatching Date	Attended School	Return Date
'Alī ²	18 years old, Georgian, Military Engineering	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
'Alī Heybe ³	18 years old, Medicine, Surgery, Anatomy, Physiology, Hygiene	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1833
'Alī Hüseyin ⁴	18 years old, Natural History and Mines	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
'Ömer ⁵	20 years old, Circas- sian, Artillery	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1830
'Ömer el-Kūmī ⁶	18 years old, Chemical Arts	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
'Ömerzāde Emīn ⁷	Metal Foundry, Weapon Manufactur- ing	Istanbul		École Égyptienne	Beginning Sep- tember 1832

¹ J. Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt* (London: Luzac & Co., 1938), 159-163. [Edme François] Jomard, "École Égyptienne" *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, (August 1828), 110.

² Jomard, "École Égyptienne", 110.

³ Ibid, 111.

⁴ Ibid, 111.

⁵ Ibid, 110.

⁶ Ibid, 111.

⁷ Ibid, 111-112. In addition, the writer mentions the arrival date of a student on another list. According to this chart, emīn *efendi* arrived in July and August 1828.

Aḥmed ⁸	18 years old, born in Greece, Commissioner Mustafa's nephew, Natural History and Mines	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1834
Aḥmed ⁹	25 years old, Military Administration	Kavala	May 1826	École Égyptienne	August 1, 1832
Aḥmed el-Necdelī ¹⁰	16 years old, Natural History and Mines	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	September 1832
Aḥmed Ḥasan Ḥaneḥī ¹¹	18 years old, Metal Foundry, Weapon Manufacturing	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	September 1832
Aḥmed Ṣa'bān ¹²	17 years old, Chemical Arts (also, dyeing)	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
Aḥmed Yūsuf ¹³	20 years old, Chemical Arts	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
Artin Sikyās ¹⁴	22 years old, Armenian, Civil Administration	Istanbul	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
el-Şeyḥ Aḥmed el-ʿAṭṭār ¹⁵	27 years old, mechanics	Cairo	My 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
el-Şeyḥ el-ʿAleḥī ¹⁶				École Égyptienne	July 1828

⁸ Ibid, 111.

⁹ Ibid, 109, 112. Moreover, the writer mentioned aḥmed *efendi* arrival date in another list. According to this chart, aḥmed *efendi* recently arrived in July and August 1828 like emīn *efendi*.

¹⁰ Ibid, 111.

¹¹ Ibid, 111.

¹² Ibid, 111.

¹³ Ibid, 111.

¹⁴ Ibid, 109.

¹⁵ Ibid, 110.

¹⁶ Ibid, 112.

el-Şeyh Muḥammed el- Daştūtī ¹⁷	23 years old, Medicine, Surgery, Anatomy, Physiology, Hygiene	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1831
el-Şeyh Muḥammed el- Raḳīkā ¹⁸				École Égyptienne	July or August 1828
el-Şeyh Rifā'ah Rāfi' ¹⁹	24 years old, born in Tahta, translation	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1831
Ḥalīl Maḥmūd ²⁰	20 years old, Agriculture	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
Ḥasan el- Vardānī ²¹	17 years old, Engraving, Typography, Lithography	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1835
Ḥüseyin ²²			on the road in July and August 1828 for Touleon and Marseilles	École Égyptienne	
Ḥüsrev Sikyās ²³	18 years old, Armenian, diplomacy	Istanbul	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
İbrāhīm Ve- hbī ²⁴				École Égyptienne	August 1827 or July 1828

¹⁷ Ibid, 111.

¹⁸ Ibid, 112.

¹⁹ Ibid, 112. Rifa' el-Tahtawi's biography was evaluated in this article: J. Heyworth-Dunne, "Rifā'ah Badawī Rāfi' at-Taḥṭāwī" *The Egyptian Revivalist Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 9 (1939): 961-967.

²⁰ Jomard, "École Égyptienne", 111.

²¹ Ibid, 111.

²² Ibid, 112.

²³ Ibid, 110.

²⁴ Ibid, 112.

İstefân ²⁵	22 years old, Armenian, diplomacy	Sébastè (Modern Sivas)	May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
Ḳāsim el-Cendī ²⁶			on the road in July and August 1828 for Toulon and Marseilles	École Égyptienne	End 1831
Küçük Ahmed	Studied in January 1828			École Égyptienne	
Maḥmūd Nāmī ²⁷	21 years old, Circassian, navigation and marine		May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning June 1833
Muḥammed Beyūmī ²⁸	17 years old, hydraulics	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1835
Muḥammed Es'ad ²⁹	15 years old, Engraving, Typography, Lithography	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1831
Muḥammed Hüsrev ³⁰	21 years old, Georgian, Civil Administration		May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
Muḥammed Maẓhar ³¹	17 years old, Military Engineering	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1835

²⁵ Ibid, 110.

²⁶ Ibid, 112.

²⁷ Ibid, 110.

²⁸ Ibid, 110.

²⁹ Ibid, 111.

³⁰ Ibid, 109. While the name *Muḥammed* was used as *Meḥmed* in the Anatolian and Rume-
lian geography, it should be noted that the names of the registered students of
Muḥammed may be *Meḥmed*.

³¹ Ibid, 110. Also, his father is from Ottoman per se, his mother is from Egypt.

Muḥammed Şenân ³²	20 years old, Circassian, navigation and marine		May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning June 1833
Muṣṭafā Mahremcī ³³	17 years old, hydraulics	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	End 1835
Rāşid ³⁴	24 years old, birth in Abkhazia, Military Administration		May 1826	École Égyptienne	August 1, 1832
Selīm ³⁵	19 years old, Georgian, Civil Administration		May 1826	École Égyptienne	December 1831
Süleymān ³⁶	18 years old, Circassian, Military Administration		May 1826	École Égyptienne	August 1, 1832 (?)
Süleymān el-Buḥayrī ³⁷	18 years old, Military Engineering	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
Süleymān Lāz ³⁸	25 years old, Artillery	Trabzon		École Égyptienne	End 1833
Yūsuf ³⁹	23 years old, Armenian, Agriculture		May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832
Yūsuf el-ʿAyāzī ⁴⁰	18 years old, Chemical Arts	Cairo	May 1826	École Égyptienne	Beginning 1832

³² Ibid, 110.

³³ Ibid, 110.

³⁴ Ibid, 109.

³⁵ Ibid, 109.

³⁶ Ibid, 109.

³⁷ Ibid, 110.

³⁸ Ibid, 110.

³⁹ Ibid, 111.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 111.

Appendix B Table II: The Egyptian Students Abroad Between the Years 1828 and 1836

This table is put together with information from J. Heyworth-Dunne's study.⁴¹

Student Name	Information	Hometown	Dispatching Date	Attended School	Return Date ⁴²
'Abdul-Cevād ⁴³	Making of gun parts in England		May 1829		August 1839
'Abdül-Ḥamīd Diyarbekirli ⁴⁴	Naval training in England	Diyarbakir	March 1829		July 1835
'Abdül-Kerīm ⁴⁵	Naval training in England		March 1829		July 1835
'Abdullāh ⁴⁶	Making of Bees' Wax in France		February 1829		December 1831
'Abdul-Marīs ⁴⁷	Silk-weaving in London	Sudanese	October 1829		August 1834
'Abdul-Rabb ⁴⁸	Making of Broadcloth in France	Sudanese	October 1829		Beginning 1833
'Abdur-raḥmān ⁴⁹	Surgical instruments in France		October 1829		End 1835

⁴¹ J. Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt* (London: Luzac & Co., 1938), 159-163.

⁴² Their return dates became available with the lights of this source: Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to...*, 170-176.

⁴³ Ibid, 173.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 174.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 174.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 171.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 172.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 172.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 172.

'Alī ⁵⁰	Boat building in England				April 1834
'Alī el-Cīzāvi ⁵¹	Ship-building in France		October 1829		Middle 1832
'Alī el-Ferārcī ⁵²	Pottery making in England		Circa 1829		End 1836
'Alī el-Šāmī ⁵³	Gun making in France	Damascus	October 1829		End 1832
'Alī el-Zarārī ⁵⁴	Dyeing in France		October 1829		Beginning 1833
'Alī Ḥasan ⁵⁵	Making of Broadcloth in Elbeuf, France		?		December 1831
'Alī Īsā (?) ⁵⁶	Coel-mining in Europe		October 1836		
'Ārif ⁵⁷	Naval construction, drawing, math, carpentry, engineering in Toulon		August 1828		Beginning 1836
'İsevī Cād ⁵⁸	Naval construction in Toulon		August 1828		End 1830
'İsevī el-Naḥrāvī ⁵⁹	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
'Ömer ⁶⁰	Making of engineering instruments,		Circa 1829		May 1837

⁵⁰ Ibid, 174.

⁵¹ Ibid, 173.

⁵² Ibid, 173.

⁵³ Ibid, 172. It can be read his origin as maybe *Şam* (modern Damascus) due to his last name.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 172.

⁵⁵ Ibid, 171.

⁵⁶ Ibid, 175.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 171.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 171.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 175.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 173.

	telescopes, compasses in England				
Aḥmed Baḥīt ⁶¹	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Aḥmed Daḡalah ⁶²	Engineering in France		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Aḥmed el-Darrās ⁶³	Gun making in France		October 1829		End 1832
Aḥmed Fā'id ⁶⁴	Engineering, math, and chemistry in Lyons London		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Aḥmed Ṭā'il ⁶⁵	Engineering		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Bilāl el-Ḥabeṣī ⁶⁶	Arabic, French, Italian, Geography, Ornamental painting, and sculpture in France	Jeddah	April 1832		January 1836
Cād Ġazalī ⁶⁷	Sword making in France	Sudanese	October 1829		End 1835
el-Seyyd Ḥasan Ġanım el-Reṣīdī ⁶⁸	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
el-Seyyid Aḥmed el-Reṣīdī ⁶⁹	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838

⁶¹ Ibid, 175.

⁶² Ibid, 171.

⁶³ Ibid, 173.

⁶⁴ Ibid, 171.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 171.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 175.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 172.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 175.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 175.

Es'adzāde Aḥmed ⁷⁰	Engineering in France		January 1829		End 1836
Ḥalīl el-Baqlī ⁷¹	Calico printing in Lyons and London		October 1829		Beginning 1836
Ḥanefī 'Oṣmān ⁷²	Making of gun parts in England		May 1829		August 1839
Ḥasan ⁷³	Circassian, Civil Administration in Paris				
Ḥasan Ebū'l Ḥasan ⁷⁴	Water marking in France		October 1829		Beginning 1836
Ḥasan el- Baḡdādī ⁷⁵	Ship-building in France	Baghdad	October 1829		Middle 1832
Ḥasan el- Cīzāwī ⁷⁶	Dyeing in France		October 1829		Beginning 1833
Ḥasan el-Dum- yātī ⁷⁷	Geometry, algebra, and drawing		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Ḥasan el- İskenderānī (called el- Şaḡīr) ⁷⁸	Making of Sealing Wax in France	Alexandria	October 1829		Mid 1832
Ḥasan el- Sa'rān ⁷⁹	Naval construction in Toulon		August 1828		End 1830
Ḥasan el- Zarārī ⁸⁰	Gold smithery and Jewelry in France		October 1829		End 1835

⁷⁰ Ibid, 171.

⁷¹ Ibid, 172.

⁷² Ibid, 173.

⁷³ Ibid, 171.

⁷⁴ Ibid, 172.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 173.

⁷⁶ Ibid, 172.

⁷⁷ Ibid, 171.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 173.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 170.

⁸⁰ Ibid, 172.

Hasan Muḥaysin ⁸¹	Calico printing in France		October 1829		Beginning 1836
Henrī Rūsī ⁸²	Water marking in France		?		Beginning 1836
Ḥüseyn ⁸³	Circassian, Civil Administration in Paris				
Ḥüseyn el-Hi-hyāvi ⁸⁴	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Ḥüseyn Muḥammed ⁸⁵	Candle-making in France		October 1829		Beginning 1832
İbrāhīm el-‘Itāl ⁸⁶	Gold smithery and Jewelry in France		October 1829		End 1835
İbrāhīm el-Dasūḳī ⁸⁷	Watch-making in France		October 1829		Beginning 1836
İbrāhīm el-Nabarāvi ⁸⁸	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
İbrāhīm Ramazān ⁸⁹	Engineering and math in Lyons London		January 1830		Beginning 1836
İsmā‘īl ⁹⁰	Making of gun parts in England		May 1829		August 1839
İsmā‘īl Ḥaneffī ⁹¹	Furniture and Carpet making in England		Circa 1829		?

⁸¹ Ibid, 172.

⁸² Ibid, 172. He also already visited his mother in France.

⁸³ Ibid, 171.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 175.

⁸⁵ Ibid, 172.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 172.

⁸⁷ Ibid, 172.

⁸⁸ Ibid, 175.

⁸⁹ Ibid, 171.

⁹⁰ Ibid, 174.

⁹¹ Ibid, 173.

Maḥbūb el-Ḥabeṣī ⁹²	Arabic, French, Italian, Geography, Ornamental painting, and sculpture in France	Jeddah	April 1832		January 1836
Marsāl el-Ḥabeṣī ⁹³	Arabic, French, Italian, Geography, Ornamental painting, and sculpture in France	Jeddah	April 1832		January 1836
Muḥammed ⁹⁴	Making of engineering instruments, telescopes, compasses in England		Circa 1829		May 1837
Muḥammed 'Abdül-Fettāḥ ⁹⁵	Veterinary Science in Alford, London		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Muḥammed 'Alī el-Baklī ⁹⁶	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Muḥammed 'Annānī ⁹⁷	Surgical instruments in France		October 1829		End 1835 and middle 1836
Muḥammed 'Atīye ⁹⁸	Making of Broadcloth in France		October 1829		Beginning 1833
Muḥammed 'Azab ⁹⁹	Saddlery in London		October 1829		End 1834
Muḥammed Baḡdādī ¹⁰⁰	Shoe making in France	Baghdad	October 1829		December 1833

⁹² Ibid, 175.

⁹³ Ibid, 175.

⁹⁴ Ibid, 173.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 171.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 175.

⁹⁷ Ibid, 172.

⁹⁸ Ibid, 172.

⁹⁹ Ibid, 172.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 172.

Muḥammed Ebū'l-ʿAynayn ¹⁰¹	Making of surgical instruments		August 1829		December 1835
Muḥammed Ebū'l-Nec-cāḥ ¹⁰²	Math and engineering in Lyons London		January 1830		Beginning 1836
Muḥammed el-Rāʿī ¹⁰³	Naval construction in Toulon		August 1828		End 1830
Muḥammed el-Şabāsī ¹⁰⁴	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Muḥammed el-Şāfiʿī ¹⁰⁵	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Muḥammed el-Sukkarī ¹⁰⁶	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Muḥammed Enīs ¹⁰⁷	Naval construction in Toulon		August 1828		End 1830
Muḥammed Ḥākim ¹⁰⁸	Watch-making in France		October 1829		Beginning 1836
Muḥammed Ḥalīl ¹⁰⁹	Candle-making in France		October 1829		Beginning 1832
Muḥammed Ḥüseyn ¹¹⁰	Shawl making in France		October 1829		Middle 1832
Muḥammed İbrāhīm (?) ¹¹¹	Coel-mining in Europe		October 1836		

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 171.

¹⁰² Ibid, 171.

¹⁰³ Ibid, 171.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 175.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 175.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 175.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 170.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 172.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, 172.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, 173.

¹¹¹ Ibid, 175.

Muḥammed Ismā'īl ¹¹²	Ornamental painting, sculpture for building in France		October 1829		April 1836
Muḥammed Manṣūr ¹¹³	Medicine in France		November 1832		1838
Muḥammed Mar'ī ¹¹⁴	Making of Bees' Wax in France		February 1829		December 1831
Muḥammed Muḥaysin ¹¹⁵	Shawl making in France		October 1829		Middle 1832
Muḥammed Murād ¹¹⁶	Ornamental painting, sculpture for building in France		October 1829		Beginning 1836
Muḥammed Nubāyal ¹¹⁷	Making of Sealing Wax	Sudanese	October 1829		Beginning 1836
Muḥammed Rāḡīb el- İslāmbūlī ¹¹⁸	Engineering and ship-building in Eng- land	Istanbul	Circa 1829		September 1836
Muḥammed Ramāzān ¹¹⁹	Sword making in France		October 1829		End 1835
Muḥammed Yaḥyā ¹²⁰	Naval construction in Toulon		August 1828		End 1830
Muḥammed Yūsuf ¹²¹	Shoe making in France		October 1829		Death in April 1833

¹¹² Ibid, 172.

¹¹³ Ibid, 175.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 171.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, 173.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 172.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, 173.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 173.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 172.

¹²⁰ Ibid, 171.

¹²¹ Ibid, 172.

Muṣṭafā el-Zarārī ¹²²	Silk-weaving in France and Lyons London		October 1829		August 1834
Muṣṭafā el-Mecdelī ¹²³	Making of Broadcloth in Austria	Magdala ¹²⁴	October 1829		?
Muṣṭafā Nūreddīn ¹²⁵	Brother of Osmān Nūreddīn, Veterinary Science in France		September 1828		End 1834
Receb el-Ma'dencī (?) ¹²⁶	Coel-mining in Europe		October 1836		
Rızq el-Ma'dencī ¹²⁷	Coel-mining in Europe		October 1836		
Seyyid Aḥmed ¹²⁸	Mechanics in England		May 1829		June 1839
Süleymān el-Bahnāvi ¹²⁹	Saddlery in France and London		October 1829		End 1834
unknown ¹³⁰	Furniture and Carpet making in England		Circa 1829		?
unknown ¹³¹	Pottery making in England		Circa 1829		End 1836
Unknown four students ¹³²	Fish-drying in Europe		July 1831		

¹²² Ibid, 172.

¹²³ Ibid, 173.

¹²⁴ Mustafa el-Mecdelī's hometown can be predicted as Magdala (in modern Israel).

¹²⁵ Ibid, 171.

¹²⁶ Ibid, 175.

¹²⁷ Ibid, 175.

¹²⁸ Ibid, 173.

¹²⁹ Ibid, 172.

¹³⁰ Ibid, 173.

¹³¹ Ibid, 173.

¹³² Ibid, 175.

Unknown three students ¹³³	In Austria				
Vārī bin Kalhū ¹³⁴	France				
Yūsuf ‘Ībādī ¹³⁵	Naval training in England		March 1829		End 1830
Yūsuf Āgāh ¹³⁶	Naval training in England		March 1829		July 1835
Yūsuf Hek-ekyān ¹³⁷	Mechanics, Engineering in England		Circa 1829		1835

¹³³ Ibid, 173. All unknown students dispatched in Austria can be estimated as the Egyptian students mentioned in the document from the Ottoman archives. The total number of these students was nine and studied agriculture. (BOA.HAT.833.37557A) Please see, chapter 3, footnote: 29.

¹³⁴ Ibid, 175.

¹³⁵ Ibid, 174.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 174.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 174.

Appendix C Table III: The Ottoman Students Abroad in the Reign of Maḥmūd II (1830-1839)

This table draws from Adnan Şişman's study about the Ottoman students in Paris, as well as a range of archival documents to shed light on the students in London.¹³⁸

Student Name	Dispatching Date	Dispatching Place	Attended School	Return Date
'Abdullah ¹³⁹	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
'Abdüllāṭīf ¹⁴⁰	December 14, 1830	Paris	<i>Institution Barbet</i>	July 12, 1838
'Abdürrrahīm ¹⁴¹	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Aḥmed ¹⁴²	December 14, 1830	Paris	<i>Institution Barbet</i>	July 12, 1838
Aḥmed ¹⁴³	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Aḥmed Vefīk ¹⁴⁴	1834	Paris	<i>Lycée de Saint-Louis</i>	1839
'Alī ¹⁴⁵		Paris		1837
'Alī ¹⁴⁶				
'Alī ¹⁴⁷	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)

¹³⁸ Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*.

¹³⁹ BOA.İ.HR.198. Cited in Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*.

¹⁴⁰ BOA.HAT.701.33726.

¹⁴¹ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁴² BOA.HAT.701.33726.

¹⁴³ BOA.HAT.701.33726.

¹⁴⁴ İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 2: 651.

¹⁴⁵ BOA.HAT.312.18445. Adnan Şişman claims that his dispatching date was 1820-1821 for this person. However, he departed in the 1830s rather than 1820s, according to the document. Şişman, *Tanzimat Döneminde*, 4.

¹⁴⁶ BOA.HAT.675.32989. In the Ottoman Archives, there was only Hāmdān Efendi's request to Reşid Beg in Paris, and whether to dispatch this potential student to Europe or not was not clear.

¹⁴⁷ BOA.İ.HR.198.

‘Alī ‘Āgā ¹⁴⁸	1832-1833	Paris		February 26, 1837
‘Ārif ¹⁴⁹	1838	Paris		
‘Azīz ¹⁵⁰	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Bahāī ¹⁵¹	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Bekir ¹⁵²		London		
Derviş ¹⁵³		London		
Mehmed Emin Derviş ¹⁵⁴	1835	Paris	<i>Ecole de Mines</i>	June 26, 1841
Emīn ¹⁵⁵		London		
Enīs ¹⁵⁶		London		
Eşref ¹⁵⁷		London		
Eyyüb Pasha ¹⁵⁸	1832-1833	Paris		July 24, 1839
Ḥalīl ¹⁵⁹	May 1839	Paris		1840
Ḥalīl ¹⁶⁰	1835-1836	London		
	1838	Paris		
Ḥüseyn ¹⁶¹	December 14, 1830	Paris	<i>Institution Barbet</i>	July 12, 1838
Ḥüseyn ‘Āgā ¹⁶²	1838 (?)	Paris		

¹⁴⁸ BOA.CM.2521, CH.6708, İ.HR.149.

¹⁴⁹ BOA.C.As.23444, BOA.C.MF.81.4004.

¹⁵⁰ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁵¹ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁵² BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁵³ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁵⁴ BOA.İ.HR.453, İ.HR.556.

¹⁵⁵ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁵⁶ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁵⁷ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁵⁸ BOA.CM.2521, BOA.HAT.310.18301.

¹⁵⁹ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁶⁰ BOA.C.As.3444, BOA. HAT.527.25932.

¹⁶¹ BOA.HAT.701.33726, İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 2: 651.

¹⁶² BOA.C.As.23444, C.As.3444, C.As.5892.

İbrāhīm ¹⁶³	1835-1836	London		
	1839	Paris		
İbrāhīm Edhem ¹⁶⁴	December 14, 1830	Paris	<i>Institution Barbet</i>	July 12, 1838
İbrāhīm 'Āgā ¹⁶⁵	1832-1833	Paris		February 26, 1837
İdrīs ¹⁶⁶	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
İsmā'īl ¹⁶⁷	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
'İzzet ¹⁶⁸	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Maḥmūd ¹⁶⁹		London		
Maḥmūd Neşāt ¹⁷⁰	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Mehmed ¹⁷¹	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Mehmed ¹⁷²	May 1839	Paris		
Mehmed Emīn ¹⁷³	1833	London		1835
		Paris	<i>Ecole de Metz</i>	1839
Mehmed Emīn ¹⁷⁴	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Mehmed Reşid Beg ¹⁷⁵	January 2, 1832	Paris	<i>Institution Barbet</i> (?)	January 30, 1838

¹⁶³ BOA.C.As.3444, BOA.HAT.738.34983.

¹⁶⁴ BOA.HAT.701.33726, Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, 2: 441-442.

¹⁶⁵ BOA.CM.2521, CH.6708.

¹⁶⁶ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁶⁷ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁶⁸ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁶⁹ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁷⁰ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁷¹ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁷² BOA.HAT.540.26715, BOA.HAT.541.26736.

¹⁷³ BOA.CM.2074.

¹⁷⁴ BOA.CM.2074, BOA.CM.5892, İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 1: 83-100.

¹⁷⁵ BOA.HAT.701.33726, Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, 5: 1382.

Meḥmed Tevfiḳ ¹⁷⁶	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Necib ¹⁷⁷		London		
Necib ¹⁷⁸	May 1839	Paris		1840(?)
Selīm ¹⁷⁹		London		
	1839	Paris		1840(?)
Süleymān ¹⁸⁰	May 1839	Paris		1840 (?)
Şerīf ¹⁸¹	1838 (?)	Paris		Died in 1839
Ṭāhīr ¹⁸²		London		
	1839	Paris		
Tevfiḳ ¹⁸³	1835	Paris		
Yenakī ¹⁸⁴	Before June 1837	Paris		
Yūnus ¹⁸⁵		London		
Unknown ¹⁸⁶	Before June 1839	Paris		

¹⁷⁶ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁷⁷ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁷⁸ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁷⁹ BOA.C.As.3444, BOA.C.As.59161.

¹⁸⁰ BOA.İ.HR.198.

¹⁸¹ BOA.HAT.1239.48202, BOA.C.MF.81.4004, C.As.23444.

¹⁸² BOA.C.As.3444, 59161.

¹⁸³ Cezar, *Sanatta Batı'ya*, 355.

¹⁸⁴ BOA.HAT.831.37529.

¹⁸⁵ BOA.HAT.527.25932.

¹⁸⁶ BOA.HAT.1238.48162.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Türkiye Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi
(BOA) – Istanbul

Cevdet Askeriye (C.AS.): 3444, 5892, 23444, 59161.

Cevdet Hariciye (C.HR): 6708.

Cevdet Maliye (C.ML): 2074, 2521, 5892.

Cevdet Maarif (C.MF.): 81.4004.

Hatt-ı Hümayun (HAT): 266.15425, 310.18301, 312.18445, 343.19585B,
527.25932, 540.26715, 541.26736, 675.32989, 694.33474, 701.33726,
738.34983, 831.37529, 833.37557A, 954.40958F, 1238.48162, 1239.48202,
1240.48207C.

İrade Hariciye (İ.HR): 149, 198, 453, 556.

Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi – Istanbul

Türkçe Yazmalar (TY): 5638.

Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, 209 (July 28, 1839).

Musavver Medeniyet, no: 9 [11 Rebi’u’levvel 1293 (April 6, 1876)].

“Ecnebi Memleketlere Gönderilecek Talebe Hakkında Kanun” T.C. *Resmî
Gazete* (1169) April 16, 1929.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Kubbealtı Lugatı, Istanbul: Kubbealtı Neşriyat, 2020.

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Rehberi. Istanbul: BOA Yayınları, 2017.

- Abdülhak Molla. *Târîh-i Livâ: Sultan II. Mahmud Portresinden Farklı Bir Kesit*, ed. Mehmet Yıldız. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2013.
- Afyoncu, Erhan. *Sorularla Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2008.
- Agras, Nurdal. "II. Mahmud Dönemi Islahat Hareketleri ve II. Mahmud'un Eğitim Öğretim Faaliyetleri." MA thesis, Selçuk University, 2010.
- Ahmed Cevdet [Paşa]. *Târîh-i Cevdet*. İstanbul: Maṭba'a-ı 'Osmâniyye, 1301[1883-1884].
- Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi. *Vak'anüvîs Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları & Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999.
- Azizi, M. H. & F. Azizi, "Government-Sponsored Iranian Medical Students Abroad (1811-1935)." *Iranian Studies*, 43 (2010): 349-363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210861003693885>.
- Baer, Gabriel. "Tanzimat in Egypt-the penal code" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. 26 (1963): 29-49.
- Bailey, Frank Edgar. *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Baysun, Cavit. "Mustafa Reşit Paşa" In *Tanzimat*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1940, 723-746.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: McGill University Press, 1998.
- Birinci, Ali. *Tarihin Alacakaranlığında: Meşâhir-i Meçhûleden Birkaç Zat-2*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2010.
- Blumi, Isa. *Foundations of Modernity*. New York & London: Routledge, 2012.
- Bowring, John. *Report on Egypt and Candia*. London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1840.
- Caquet, P. E. *The Orient, the Liberal Movement, and the Eastern Crisis of 1839-41*. Cambridgeshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

- Cameron, D[onald]. A[ndreas]. *Egypt in the Nineteenth Century: Or, Mehemet Ali and His Successors until the British Occupation in 1882*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1898.
- Câbî Ömer Efendi. *Câbî Târihi: Târih-i Sultân Selîm-i Sâlis ve Mahmûd-ı Sâni*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2003.
- Castellan, A[ntoine]. [-]L[auren]. *Lettres Sur La Morée, L'Hellespont et Constantinople*. Paris: Chez A. Nepveu Libraire, 1820.
- Cezar, Mustafa. *Sanatta Batı'ya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi*. Istanbul: Erol Kerim Aksoy Kültür, Eğitim, Spor ve Sağlık Vakfı Yayını, 1995.
- Cobbing, Andrew. *The Japanese Discovery of Victorian Britain*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Cowles, Loyal. "The Failure to Restrain Russia: Canning, Nesselrode, and the Greek Question, 1825-1827." *The International History Review*, 12:4 (1990): 688-720
- Çelik, Yüksel. *Şeyhü'l-Vüzerâ Koca Hüsrev Paşa: II. Mahmud Devrinin Perde Arkası*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2013.
- Çelik, Yüksel. "Hüsrev Mehmet Paşa Siyasi Hayatı ve Askeri Faaliyetleri (1756-1855)." PhD diss., Istanbul University, 2005.
- Dodwell, Henry. *The Founder of Modern Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931.
- D'Ohsson, Mouradgea. *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman*. Paris: Chez Firmin Didot Péere et Fils, 1824.
- Emecen, Feridun. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kurulu ve Yükseliş Tarihi (1300-1699)*. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015.
- El-Haj, Rifaat Abou. *Formation of the Modern State*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2005.
- Eldem, Edhem. "Bir Biyografi Üzerine Düşünceler. İbrahim Edhem Paşa Rum muydu?." *Toplumsal Tarih* 202 (Ekim 2010): 2-12.

- Erdoğan, Aynur. "Türkiye’de Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusunun Sosyolojik Çözümlemesi" MA thesis, Istanbul University, 2009.
- Erol, Salih. "XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Devlet Adamlarından İbrahim Edhem Paşa." PhD Diss., Anadolu University, 2019.
- Eyyüb Şabri [Paşa]. *Tārīḥ-i Vehhābīyye*. Istanbul: Kırk Anbar Maṭba‘ası, 1296 [1878-1879].
- Fahmy, Khaled. *All the Pasha’s Men*. Cairo & New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 1997.
- Fahmy, Khaled. "The Anatomy of Justice: Forensic Medicine and Criminal Law in Nineteenth-Century Egypt" *Islamic Law and Society*, 6:2 (1999): 224–271.
- Fahmy, Khaled. *Paşanın Adamları*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010.
- Green, Nile. *The Love of Strangers*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Heyworth-Dunne, J[ames]. *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt*. London: Luzac & Co., 1938.
- Heyworth-Dunne, J[ames]. "Rifā’ah Badawī Rāfi’ at-Taḥṭāwī." *The Egyptian Revivalist Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 9 (1939): 399-415.
- Houghton, John. "The Egyptian Navy of Muhammad Ali Pasha.", *The Mariner’s Mirror*, 105:2 (2019): 162–182.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.2019.1589113>
- Hunter, F. Robert. *Egypt Under the Khedivs 1805-1879*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1999.
- Ilıcak, H. Şükrü. "Ottoman Context" In *The Greek Revolution a Critical Dictionary*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides & Constantinos Tsoukalas. Cambridge & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2021.
- Inoue, Takeshi. "Japanese Students in England and the Meiji Government’s Foreign Employees (Oyatoi): The People Who Supported Modernisation in

- the Bakumatsu-Early Meiji Period" *Discussion Paper Series*, 40 (2018): 1–30.
- İnal, İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal. *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadriazamlar*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943.
- İnalcık, Halil. *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 1st ed., s. v. "Hüsrev Paşa, Koca".
- İnalcık, Halil. "Ottoman Methods of Conquest" *Studia Islamica*, 2 (1954): 118.
- Jaubert, Amédée. "Constantinople En 1830." *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, 15 (February 1835): 137–151.
- Jomard, [Edme François]. "École Égyptienne de Paris." *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, (August 1828): 96–117.
- Jorga, Nicolae. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi (1774-1912)*. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2009.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "Sunuş" In *Paşanın Adamları: Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Paşa, Ordu ve Modern Mısır*, ix–x. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010.
- Karal, Enver Ziya. *Osmanlı Tarihi: Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri (1789-1856)*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2017.
- Karal, Enver Ziya. *Selim III'ün Hat-tı Hümayunları: -Nizam-ı Cedit- 1789-1807*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 1998.
- Karateke, Hakan T. *Padişahım Çok Yaşa: Osmanlı Devletinin Son Yüzyılında Merasimler*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2017.
- Kaynar, Reşat. *Mustafa Reşid Paşa ve Tanzimat*. İstanbul: TTK Yayınları, 2010.
- Keddie, Nikkie R[agozin]. *Modern Iran, Roots and Results of Revolution*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Koloğlu, Orhan. *İlk Gazete İlk Polemik*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2014.
- Korkmaz, Harun. *The Catalog of Music Manuscripts in Istanbul University Library*. The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University: SOLL 118, 2015.
- Kuran, Ercüment. "Sultan II. Mahmud ve Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Paşa'nın Gerçekleştirdikleri Reformların Karşılıklı Tesirleri" In *Sultan II. Mahmud*

- ve Reformları Semineri, 107–111. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1990.
- Kut, Günay, and Edhem Eldem. *Rumelihisarı Şehitlik Dergâhı Mezar Taşları*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010.
- Kut, Günay. “Budinli Hisâlî Dîvânı’ Yayını Üzerine.” *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 43 (2015): 71–115.
- Küçükler, Osman Zahit. “Osmanlı Devletinde Eğitimde Modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş.” Phd Diss., Ankara University, 2016.
- Kütükoğlu, Mübahat. *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2018.
- Lalor, Bernard Aldras. “The Politics and The Reforms of Sultan Mahmud (1826-1839).” Phd diss., University of Chicago, 1975.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Middle East and the West*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Marsot, Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid. *Egypt in the reign of Muhammad Ali*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Mehmed Süreyya. *Sicill-i Osmanî*. Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları & Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1996.
- Nutku, Emrullah. “Türkiye’de İlk Resmî Balo.” *Hayat Tarih Mecmuası*, 8 (August 1975): 82–85.
- Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010.
- Pınar, Hayrettin. *Babîâli ve Hıdiv İsmail*. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2012.
- Rajaei, Farhang. *Islamism and Modernism: The Changing Discourse in Iran*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007.
- Sarı, Nil. “Mekteb-i Tıbbiyye” *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 1st ed. Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 2004.
- Sertoğlu, Midhat. *Mufasssal Osmanlı Tarihi*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2011.
- Shefer-Mossensohn, Miri. *Science among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015.

- Silvera, Alain. "The First Egyptian Student Mission to France under Muhammad Ali" *Middle Eastern Studies*, 16 (1980) 1–22.
- Shaw, Stanford J. *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III 1789-1807*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Skiotis, Dennis N. "The Greek Revolution: Ali Pasha's Last Gamble," in *Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation (1821-1830) Continuity and Change*. ed. P. D. Nikiforos (Institute for Balkan Studies, 1976) 97–109.
- Şânî-zâde Mehmed 'Ata'ullah Efendi. *Şânî-zâde Târîhi*. Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2008).
- Şemsî Ahmed Paşa. *Şeh-nâme-i Sulţân Murâd*. The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University: SOLL 56, 2003.
- Şişman, Adnan. "Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa'ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri (1839-1876)" PhD diss., Istanbul University, 1983.
- Şişman, Adnan. *Tanzimat Döneminde Fransa'ya Gönderilen Osmanlı Öğrencileri (1839-1876)*. Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2004.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Ondokuzuncu asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1942.
- Topal, Alp Eren. "From Decline to Progress: Ottoman Concepts of Reform 1600-1876" PhD diss., Bilkent University, 2017.
- Turhan, Mümtaz. *Garphlaşmanın Neresindeyiz?*. Istanbul: Bâbîâli Yayınevi, 1961.
- Türker, Deniz. "Ottoman Victoriana: Nineteenth-Century Sultans and the Making of a Palace, 1795-1909." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. "İbrahim Edhem Paşa Âilesi ve Halil Edhem Eldem (1861-1938)" In *Halil Edhem Hâtıra Kitabı*, 369–382. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2013.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. "Selim III'ün Veliaht İken Fransa Kralı Lûi XVI ile Muhabereleleri." *Belleten*, 5-6 (1938): 191-246.
- Wanda, Par. *Anecdotes Sur La Turquie (1820-1870)*. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1884.

Yaycıoğlu, Ali. *Partners of the Empire*. California: Stanford University Press, 2016.

Zinkeisen, Johann Wilhelm. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*. Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2011.

WEBSITES

<https://jisho.org/search/%E9%8E%96%E5%9B%BD>, accessed June 26, 2021.

<http://ingilizce.cagdassozluk.com/kamus/osmanlica-ingilizce-sozluk-madde-16922.html>, accessed October 26, 2020.

http://www.iranianoralhistory.de/allg/printed_collection_link.html, accessed January 29, 2021.

<https://archive.org/details/egyptinnineteen00camegoog>, accessed June 27, 2021.

<https://www.polytechnique.edu/bibliotheque/fr/jomard-et-l%C3%A9cole-%C3%A9gyptienne-de-paris>, accessed July 8, 2021.