

DIPLOMACY AS A SOURCE OF TRAVELOGUES: THE CASE OF PIERRE AMÉDÉE JAUBERT'S MISSION IN PERSIA IN 1805-1806

Özgür YILMAZ*

Abstract

In terms of sources of travelogues, it could be said that diplomatic relations have a very important place in the emergence of this kind of writing as seen in the early examples of travelogues. Among the travelogues on the Eastern countries, the European diplomat, ambassador or his retinues wrote an important part of them. These works can be used as a diplomatic source with respect to their writers, as well as being an unofficial type of literature; they contain many interesting details about the country in which travellers journeyed and resided. There is a very rich travel literature on Persia, and they constitute an important part of the sources of Persian history. Travelogues increase especially in the 19th century. However, considering the developments of the early periods of the century, it can be seen that these sources are more important in terms of Persian external policy. Napoleon's attempt to ally with Persia led to the emergence of some important sources about this period. Focusing on Jaubert's mission in Persia, this paper aims to make some determinations about the importance of diplomatic missions in travel writing.

Keywords: Jaubert, Travelogues, Diplomacy, France, Persia, Armenia.

Introduction

The longing for distant places and curiosity about unknown places that inherited in the nature of the human being make people to travel longer journeys, to write voluminous travel books. This kind of writing, which was created by diplomats, writers, artists, scholars traveling around the world, is called as "travelogues" in general, shows a literary feature as well as being a historical resource.¹ Travel literature is a broad genre consisting of descriptive accounts, also known as travelogues or itineraries, telling about an individual or a group's encounter with a new place, peoples and cultures. Travelogues can present an account of a cross-cultural or transnational aspect, or tell about travel to particular regions of a country.²

When we look at the rise of the oriental travel, we must refer to the Ottoman Empire, which became a great power from the 15th century in the Mediterranean especially after the conquest of Syria and Egypt.³ The intense relations with the European states and the Ottoman dominance over the trade routes from 1580s have attracted many travellers

* Assoc. Prof., Gümüşhane University, Faculty of Letters, Department of History, oyilmaz1978@gmail.com

¹ Winfried Löschburg, *Seyahatin Kültür Tarihi*, Trans. Jasmin Traub, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1998, p. 8.

² Özgür Yılmaz, "Osmanlı Şehir Tarihleri Açısından Yabancı Seyahatnamelerin Kaynak Değeri", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 28/2, İzmir 2014, pp. 599-606.

³ Gülgün Üçel-Aybet, *Avrupalı Seyyahların Gözünden Osmanlı Dünyası ve İnsanları (1530-1699)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003, p.16.

to the Ottoman lands.⁴ In the 18-19th century, a remarkable increase was seen in the quantities of travelogues on the Orient. At the end of the 18th century, the establishment of the British administration in India, the occupation of Egypt by the French, and the British-French competition led to an unexpected increase in the number of travels to the East. Moreover, the travellers published voluminous travelogues to satisfy European readers who were ready to read all kind of travel literature. This process played a key role in the emergence of a scientific discipline called "orientalism". As a product of the West's defining process of the East, orientalism became a means of establishing the western hegemony over the Eastern cultures by the end of the 19th century. The European traveller's systematic study of the East led to systematic abuses in cultural and political matters too.⁵

From the 18th century onwards, the western perception about the East has also begun to change, and the western travellers have found a stable and idle eastern world against the developments in Europe. In other words, a more distinctive Oriental concept has emerged in the eyes of the west. This was the result of the political and economic developments of the period and the influence of the dominant ideologues. Colonialism and imperialism, which reached the zenith in the 19th century, changed the structure of travelogues and the improvement of travel conditions thanks to the railways and steamboats during this century strengthened the ties between the east-the west.⁶ By the end of this century, because of the scientific developments, the traveller in the classical period has left his place to the experts according to their profession as geologists, geographers, archaeologists, diplomats and historians, and thus they have produced works based on more important and scientific data.

There was a close relationship between travels and diplomacy as observed in the emergence of many travelogues. Diplomacy and commercial interests intertwined from ancient times, and embassies between rulers to discuss matters of politics and trade have generated informal travelogues, diaries, or letters outside the official reports sent back to ambassadors' masters. The earliest recorded diplomatic missions took place when the kings of Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt sent envoys to negotiate with other ruler. Although little is known about earliest trade missions, one of the first was in ancient Egypt. In the Christian era, papal missions to convert the "enemies of Christ" often used by members of religious orders-Dominican and Fran-

⁴ On this topic see Gerald MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*, Hamshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006; Michele Longino, *French Travel Writing in the Ottoman Empire: Marseilles to Constantinople, 1650-1700*, New York: Routledge, 2015.

⁵ Fatma Acun, "Seyyah Söylemi ve Trabzon'a Gelen Yabancı Seyyahlar", *Trabzon ve Çevresi Uluslararası Tarih-Dil-Edebiyat Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (3-5 Mayıs 2001), V. I, Trabzon: Trabzon Valiliği, 2002, p.146.

⁶ Löschburg, *op.cit.*, pp. 112-118.

ciscans and later the Jesuits- as ambassadors to make contact with rulers whose subjects were viewed on the basis of total ignorance, as likely candidates for conversion. On the secular and commercial front, the most famous medieval westerner who visited the courts of Far East was Marco Polo. Nevertheless, outward embassy traffic was not confined to Christian Europe. One of the greatest medieval travellers was the 14th century scholar Ibn Battuta who journeyed throughout Islamic world. Another Islamic traveller was Ibn Haldun employed by Nasrid Sultan Muhammed V of Granada as ambassador to Pedro Cruel of Castile in 1360s. In the Far East, the Chinese court also sent ambassadors to Malay Peninsula for commercial and diplomatic missions in 15th century. Some of the most important reports were written by Jesuits who were attached often for a long periods to the courts of foreign powers.⁷

Modern diplomacy emerged in Renaissance Italy where the princes of nation-states of the country engaged deeply with diplomacy that they involved frequent exchanges of ambassadors. However, it could be said that diplomatic activities intensified after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, by alliance attempt of the Byzantine emperors with Catholic powers of Europe. After the ad hoc period of the diplomacy, from the mid-fifteenth century the Venetians opened the period of the permanent diplomacy by appointing commercial representations as baylo, in other words trade consuls. Other powers of Europe followed the Venetian's' practise and maintained permanent presence in foreign capitals. For this reason, the developments of permanent diplomacy can be followed also in the Ottoman capital from the mid-fifteenth century. Apart from the power base of the Muslim threat to the heart of Europe and centre of vast trading empire, the Ottoman capital was really the focus of the diplomatic activity from the sixteenth century onward. So many ambassadors and other diplomatic representatives, besides their official reports, recorded their impressions as travelogues.⁸

Ambassadors and pilgrims were the most important group of travellers during the 15-16th centuries. Other servants, who were working under the patronage of embassies, as interpreters, accountants, traders, religious officials, pharmacists, researchers, clergy, priests, orientalist and archaeologists, chamberlains, prisoners and slaves, followed them. They prepared so many travelogues concerning the Ottoman Empire and created an interesting source of information on the history of Ottoman diplomacy, international affairs and the Ottoman social and economic life.⁹

⁷ Martin J. Manning, "Diplomatic and Trade Missions", *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*, Ed. Jennifer Speake, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp. 339-341.

⁸ Manning, *op.cit.*, pp. 339-341.

⁹ Esin Yurdusev, "Studying Ottoman Diplomacy: A review of the Sources", *Ottoman Diplomacy Conventional or Unconventional?* Ed. A Nuri Yurdusev, New York: Springer, 2004, p. 181.

As for the Persian example, it is possible to see the characteristics of this country and its differences as compared to the Ottoman Empire. As Wannell stated that, in the classical, Christian or Islamic and modern periods, Persia has been the “other” a different, fascinating challenging, sometimes as hostile area of culture and politics. The western travel literature approached it from different point of view, because the country was totally unknown to the west. The mass travel literature on Persia was military, diplomatic and missionary. This literature tended to during the periods of the country's power and expansion. The earliest written account on the country goes back to sixth-century B.C. The next important series of written sources on Persia date from after the seventh-century Arab conquest. The Mongol conquest of the central Islamic world in the 13th century inspired a series of missions to secure military alliance with Persia and Europe. The search for alliance with Persia continued in the Ottoman period as we could see in the case of Ruy Gonzalez Clavijo to Tamerlane in 1404. The European direct trade with the Indian Ocean had also increased the strategic importance of Persia. The rise of the literate mercantile middle class and the spread of printing, as well as the growing taste for luxury textiles, silks, and carpets gave enormous boost to travel writing as seen in the 17th century in Persia. In the following century, the country was visited by well-known travellers as Pietro Della Valla, Jean Thévenot, Tavernier, Chardin and Du Mans.¹⁰ However, the Afghan destruction of the Safavid capital in 1722, Persia was plunged for a long period into political anarchy, civil war, and economic and social insecurity. As a result, there were fewer western residents and visitors to Persia in the latter half of the eighteenth century.¹¹

A direct outcome of the perennial rivalries among the great western nations in the early 19th century was a number of diplomatic missions, particularly French, sent to Persia in the hope of concluding agreements with the shah. Among the first French missions, some were also engaged in research on geographical, economic, political and social aspects. Their findings brought home to the west the realization that Persia was not as highly developed, nor as populated and rich as some 17th century travelogues had led them to believe as in the example of Jaubert's travelogue, and the maps that sometimes accompanied the accounts showed a considerable part of the country as barren and deserted.¹² From the British side, many more British wrote about their travels in Persia during the first half of the 19th century: army officers going home or returning to India from leave, other officers on intelligence gathering

¹⁰ Bruce Wannell, “Iran/Persia”, *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*, Ed. Jennifer Speake, New York: Routledge, 2003, pp. 616-617.

¹¹ Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam, “France VIII. Travelogues of the 18th-20th Centuries”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X/2, p. 146.

¹² *Op.cit.*, p. 146.

missions, diplomats and their staff, members of military missions and of exploratory expeditions.¹³

The history of the relations of France with Persia goes back to medieval times. In the early middle Ages, Persia was perceived by the French mostly through biblical, Greek, and Latin sources. During the Crusades, which were sanctioned by the papacy and launched by the Franks, all Muslim countries, including Persia, were considered enemies of Christianity. The Mongol invasions, despite their calamitous effects, permitted the renewal of contacts between the east and the west, with France playing a leading part. Europe's foremost motivation was to Christianize the Mongols, as it had earlier barbarian invaders. Dominican and Franciscan missionaries were sent to Il-khanid Persia. Missions and ecclesiastical sees were established at Soltaniyeh, Maraga, Tabriz, and Tiflis. Christian missionary activity, diplomacy, commerce and travel continued in the following centuries. In the Aq Qoyunlu period, the European states were trying to establish political and commercial ties with Tamerlane and Uzun Hasan against the rising Ottoman danger.¹⁴ In the Safavid period, the Ottoman-French relations prevented the French from establishing direct relations with the Safavids. Although it caused the reaction of the Ottoman government, the first attempt to establish direct Franco-Persian was made in the reign of Louis XIII. Deshayes de Courmenin went to the Safavi palace and saw the shah, but he could not gain a very important achievement in terms of Franco-Persian relations.¹⁵

However, despite this political failure, Catholic missionaries settled in Persia and the French Capuchins activities achieved to establishment of the French in this country. French missionaries played an important part as informants for travellers, merchants, and diplomats. In the beginning of the 18th century, French-Persian relation was carried out by semi-official merchant as Jean Billon de Canserille, Jean-Baptiste Fabre, Marie Petit and Pierre-Victor Michel. In this process, the first Persian embassy Muhammed Riza who was sent to France reached Paris in 1715 to negotiate a new Persian-French treaty. However, with the fall of the Safavid dynasty shortly afterwards in 1722, the advantages were not enforced and there was no increase in French trade with Persia. Shortly after the Persian embassy's reception, Louis XIV's death in 1715 coincided with the decline of the Safavids. Once again, France tried to further its political and commercial links with Persia through the enforcement of the renewed treaty. But French endeavours to establish relations with Persia remained cautious and limited. Despite that, France tried to play an

¹³ Denis Wright, "Great Britain VII. British Travelers to Persia", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, XI/3, p. 246.

¹⁴ Jean Calmard, "France II. Relations with Persia to 1789", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, X/2, p. 127.

¹⁵ René Pillorget, "Louis Deshayes de Courmenin et l'Orient musulman (1621-1626)", *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises*, 27, Paris 1975, p. 67.

important part in post-Safavid external policies of Persia sometimes as a mediator between Russia, Turkey and Persia sometimes to arrange Turco-Persian alliance against Russia. Cultural links between France and Persia, though gradually developing throughout this period, suffered at times because of ruptures in diplomatic and commercial relations. In the Safavid period and its aftermath, Franco-Persian relations remained mostly under the control of the French ambassadors to the Porte.¹⁶

After this introduction part on the travel literature, the rise of travel related to the East and especially the brief introduction of French relations with Persia, the following section of this study will focus on the activities of French alliance with Persia in the framework of Napoleon's eastern policy and will examine the emergence process of the Persian mission of Jaubert according to secondary sources on this topic. Jaubert's journey to Persia and the following sections are based on Jaubert's travelogue, *Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, fait dans les années 1805 et 1806*, which was published in 1821.¹⁷ In this context, the content of the study is formed according to Jaubert's book. In these parts, we will focus on Jaubert's journey on the Ottoman and Iranian lands, the difficulties, which he faced, and the impression of the traveller on the Ottoman and the Persian sides. The mission of Jaubert by Fath-Ali Shah and his observation on Persia in many respects are summarized according to Jaubert's work in the section. In the last part, the journey of the traveller from Persia to Finkenstein is examined. As it will be seen in the text, the study revealed new findings about the difficulties which Jaubert faced in Bayezid from the correspondences of the French Consulates in Trabzon. To sum up, the study is largely based on the work and impressions of Jaubert. It can be said that, in the framework of travel literature, the rise of Oriental travel and the French attempt to alliance with Persia in Napoleon's reign, the study aims to make brief evaluation of Jaubert's work on his Persian mission. The other secondary sources and French archival documents are used, though the study is based on largely Jaubert's work.

¹⁶ Calmard, *op.cit.*, pp. 129-131.

¹⁷ For the analysis of Jaubert's travelogue in French see *Nouvelles Annales des voyages, de la géographie et de l'histoire*, publiées par MM. J.B. Eyriès et Malte Brun, Tome XIII, Paris: Librairie de Gide, 1822, pp. 236-255; For English see M. Jomard, "Analysis of the Travels of M. Amedee Jaubert, in Armenia and Persia, in 1805 and 1806", *The European Magazine, and London Review*, Vol. 82, London: Philological Society of London, 1822, pp. 137-143; Jaubert's travelogue translated to German in 1822, see Pierre-Amédée Jaubert, *Reise durch Armenien und Persien: in den Jahren 1805 und 1806*, Weimar 1822; And to Dutch in 1823, see Pierre-Amédée Jaubert, *Reis in Armenië en Perzië, gedaan in de jaren 1805 en 1806*, Amsterdam 1823.

1. The Background of Jaubert's Mission: Napoleon's Persian Policy

In the last years of the 18th century, significant changes were seen in terms of internal and external policy of France and Persia. Despite the hostility of Catherine the Great of Russia towards both Persia and the French Revolution, the ascendancy of the Qajars in Persia and the changes brought about by the French revolutionary government in 1789 did not at once lead to any closer ties between the two countries. From late 1795, Persia became part of French projects against British India. Napoleon had viewed his Egyptian campaign (1798-99) as a foothold to launch a conquest of India.¹⁸ He is also said to have combined with the Tsar Paul I a joint attack on India. From the renewal of the Franco-Ottoman relations with the Treaty of Paris in June 1802,¹⁹ he sought information on Persia. Diplomatic overtures towards a Franco-Persian alliance were made through General Brune,²⁰ French Ambassador at Constantinople.²¹ The main mission of General Brune was not only deal directly with the sultan and beyond but to establish the first relations of France with Persia.²²

From October 1803 onwards, France's interest in Persia intensified. Talleyrand, the Foreign Minister, directed Jean-Francois Rousseau,²³ the French commissioner for commercial relations in Baghdad, and his colleague in Aleppo, Louis-Alexandre de Corancez. The main duty of these officials was to provide detailed information on Persia's force, its dispositions and the character of rulers and to provide regular information flow from that country. Precisely in this period, an important event occurred that Persia sought for help of France. In 1804, General Tsitsianov, Governor of Georgia, seized the Persian

¹⁸ Iradj Amini, "Napoleon and Persia", *British Institute of Persian Studies*, 37, London 1999, p. 109; For more detailed information on the Napoleonic period of Franco-Persian relations, see Iradj Amini, *Napoleon and Persia: Franco-Persian Relations Under the First Empire*, Washington DC: Mage Publishers 1999.

¹⁹ For this treaty, see Comte de Saint-Priest, *Mémoires sur l'ambassade de France en Turquie et sur le commerce des Français dans le Levant*, Paris: Librairie de la Société Asiatique, 1877, pp. 523-537.

²⁰ For the ambassador's mission in Constantinople, see P. Coquelle, « L'ambassade du maréchal Brune à Constantinople (1803-1805) » *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, XVIII/1, Paris 1904, pp. 53-73.

²¹ Jean Calmard, "Gardane Mission", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, X/3, pp. 292-297; Brune was instructed by the French government to collect detailed information on different Ottoman provinces and sent to French cabinet. Besides, Brune had to make observations about Persia, see Henri Dehérain, "Lettres inédits de membres de la mission Gardane en Perse (1807-1809)", *Revue française d'histoire d'outre-mer*, Tome XVI, 15, Paris 1923, p. 249.

²² David Vinson, « "Napoléon en Perse" : la mission Jaubert (1805-1807) Entre expérience viatique et contexte diplomatique, » *Astrolabe*, 20, Paris 2008, (<http://www.crlv.org/viatica/juilletaoût-2008/«-napoléon-en-perse-»-la-mission-jaubert-1805-1807>).

²³ Rousseau was the writer of the unpublished manuscript under the title of "*Tableau général de la Perse moderne ou mémoire géographique et politique sur la situation actuelle de cet empire*", and was another important source of information on Persia in this period. Irene Natchkebia, "Unrealized Project: Rousseau's Plan of Franco-Persian Trade in the Context of Indian Expedition (1807)," *Studies on Iran and The Caucasus: In Honour of Garnik Asatrian*, ed. U. Bläsing, V. Arakelova, M. Weinreich, Leiden: Brill, 2015, pp. 115-126.

fortress of Ganja in Azerbaijan and was about to besiege Erevan under Persian possession. In this case, Fath-Ali Shah applied to assistance of Britain in accordance with the terms of the 1801 Anglo-Persian treaty. However, the shah could not see the support of British assistance that he had expected. Therefore, Fath-Ali Shah did not have other option of asking for help from the French.²⁴ From this possible alliance, each side had their own expectation. Fath-Ali Shah hoped Napoleon might help him recover Georgia, while the latter thought that closer ties with Persia might facilitate the defeat of Russia and open the way to India.²⁵ Fath-Ali Shah wrote a letter to Napoleon and gave it to an Armenian called Ossep Vassilovitz to hand over to the French ambassador in Constantinople. Vassilovitz delivered the Shah's letter to Pierre Ruffin, the embassy's Counsellor and informed him of the situation in Persia and of the character of the shah.²⁶

In this period, apart from the arrange French-Persian relations, the most important occupations of the French embassy at Constantinople was the relation between Selim III and Napoleon. Under pressure from the British and the Russians, Selim III having refused to acknowledge the imperial title of Napoleon, the French ambassador in Turkey decided to quit his post in protest. In such a diplomatic atmosphere, the French took a new step and decided to send Jaubert to Constantinople, near Brune, to transmit the news of his coronation to Selim III and to negotiate the recognition of the imperial fact by the Ottoman sultan. As soon as Jaubert arrived in Constantinople, he began to look for a suitable interview facility to give the letter of the Nopoleon to Selim III. According to Jaubert, however, the increasing Russian influence after Brune's departure from the capital prevented him to reach this opportunity. Finally, Jaubert had an occasion to meet with Selim III in Kağıthane and he was well received by Selim III and conveyed the letter of Napoleon. Therefore, he fulfilled the first part of the mission.²⁷ However, the more important and more difficult Persian mission of Jaubert was beginning. Suspected the reality of Ossep Vassilovitz's letter, Napoleon wanted to confirm whether the letter was true. As we cited above, Napoleon, who wanted to make a military alliance with Persia against the British and Russians by making use of this opportunity, charged Pierre Amédée Jaubert to examine the situation and make preliminary preparations for the treaty which would be signed with the shah.

Before proceeding with Jaubert's mission in detail, it is important to be informed about his career that he can give us an idea of why Napoleon chose

²⁴ Amini, *op.cit.*, p. 112; Mustafa Aydın, *Üç Büyük Gücün Çatışma Alanı Kafkaslar (1800-1830)*, İstanbul: Gökkuşbu, 2008, p.118.

²⁵ Florence Hellot-Bellier, "France III. Relations with Persia 1789-1918," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X/2, p. 131.

²⁶ Amini, *op.cit.*, p. 112.

²⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 3-4.

Jaubert. He was born in Aix-en-Provence, 3rd June in 1779. He studied Turkish, Arabic, and Persian languages for two years (1796-98) with Sylvestre de Sacy at the École des Langues Orientales in Paris, and then was appointed interpreter with the title “jeune de langues” at the French legation in Constantinople. Then he took part, as the interpreter, in Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt (1798-99) and in 1799, he became the senior interpreter in the service of Napoleon. He taught for two years (1800-01) at the École des Langues Orientales, before accompanying French troops in 1802 in their expedition to Alexandria in Egypt.²⁸ On his return to France in 1803, he was appointed secretary interpreter at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and professor of Turkish language at the École des Langues Orientales. As we mentioned above, in 1804, he was charged to announce to Sultan Selim III that Napoleon had been crowned emperor. In March of the following year, he was sent to Persia to establish an alliance with Fath-Ali Shah against England and Russia.²⁹

After returning to France from the Persian mission, Jaubert received many privileges from Napoleon Bonaparte: the cross of chevalier of the Légion d’honneur, the title of Chevalier of the Empire in May 1808, and the position of Master of the requests at the Council of State in 1810. During the period known as Hundred Days between March 8 and July 1815, Jaubert occupied the position of the “Chargé d’affaires” of France in Constantinople. That was why the next French regime did not appreciate his services and he was dismissed. Afterwards, he devoted his time to linguistic research and to teaching. In 1818-19, with government aid, he embarked on a new trip to Tibet, from whence he succeeded in introducing into France 400 Kashmir goats. He was once again sent to Istanbul by King X. Charles in 1830 for the determination of the Ottoman-Greek border.³⁰ Jaubert spent the rest of his life in study, in writing and in teaching. In the same year, he joined the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres while teaching as the professor of the Persian language in the Collège de France. In 1834, he was named president of the Société asiatique. In 1841, he was appointed “Pair de France” in the Chambre des Pairs in Paris. He became Chevalier of the Légion d’honneur (1845) and was president of the Société asiatique until 1847. He died in Paris on 28 January 1847 and was buried in the Père-Lachaise cemetery.³¹

In September 1805 and June 1806, the French envoy Jaubert and the

²⁸ For more detailed information on Jaubert, see. M. Sedillot, “Notice sur P. Am. Jaubert,” in Pierre Amédée Jaubert, *Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, précédé d’une notice sur l’auteur, par M. Sédillot*, Paris: E. Ducrocq 1860, pp. I-XXVII.

²⁹ Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam, “Jaubert, Pierre Amédée Émilien-Probe”, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, XIV/6, p. 593.

³⁰ Semavi Eyice, “Jaubert, Pierre Amédée Jaubert, *DİA*, vol. 23, 2001, pp. 576-578 ; Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. XVIII.

³¹ Nasiri-Moghaddam, *op.cit.*, p.593.

army officer Antoine Alexandre Romieu were instructed to present letters from Napoleon to the shah of Persia. When we look at Napoleon's instructions in this regard, it can be seen that these two officers explain in detail how they should go to Persia.³² When Jaubert was waiting for his journey to Persia, Alexandre Romieu arrived in Constantinople on May 20, 1805. Both were therefore charged with a common mission with similar expectations and instructions, but for safety reasons they had to follow different routes. Moreover, Romieu, unlike his "co-emissary", a recognized orientalist and former chief interpreter of the Egyptian expedition, did not master any of the languages used in the countries to be crossed and, apart from his short experience in the Ionian Islands, he knew very badly the oriental habits and customs. Despite the secrecy surrounding the mission Romieu, the English consul in Baghdad, Harford Jones, was quickly informed by his Persian intermediaries and his colleague in Alep, Barker, tried to prevent Romieu and his entourage from reaching Persian capital. Accompanied by the young interpreter, Georges Outrey, Romieu set out on 15 June 1805 for Tehran via Halep, Urfa, Diyarbakir, Mardin, Musul, Kerkuk, Hamedan, and Qazvin. Despite dangers which came chiefly from the hostility of local populations and the intrigues of English agents, Romieu arrived in Tehran on September 25, 1805.³³

In the Persian capital, Romieu met the shah and his ministers, and wrote correspondences and various diplomatic memories. According to Amini, in his correspondences, Romieu saw little interest in an alliance with Persia. In Romieu's opinion, the only point of such an alliance would be on the one hand to prevent Russian expansion, and on the other to reserve the remains of the Ottoman Empire.³⁴ Interestingly, however, Romieu died in October three months after his arrival. There was amid rumours that he had been poisoned

³² "The person I intend to send to Persia is Adjutant Commandant Romieu. Have him give the same instructions as M. Jaubert, and let him go as soon as possible? If it happened that M. Jaubert had not left Constantinople when he arrived there, they would concert together, and set out at a great distance from each other, and by different roads. M. Romieu might well pass through Trebisonde; but if he were to pass through Bagdad as well, he ought not to set out at the same time as M. Jaubert, so that if accidents should happen to one, the other would overcome them. You will not fail to inform him that the principal object of his journey is to learn of the situation of Persia, and of the course of the governors who exist there, province by province, and to recognize to what extent his forces are mounted. He must, if possible, travel the banks of the Araxes and push to the Russian frontiers. He will take information on past events, and, lastly, on all that may enable me to know the country well. He will be very reserved, however, in talking with the ministers and the Emperor (Fath-Ali Shah), he will say that I want to enter into a covenant with him and offer him succor". Vinson, *op.cit.*, (<http://www.crlv.org/viatica/juilletaout-2008/«-napoléon-en-perse-»-la-mission-jaubert-1805-1807>).

³³ David Vinson, "« Napoléon en Perse » : la mission diplomatique Romieu: Un « lieu de mémoire » viatique au début du XIXe siècle," *Astrolabe*, 26, Paris 2009, (<http://www.crlv.org/astrolabe/juilletaout-2009/napolé-en-perse-la-mission-romieu>).

³⁴ Amini, *op.cit.*, p. 112; Vinson, *op.cit.*, (<http://www.crlv.org/astrolabe/juilletaout-2009/napolé-en-perse-la-mission-romieu>); Calmard, *op.cit.*, pp. 292-297.

by agents in the service of England. Because, Romieu had already accused the British consul, Barker, in Aleppo of having attempted to assassinate him during his trip to Persia.³⁵ Thus, as the first diplomat of Napoleon to the court of Persia to seek Franco-Persian alliance, Romieu's mission did not reveal the expected results. Nevertheless, after Romieu's death, his assistant, Georges Outrey returned to France with the news that the Shah intended to send an ambassador to Paris.³⁶

2. A Perilous Journey of Jaubert to the Persian Border

After this information, let us return now to the details of Jaubert mission. According to Jaubert's travelogue, "in order to ensure the success of the journey, it was important that the motive should not be disclosed. The Shah of Persia desired it, and it was known that the Sublime Porte did not wish European travellers to pass through its provinces of Asia; Moreover, it was reasonable to suppose that the agents of England and Russia, employed in the Ottoman Empire, would neglect nothing to defeat such a mission, if they knew its object". For these reasons, Jaubert left secretly Paris on the 7th of March 1805. He crossed Germany, Hungary, and Transylvania diligently, and arrived at Bucharest on the 2nd of April. He passed to Nessebar, from there he took the road to the Black Sea coast by Süzebolu, İğneada, and Kiyıköy, which exposed him to less danger than those of Edirne. Jaubert followed this direction to a short distance from Constantinople, and after the thirty-fifth day journey, he arrived on the 10th of April in the Ottoman capital. After completing the first part of the mission there, Jaubert began preparations for the voyage to Persia. M. Ruffin, counsellor of the Embassy, assisted him for preparations and Jaubert concerted with the Armenian, Ossep Vassilovitz, who had brought the Shah's letter and had waited at Constantinople for an answer. However, it was not easy to decide which route to choose for the voyage. Jaubert who contributed to the anarchic environment in Anatolia and the British entrances in Baghdad decided to go to Trabzon by sea and then to proceed to Persian capital. Jaubert had to stay in Constantinople for more than a month to get the necessary preparations. Finally, accompanied by the Armenian guide, a Tartar and a French servant Jaubert left Constantinople and after seven days journey, he reached Phase (Faş) and from there to Trabzon.³⁷

In fact, Jaubert's preference was not in vain that Sinop and Trabzon were

³⁵ David Vinson, "« Napoléon en Perse » : genèse, perspectives culturelles et littéraires de la mission Gardane (1807-1809)", *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 109/4, Paris 2009, pp. 882.

³⁶ P. Avery- G. R. G. Hambly- C. Melville (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 7, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 380.

³⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 5-6.

hosting the French consulates since 1803.³⁸ Therefore, we can say that Jaubert should be encouraged by the presence of French officials at these ports. At his landing at Trabzon, he handed to the French consul, Pierre Dupré, the letters of recommendation. In this letter Jaubert was only qualified as “a merchant” who travelled for his business. It is interesting to say that Pierre Dupré's correspondence does not include any information on Jaubert's visit to the city and the permission for travel from the governor of the city in this period.³⁹ It is possible to explain this situation as follows: At that time, that Dupré had an influential competitor, Roubaud, who was also French citizen, but was in charge of Russian interests in Trabzon. Dupré occasionally blamed Rubaud who was appointed later by the Russian government as consul in the city, for his intrigues as to seize the Dupré's letters and get him out of Trabzon in accordance with Russian politics.⁴⁰ Probably because of the confidentiality of Jaubert's mission, Dupré chose not to mention French diplomat in his reports.

Jaubert had chosen a very inappropriate time to travel to Persia. There was a complete atmosphere of chaos and turmoil in Anatolia during this period. The turmoil caused by the rebellion of Tayyar Mahmud Pasha had an effect on the eastern part of Anatolia as well as on the central Anatolian region.⁴¹ As for Trabzon, the governor of Trabzon, Memiş Ağa was at war with the inhabitants of the country. Therefore, as Jaubert stated in his travelogue, Memiş Ağa had warned French consul Dupré who introduced Jaubert to himself.⁴² After three or four days stay in Trabzon, Jaubert took the permission from Memiş Ağa to depart the city. He left Trabzon and arrived in Erzurum on June 19 after an 8-day trip. Jaubert dressed in Armenian clothes for fear that he could be recognized in the city. His guide had assured him that the inhabitants of Erzurum were the most fanatical and intolerant of men. But despite this camouflage, Jaubert was recognised by Ahmed Bey, intendant governor of the custom-house, who had received many civilities from the French army in Egypt six years before, after having been stripped of everything by the Arabs;

³⁸ For more and detailed information on the French consulates in these ports, see Özgür Yılmaz, “Güney Karadeniz’de Yeni Fransız Politikası: Pascal Fourcade ve Sinop Konsolosluğu (1803-1809)”, *Cahiers balkaniques*, 42, Paris 2014, pp. 223-268; Özgür Yılmaz, “Trabzon’da Fransız Varlığının İlk Dönemleri: Pierre Jarôme Dupré’nin Trabzon Konsolosluğu (1803-1820)”, *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 21, Trabzon 2016, pp. 87-120.

³⁹ For the Dupré's correspondences, see AMAE, CADN, APD, Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D, Trébizonde, Tome 1-2; AMAE, CADC, CCC, Trébizonde, Tome 1-2, (1801-1824).

⁴⁰ AMAE, CADC, CCC, Trébizonde, 1, Dupré to Talleyrand, Trabzon, 5 July 1806.

⁴¹ For the Tayyar Mahmud Pasha's rebellion from the French perspectives, see Yılmaz, Pascal *Fourcade ve Sinop Konsolosluğu*, pp. 243-251; Yılmaz, *Jarôme Dupré'nin Trabzon Konsolosluğu*, pp. 98-103.

⁴² “What does this infidel want? Does he not know that the roads are impracticable, and does he think me to believe that the only lure of mediocre gain determines him to risk his life to arrive a few hours earlier in Armenia? If the declaration he made is “true, let him take patience, if it is not, let him go; I shall be able to discover the object of his journey”. Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 9.

fortunately, it was Jaubert, then secretary to the interpreter who had transmitted to him the papers of the French general. Jaubert was quite well received by Ahmed Bey in a way that he had never expected and learned from Ahmet Bey how he would leave the city. Thanks to Ahmet Bey's help, Jaubert was able to make his way from Erzurum on June 29.⁴³ Even if he was exposed to the threats of the Kurdish bandits, especially at nights, he was able to reach Bayezid.

In Bayezid, Jaubert was coldly welcomed by Mahmud Pasha, bey of the region, and the pasha was also suspicious of them. Indeed, the pasha retained the tartar and Armenian as prisoners. This latter, being put to the torture, confessed the object of the journey, and was soon after strangled. In this way, the pasha realized that Jaubert did not also intend to go to Yerevan, but he was a European who was sent to the Persian capital with his valuable gifts. Jaubert, obliged in his turn to make some confessions, was reassured by the insinuating manners of Mahmud who promised him help and protection, and even gave him an escort, Halil Ağa, to accompany him to the place of his destination to Erivan.⁴⁴

Accompanied by the Tartar and two servants Jaubert departed under an escort of Kurds, but deprived of the assistance of his Armenian guide. The escort soon increased; every moment fresh soldiers arrived. At length they crossed the river which run at the foot of Mount Ararat, and served as a frontier to the Turkish possessions; they landed and while Jaubert was congratulating himself on his arrival in the Persian territory, he was suddenly surrounded by the Kurds; one seized him in the middle of his body, another tied his arms, and a third disarmed him. They blindfolded him, turned his face towards the ground, and bound in the same manner his servants and the Tartar. They then carried them all into a solitary valley. Some hours after, Jaubert and his attendants were conducted to a lonely castle, where Mahmoud expected them. Mahmud Pasha pretended to have received from Constantinople an order to seize Jaubert and his servants. He afterwards caused him to be thrown into a frightful with his three companions.⁴⁵

Jaubert and his three companions spent three months in the dungeon in very bad conditions. The pasha, to avoid the reproaches of the Porte or the vengeance of Persia, propagated false reports; but he still hesitated to make an end of his victims. Such was their horrible situation, when all at once the plague broke out at Bayezid, which had not appeared for twenty-four years. At

⁴³ M. Jomard, "Analysis of the Travels of M. Amedee Jaubert, in Armenia and Persia, in 1805 and 1806", *The European Magazine, and London Review*, Vol. 82, London: Philological Society of London, 1822, p.137; Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p.14.

⁴⁴ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 26-30.

⁴⁵ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 38-51.

that time, Bayezid was divided into a high city inhabited by the Kurdish tribes, and each occupied a separate quarter and in the city, inhabited by the Armenians. It was in the upper part that the contagion caused the greatest ravages. The alarm was at the harem and Mahmud Pasha attacked by the plague and in a short time he was the victim of the disease. Last successor was his son Ahmet Bey who was condemned the prisoners to death. However, fortunately Ahmed Bey who was struck with the contagion died too. At this moment, there was a development that would end Jaubert's bondage. The governor of Erivan had sent for him to Bayezid a courier who informed that the shah of Persia would menace the town with the whole weight of his vengeance if they did not restore him to liberty. Ibrahim Bey, successor of Ahmed Bey, wrote to Constantinople for the prisoner's situation. The answer of the Porte soon arrived from Constantinople that ordered Ibrahim Bey to send Jaubert to the camp of Yusuf Pasha.⁴⁶ Thus, Jaubert miraculously saved from an apparently inevitable death. According to Jaubert, his captivity began on the 5th of July 1805, and ends only on the 14th of March of the following year, the day of his arrival at Yusuf Pasha's camp, in other word, an interval of eight months and thirteen days.⁴⁷

It must be pointed out that neither the current literature nor Jaubert's travelogue contain any descriptive information about who was the origin of this captivity in Bayezid. According to Jaubert's writing, this seems like a decision taken by Mahmud Pasha's own initiative. However, in this issue, we find interesting information in the consular correspondences from Trabzon. As we stated above, Jaubert had come to Trabzon where he was introduced to local authorities as a French merchant by the French consul Dupré. But, in the city, there was another French merchant named Roubaud who was the Russian consular candidate and charged with take care of the Russian interests. Interestingly, in his correspondences, Dupré was steady complained about Roubaud's hostility towards him and linked Jaubert's captivity with Roubaud's intrigues. In a letter of Dupré to Roussin dated on May 26, 1806, French consul stated that Jaubert brought also Ruffin's letter to Roubaud. When the Jaubert gave the letter to Robaud, he recognized him because Roubaud had seen him in Constantinople. Although Jaubert told him that he was wrong, Roubaud who delivered this secret mission to Constantinople learned the truth and informed Russian consul in Sinop.⁴⁸ Based on Dupré's comments, it is possible to say that Jaubert's bondage was a reaction of the Russian diplomacy, which did not want to see the French presence in Persia.

Jaubert moved from Bayezid on February 19 to join Yusuf Pasha's camp.

⁴⁶ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 63; Jomard, *op.cit.*, p.139.

⁴⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 82.

⁴⁸ AMAE, CADC, CCC, Trébizonde, Tome 1, Dupré to Roussin, Trabzon, 26 May 1806.

The impressions on the region, which he had obtained during this journey, were included by the author as a separate section on his travelogue. In this chapter, he mentioned the Kurdish population in the region. When we look at the information of Jaubert on the region, he especially focused on the division of the Kurdish region in the north and in the south and another division of the region into two parts, one of which is comprised in Asiatic Turkey, and the other in the Persian Empire. He also mentioned Kurdish customs, their exercises, their livelihood methods, and their nomadic life.⁴⁹

Jaubert, who departed Bayezid with a cavalry escort, arrived at Toprakale on 22 February. After a hard journey from here, he reached Erzurum on March 3. Jaubert stayed in comfortably for a while here, also had the opportunity to write a letter about the situation of himself to the French consul Dupré in Trabzon after a long time.⁵⁰ Jaubert who departed from Erzurum arrived at Yusuf Pasha's camp in Suşehri. Yussuf Pasha knew Jaubert personally, having seen him in Egypt after his fatal loss at the battle of Heliopolis. He gave Jaubert a very distinguished reception, in consequence of having just received news of the great victory gained by the French at Austerlitz. He promised to send him safe to his destination and at the same time cautioned him against the politeness and agreeable manners of the Persians, who, although so much thought of in Europe, are deficient in frankness and sincerity. Jaubert's visit to the vicinity of Suşehri had also allowed him to make observations about the region. Jaubert focused on the Canik region in particular and gave valuable information about the people of Canik, the anarchic environment prevailing in the region, the struggle between Tayyar Pasha and Yusuf Pasha, and Yusuf Pasha's activities in order to provide local tranquillity.⁵¹

After seventeen days' stay, Jaubert left the Yusuf Pasha's camp on April 1, 1806 with an escort which consists of twenty men of confidence, commanded by Mustapha Ağa. After three days' march, they arrived in Erzincan, the ancient Satala, upon the Euphrates near one of the chains of Taurus. From thence, he arrived five days after in Erzurum. Avoiding the road to Bayezid, he directed his course south, towards Hınıs, Malazgirt and Van. Near Malazgirt, Jaubert met with the Yezidis who, according to Jaubert, a Kurdish tribe, are terrible to travellers, inhabit the foot of the mountain; they worship the evil spirit, and consider robbery and murder lawful. Jaubert arrived in Van where Feyzullah Paşa received him with great distinction; gave him an escort; and by one of those revolutions so very frequent among the Turks. But the pasha perished three days after, being assassinated by a rival. Jaubert left Van with

⁴⁹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 66-78.

⁵⁰ For the the Jaubert's letter to French consul Dupré, see AMAE, CADN, APD, Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D, Trébizonde, Jaubert to Dupré, 3 Floréal 14/ 14 April 1806.

⁵¹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 88-94.

a new escort entirely composed of Kurds on the 30th of April, and directed his course towards Qotur, the last village in Turkey.⁵²

3. Voyage in the Persian Territory

Jaubert arrived in Hoy on May 4, 1806. He was able to live comfortably in the city after he explained their missions, although he faced with a very bad treatment at first in the city. According to Jaubert, a part of Hoy's population, which was approximately twenty-five thousand people, had left the city due to internal disturbances. The next day, Jaubert visited the governor of the city, Hüseyin Khan who welcomed him with politeness and showed him an interest, which perhaps his misfortunes had inspired. Jaubert was confronted with a different atmosphere in Persian side like politeness of manner, health of the inhabitants, richness and variety of cultivation, elegance of language. By way of Hoy-Marand, Jaubert he reached to Tabriz where Jaubert saw the ruins of the earthquake. In Jaubert's words, "if Chardin⁵³ were to revisit it, he would no longer know it". In Tebriz Jaubert was welcomed by Fath-Ali Khan who lodged Jaubert in his magnificent palace, a delicious residence.⁵⁴

Jaubert left Tabriz, full of gratitude for all the good treatment he had received there. Instead of going on towards Tehran, he travelled eastward, through Saidabad, Serab, and Ardebil in order to visit the camp of Abbas-Mirza. According to Jaubert's observation, in this country between Seidabad and Erdebil, the houses were built below the soil, like several parts of Armenia and Georgia where the inhabitants lodge underground. The environs of Ardebil, better cultivated than those of Serab and Chelebian, abound in excellent fruits. The city, which was located south of the mountain range, served as a warehouse for goods transported by caravans traveling from Tiflis, Derbend and Baku to Tehran and Isfahan. So, the bazaars of this city were well maintained. At Erdebil, Jaubert, who had resumed his European dress, became the object of general and disagreeable curiosity.⁵⁵

On his arrival at the camp of the young Persian prince, Abbas Mirza, on May 17, he was treated with the greatest distinction. Abbas-Mirza had recently gained some advantage over the Russians; but the renown of the victories of the French armies excited his admiration, and he wished to have a faithful account of them. By asking the following questions, Abbas-Mirza wished to inform himself of everything remarkable: "What is the power which gives you so great a superiority over us? What is the cause of your progress and our

⁵² Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 95-128.

⁵³ The famous French traveler who traveled to east between the years 1664-1677. Jean Chardin, *Voyages du chevalier Chardin en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient*, Paris: Le Normant, 1811.

⁵⁴ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 128-145.

⁵⁵ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 146-150.

constant weakness?" Jaubert could not hide his confusion in the face of these questions and voiced his pleasure of hearing from the Persian princes such questions that he never heard in Turkey. The young Persian prince was curious about the French expedition to Egypt, the bravery of the Mamelukes, the life of the ferocious Cezzar Ahmet Pasha.⁵⁶

After spending six or seven days in Ardebil, Jaubert left the city for the Persian capital. He reached to Khalkhal and departed from there on May 24, after two days' march he arrived in Zanjan where two roads that lead from Tabriz and Ardebil to Tehran meet in. Jaubert and his entourage travelled in two days from Zenghian to Soltaniyeh, where they find remarkable ruins, not by a high antiquity, but by the immense extent of the ground, which they occupy. This aspect of Soltaniyeh was the result of civil wars. Beyond it is the fertile valley of Abhar which follows the desert of Kazvin; Jaubert was very pleased with the nature of Abher, a small village in his route after Soltaniyeh. In Kazvin Jaubert was quite well received by Baba Khan, where he witnessed a brilliant fete in honour of the birth of three princes of the blood-royal: music, poetry, illuminations, flowers, dancing, and the most delicious perfumes embellished a splendid repast.⁵⁷ He only spent two days in Kazvin, and left that city on the 2nd of June. After three days' march, Jaubert reached to the Persian capital and entered to the city with the escort of a numerous and magnificent cavalry that Fath-Ali Shah had sent him.⁵⁸ When Jaubert arrived in Tehran, another French emissary, Romieu had died in October 1805. Therefore, the French struggle to achieve the Persian alliance had interrupted about ten months. Although Romieu was of a different religion, Persians extremely affected at the sight of the body of a French warrior, and they erected for him a monument surmounted by a cupola.⁵⁹

4. Jaubert in the Persian Court

After a delay of 15 months, Jaubert finally reached to his target that and the first audience granted to him by the Shah of Persia. In his travelogue, Jaubert makes very detailed descriptions of this first reception ceremony. In his words, "They ascended by horse, preceded by a numerous and brilliant cavalry, and by various slaves. A double hedge of soldiers seated on the ground, with a gun on his shoulder, bordered the streets. The spectators stood behind, the terraces of the houses were covered with women and children. The door of the imperial palace, to which the Persian called Dar-ı Saadet, was like a

⁵⁶ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 150-172.

⁵⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 173-186; Jomard, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

⁵⁸ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 198.

⁵⁹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 295.

fortress, defended by a large ditch on which a drawbridge was dropped. After passing the bridge, they entered the first courtyard of the palace, which is very spacious and saw troops there, some pieces of cannon, and white horses belonged to the shah. The mane, tail and legs of these animals were painted red on the orange. Then, they reached a second door, built of painted brick, and situated at the entrance of a dark gallery, which extends to the salon of the viziers". Jaubert was received by the *teşrifatçıbaşı* and taken into the drawing-room where he encountered with the Vizier and the ministers. While he was waiting for the hour appointed by the astrologers for the audience, he was offered the *narghileh* and refreshments. In this ceremony, Jaubert was kept so far off, that he could scarcely see the throne of Fath-Ali Shah. The master of the ceremonies having announced him to the shah, he replied, "you are welcome".⁶⁰

After which a vizier conducted him to the hall of audience where he saluted the shah again. The letter that Jaubert was carrying, enclosed in a brocade bag, was then presented to the shah on a golden tray. The Grand Vizier, after having displayed this letter, read the translation, modulating his voice to make the rhythm of the phrases feel. The shah, by a peculiar benevolence, allowed Jaubert to sit down with the Persian opposite to him. The audience lasted more than an hour, because of the shah's desire to be precisely informed of the object of Jaubert mission, or because he was pleased to be able to converse with a European without interpreter assistance. Before the end of this audience, Fath-Ali Shah ordered him to see the gardens of his palace, a favour that no stranger had enjoyed until then.⁶¹

After Fath-Ali Shah's reception ceremony and the description of his palace, Jaubert begins to give information about the king's administration. Fath-Ali Shah, who reigned over Persia, was about forty years old when Jaubert arrived in Tehran. He was of an elevated stature, and of a very strong constitution. His physiognomy presents the character of that of the men of Turkestan. The shah was affable, generous; but severe to excess, and implacable in his anger. He enjoyed questioning her guests who were envoys, travellers, and dervishes, who from various parts of Asia arrive daily at his court. He had a taste for literature, and cultivated it successfully. Jaubert also mentioned political situation of Persia under the administration of the shah. When Fath-Ali Shah ascended to the throne, the Persian Empire was still shaken by the shocks of the death of Tahmas Kulu Khan. The eastern provinces of Persia did not obey Fath-Ali Shah's reign. In addition, Hussein-Khan, his brother, seemed willing to raise the standard of revolt. However, despite the political situation of the country, the greatest tranquillity reigned throughout the empire under

⁶⁰ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 204.

⁶¹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 202-210.

the reign of the shah, because the shah's orders were executed punctually. In this safety environment, the traveller could safely traverse all the roads. Referring here to the anarchy environment in Anatolia, Jaubert stated that in the Persian territory there was no longer any need to fear as in the Turkish territory by the hordes of Arabs and Kurds. In addition to these, the shah had established complete control over the palace. In Persia, the viziers were not invested with all the authority of the monarch, as they were at the beginning of this century in Turkey. On the contrary, the shah dominated everything by himself. His ministers were only entrusted with the details of affairs. In order that his ministers could not turn against him, he took care to choose them only among the mirzas or the ulemas.⁶²

Jaubert also told about the residence in the capital where he lived in the palace of Mirza-Riza-Kulu. A great number of Persian lords and Armenians, guided by curiosity and chiefly by the desire to do something agreeable to the shah, visited in the capital. The ministers gave brilliant festivals, which always took place at night. The city of Tehran was built on a low ground at the foot of the chain of the Mount Alborz. Mehmed Khan, in 1794, determined to fortify Tehran and to establish his residence in that city. Although the air, which it breathes in, was very unhealthy in summer, and that the sojourn of Isfahan ought to have seemed more agreeable to him. The fortifications of the city seemed to him very mediocre and the palace and gardens of the shah covered a considerable site; but the houses of the great have no appearance. The Persians' preferring to adorn the inside rather than the exterior of their dwellings, the mosques, bazaars, and caravanserais of Tehran were still in their former state. However, the city, at the time of Jaubert's visit, was not very flourishing, and whose inhabitants were not more than thirty thousand. The soil of the neighbourhood of Tehran, both on the east and west sides, is stony and barren; but the waters which flow from the mountains situated some distance to the north of this town, watering the intermediate plain, make it susceptible of some cultivation.⁶³

5. Sketches of Persia: Agriculture, Population, Economy, Army, Commerce and Traditions

During his sojourn, which lasted little as more than a month, Jaubert did not neglect to make observations about the country. By making extensive evaluations on Persia in many respects, we found in Jaubert's travelogue "a portrait of Persia" at the beginning of the 19th century. He first touched on the climate of Persia in relation to the agriculture of the country. According to Jau-

⁶² Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 211-215.

⁶³ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 291-293.

bert, the climate of Asia Minor and that of Persia vary according to the direction of the great chain of mountains. This chain stops the clouds, which come from the Mediterranean, and makes them fall in rain in the northern part of Anatolia. In Persia, the mountains extend towards the south-east and they no longer oppose any barrier to the west winds, but allow them to run unimpeded to the plateau of Punjab and to the elevated places from which the Jihun, the Indus, and the Ganges. Dagestan, Georgia, Shirvan, Armenia, part of Kurdistan and Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ghilan, Mazenderan and the province of Aster Abad must therefore be considered as very humid countries. Therefore, the soil was rich and fertile. However, in the south of the Taurus, on the contrary, it was rare that no vapour obscures the air, which consequently was very dry.⁶⁴

The rivers of Persia which reach the Caspian Sea are extremely rapid, which proceeds from the considerable volume of their waters and from the slope of the ground; but those which water the plains of Kashan, Qom, Isfahan, and Shiraz, flow with less speed, and as they move away from their sources, they diminish instead of grow. While only a few of these rivers can reach the sea, most of them disappear in the middle of the sandy plains. The inhabitants of these arid provinces successfully applied to irrigation by underground aqueducts, which known as Qanat in Persia. Once the soil had been soaked with water, grass, wheat, rice, vegetable crops, herbaceous cotton, shrubs, fruit trees, trees to provide shade, such as the willow, the poplar, the plane tree, the abalone, grow in sight, and present a verdure all the fresher, the more agreeable, as it contrasts with the colour of the sand of the deserts. Pretty dwellings, kiosks, mosques, and palaces rose in the midst of these immense orchards. However, the population sometimes were infected by a kind of venomous reptiles that escape from the desert and breed in inhabited places. In addition, the population was exposed another inconveniences which, in summer, result from the scarcity of water, air, and the exhalations of a humid country. That's why, the inhabitants of several provinces of Persia was generally of a diseased complexion and spend a great part of their lives in different places.⁶⁵

As for the people of Persia, Jaubert said that because of almost continual disorders, the population reduced to six or seven millions who were dispersed in the various provinces of the empire. Beside this, the people of Persia consisted mainly of two different sects which one that of the nomads inhabits the mountains or traverses the deserts; the other, known by the name of Tajik, lives in fields and watered places, or resides in towns. In Persia, on the contrary of Egypt and Arabia, the nomad was not reluctant to naturalize himself in a city. The farmer embraced the kind of life and the pastoral habits of the nomads. The Muslims did not scruple to profess the most complete tol-

⁶⁴ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 216-217.

⁶⁵ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 217-220.

eration towards Christians who were resided in different parts of the empire. Jaubert, who compared Arab and Turkmen nomads with that of Persian, point out that the latter were quite different. They were subject of the prince, whoever reigns over Persia, contract even in the midst of the camps, gentleness and politeness of the inhabitants of the towns. The Persian nomads preferred the vast lands, the high mountains, as aboding places most favoured by nature. They changed their places from time to time, to breathe a new air, to experience, so to speak, at every moment, the feeling of their independence. When the inhabitants of the towns, indolent and effeminate, took up arms only in a pressing danger, the nomads were always armed and ready to fight their enemies. These nomads created also an important military force for the shah as mercenary troupes. Jaubert also mentioned some of the most important of these nomadic tribes, as well as the places they live in.⁶⁶

The class of Persian agriculturists, by their condition and the habits, holds the middle class between those of the nomads and the townspeople. A cultivator in Persia was in absolute dependence on the government. He obeys and suffers without murmuring, as long as the evil is not carried to excess; but if the trustees of public authority oppress him too strongly, he fled his fields, abandoned the paternal roof, and returned to the class of nomads. However, when he resumed his labours and pursued them with as much activity as intelligence, and when nothing disturbed him in the exercise of his industry, a Persian cultivator could easily have enriched. This richness was showing in the most mediocre villages of Persia as large and beautiful houses, containing all the superfluities afforded by opulence.⁶⁷

Jaubert described the formation of Persian towns as follows: When a chief of a powerful nomad tribe camped in a fertile valley to take possession, firstly he built houses as weak as the tents and indicated to each one the ground he ought to cultivate, and he regulates the kind of work he is entitled to expect from those who are subordinate to him. Some plant gardens, others dig reservoirs. Women occupy the housekeeping, knead the bread, spin the wool, tread felts and weave carpets. If the establishment thrives, if the chief inspiration of confidence, merchants attracted by the lure of gain, come in all directions. The huts are succeeded by dwellings proper, convenient, but open and airy. After then mosques, bazaars, and fountains are erected, and soon the camp of pastors presents the appearance of a city.⁶⁸

Another issue that Jaubert referred to was the population and economic situation of Persia. Like any voyageur who visited Persia, Jaubert firstly was influenced by the dilapidated image of the country, which was the result of fre-

⁶⁶ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 221-230.

⁶⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 230.

⁶⁸ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 231.

quency of earthquakes. Another factor of this view was the Persian customs that they leave the paternal house when they marry and build their houses at their will as Jaubert observed in Soltaniyeh. Besides, according to Jaubert's observation, many important Persian cities as Tabriz, Isfahan, and Hamadan were in a decline compared to their former state. Contrary to the testimony of the native sources, Jaubert said that the present population and the revenues of Persia were not as much superior as they expressed. From different sources, he evaluated population of Persia as 6,562,000. As for the revenues of the shah, they were composed of the products of his domains; royalties paid to him by the governors of the provinces; customs duties levied on different goods; tributes which it imposes on the chiefs of the nomadic hordes and the princes of some neighbouring countries and presents that, in order to conciliate his benevolence, make him various governors, whether rulers or foreigners, and especially those of the Afghan province of Herat. It is necessary to add this sum horses, cattle, felts, carpets, and other objects given by the tribal chieftains that increased the revenues of the shah to seventy to eighty millions of francs. By these revenues, the shah was to maintain his army, to pay the expenses of his palace, and to give to those of his subjects, who have deserved them by their services, considerable gratuities. As for public establishments, such as colleges, mosques, fortifications, aqueducts, and bridges, they are for the most part the responsibility of the provinces, and consequently poorly maintained. With a critical approach, Jaubert stressed that the shah instead of employing these revenues in a manner more useful to the country and to the shah himself, he was thinking only of accumulating his wealth. Because, in Jaubert's opinion in the despotic states, the public interest was counted for nothing, and that the words of political economy, wisdom of administration, order and foresight were unknown.⁶⁹

Of course, another crucial observation topic of Jaubert, who was sent to Persia to seek alliance with this country for the benefit France, was the Persian military power that he studied it as their discipline, their pay, and their presumed number. The Persian troops, when on the march, live almost always at the expense of the country they traverse. The intendants of the army gave mayors of each village, recognition of the commodities, which had been consumed. However, this method generally caused the villagers to be damaged. Persian troops were armed lightly and in a manner quite appropriate to military service. As the army to went an expedition in summer, they often walked by night, by the light of torches, and by the sound of noisy music. The places of encampment and residence were assigned by the firmans of the shah. Officers who were ordered to choose suitable positions and arrange for food and forage were despatched beforehand. In this way, tents and other

⁶⁹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 233-240.

necessities were provided before military troops arrived. As for the Persian army's ability to fight, Jaubert used rather negative expressions like "Persian had no idea on war and their troops retained no order as seen in their manner of fighting". Moreover, the army had no barracks, no military hospitals, nor stores for the supply of the army. Each cavalier was obliged, by means of the pay, ranged from 120 to 140 franc, which he receives from the sovereign, to supply himself with everything. Referring to the Malcolm's book on Persia⁷⁰, Jaubert calculated the number of the Persian army as 254.000 which consisted of guards of the shah and princes; troops supplied by the nomadic tribes; provincial militias and various corps of infantry, cavalry and artillery, exercised and dressed almost European. In this context, on the modernisation of the army, Jaubert, who also took into account subsequent developments in the country, expressed that there were some obstacles to the modernization of the army, which stemmed from the religion and the traditions.⁷¹

Placed between Europe and India, the Persians imported by land, and at little expense, the productions, and were generally satisfied with a mediocre gain, were hoping to extend their affairs by this means. Jaubert identified three major obstacles to the further enrichment of the country and the development of trade. The first was them was the practise, which allowed everyone to buy and sell for his own account. The second was the aversions, which the Persians had always had for the sea. They neglected the shorter maritime routes and preferred the passage from the most arid and dangerous deserts. The lack of maritime culture of the Persian, which resulted of such an antipathy, was doubly fatal to the country, which placed between the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf. The third cause was the lack of exchange. The bills of exchange and that of paper money were not unknown in Persia. However, despite these shortcomings, the industrious genius of the Persians, and the advantage afforded those by the situation of their country, which was placed between the two richest parts of the world, combined with the safety of the roads of Persia, could chance the conditions of the Persian. Jaubert who described the trade partners of the country and the products which subjected to import and export of Persia, referred also the products that France could sell.⁷²

Jaubert analysed the manners of the oriental in three chapters in his travelogue. But it can be said that, these chapters not only based on his observation in Persia, but also long years that Jaubert lived in the Turkish and the Arabic society. His oriental knowledge, that he had studied Turkish, Arabic, and Persian languages for two years, allowed him to engage with the local

⁷⁰ John Malcolm, *The History of Persia, From the Most Early Period to the Present Time*, Vol. I-II, London: John Murray, 1815.

⁷¹ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 241-247.

⁷² Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 248-254; Vinson, *op.cit.*, (<http://www.crlv.org/viatica/juilletaoût-2008/«-napoléon-en-perse-»-la-mission-jaubert-1805-1807>).

population directly and compare with each other as well as European society. He stated that although the geographies and origins are different, Turkish, Arab and Persian society belong to common traditions. Focusing on the family, Jaubert tried to make accurate definitions about Persian society. The individuals who compose the family were the father, the mother, the children, the domestic servant, and the slaves. The paternal authority being more extended among these people than European society. In particular, the situation of women was the subject of Jaubert's assessments. Jaubert who criticizes misinformation by the relations of certain travellers from Europe, like stupidity, meanness, and falseness, about oriental women stressed that such an opinion would be ill founded. He also stated that oriental women were not exposed to any pressure that they had a special place in society. After further determination on the structure of oriental societies, Jaubert finally tried to make comparative evaluations between the Turks and the Persians.⁷³

6. Route to Finkenstein

Jaubert, who had quite bad experiences in his journey to Persia, did not neglect to make suggestions about his ways of travel to the east and gave explanatory information on topics such as which destinations and routes should be followed and how to travel that would be very useful for future travellers.⁷⁴

After his sojourn in Persian capital more than a month, he had a good opportunity to leave Tehran. Fath-Ali Shah used to leave the capital for military inspection of his army. For this reason, the shah left Tehran for Soltaniyeh on June 24, 1806. Jaubert accompanied to the shah's retinue; but a violent fever, caused by the unhealthy conditions of Tehran, detained him at Ali Shah Abbas. The shah's chief physician, Mirza-Chefi, received orders to take every care of him.⁷⁵ When he was still ill in Ali Shah Abbas, Adrien Dupré,⁷⁶ son of Pierre Dupré, consul of France in Trabzon, arrived in Persia and brought latest news from Europe. Thanks to the effort of Persian physicians and the regime that he followed, Jaubert recovered partly from the disease and continued his journey. He arrived at the camp at Soltaniyeh on the 5th of July and rested there nine days. In this period, he assisted for forty days at the hunting parties of Fath-Ali Shah, and at the reviews of troops, employing himself during the time with the purport of his mission. Finally, he obtained his audience of

⁷³ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 255-285.

⁷⁴ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 286-290.

⁷⁵ Édouard Driault, *Napoléon'un Şark Siyaseti*, Trans. Köprülüzade M. Fuad, Prep. Selma Günaydın, Ankara: TTK 2013, p. 161.

⁷⁶ Adrien Dupré also wrote his own work on his mission in Persia, see Adrien Dupré, *Voyage en Perse, fait dans les années 1807, 1808 et 1809, en traversant la Natolie et la Mésopotamie, depuis Constantinople jusqu'à l'extrémité du Golfe Persique, et de là à l'Irèwan*, Tome I-II, Paris: J.G. Dentu, 1819.

leave, and received magnificent presents. The Shah assured him that he much wished to be in amity with the French nation; and promised to receive with politeness all Frenchmen, who should be induced to visit Persia through curiosity or business.⁷⁷

The shah appointed Mehemed Khan, officer of the Persian army, as a mihmandar for return of Jaubert to Erzurum. With Adrien Dupré, the tatar, the servants and the baggage, Jaubert departed from Soltaniyeh on July 14. His route was nearly the same as that by which he came. The first day, they reached to Zenjan where they spent two jour. On July 23 they arrived in Tabriz where welcomed by Ahmed Khan. From Tebriz, after a four-day trip they reached to Hoy. Thence, they went to Van, then passed an arm of the Euphrates, near Tuzla, which they crossed with the help of leather bottles; and lastly, the Araxes, which is in the same mountains as the Tigris and the Euphrates and arrived in Erzurum on August 19. On August 28, Pierre Dupré informed to Ruffin, chargé d'affaires of French embassy at Constantinople:⁷⁸

"It is with greater joy that I have the honour to inform you of the arrival at Erzurum of M. Jaubert. He gave me notice of it by a pedestrian whom he sent me, ordering me to charter a ship, in order to pass immediately to your capital. A disease, which he has undergone, and of which he is not entirely recovered, has the strength to go on short days. I hope, however, to have the pleasures of receiving him in a few days, he testifies to me all the satisfaction which he experiences, the arrival of my son with him".

The next day, Jaubert departed from Kian, a large village about a mile away from Erzurum. It was near Aşkale that Jaubert met Jouannin, who was sent to him by Ruffin as interpreter of France mission in Persia.⁷⁹ Jaubert arrived in Gümüşhane on August 23, well known town for the exploitation of considerable mines which are at a short distance. From Gümüşhane, by the summer road of Trabzon-Erzurum they reached on the 24th to Stavri, which was the first Greek village to be encountered on the way from Erzurum-Trabzon. When he was in Cevizlik (Maçka) he wrote to Pierre Dupré, the consul of Trebizond, a letter to welcome him on the way. The next day Jaubert and his retinue arrived in Trabzon where Jaubert saw the Black Sea that reminded him the Retreat the Ten Thousands of Xenophon.⁸⁰

According to French consul Dupré's correspondences, Jaubert resided in Trabzon nearly a week. During his stay, he was accompanied by Dupré.

⁷⁷ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 301-310

⁷⁸ AMAE, CADN, APD, Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D, Trébizonde, Dupré to Ruffin, 28 August 1806.

⁷⁹ Henri Cordier, « Un interprète du général Brune et la fin de l'École des Jeunes de langues », *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France*, 38/2, Paris 1911, p. 340.

⁸⁰ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 325-333.

With the consul, he accepted the agent of Georgia sent by Solomon Khan.⁸¹ Of course, Jaubert's arrival at Trabzon triggered the jealousy Russian consuls, Roubaud in the city. On his report dated on September 7, Dupré informed to the French embassy that after the departure of Jaubert, he was worried about safety of Jaubert's voyage to Constantinople because of Russian ships near Trabzon. Even in his later correspondences, Dupré stated that the Russian consul did not pleased Jaubert's return from Persia, his stay at Trabzon and his departure, and referring to the mütesellim of Trabzon, he tried to prevent Jaubert from leaving the city.⁸² For the journey to Constantinople, Dupré chartered a small ship, beşçifte, for Jaubert and passed him Pulathane, the real port of Trabzon. Interestingly, the misfortune of Jaubert did not leave him from on his returning journey. Due to bad weather, he had to wait at the port of Pulathane for a while, and later stormy weather of the Black Sea forced the Jaubert's beşçifte to stay at several places on the southern coasts of the sea, as Vona and Ünye. Under these circumstances, however, was favourable to them that the ship anchored in the harbour of Kumcağız, not far from the mouth of the Kızılırmak. As the season was advancing, the sea became less navigable from day to day. So Jaubert planned to continue his journey by land at least until Sinop and sent his janissary to ask the mutesellim de Bafra for the permission. The answer of the latter was that, in view of the presence of the anarchy in the region, it was advisable to wait a few days. Under these circumstances, Jaubert spent seventeen days in Kumcağız.⁸³ As he planned, Jaubert arrived in Bafra by land; because there was no ship in the harbour, he returned to Kumcağız. Finally, after a week's compulsory stay in Kumcağız, he could find a ship to take him to Sinop on September 30.⁸⁴

When Jaubert arrived in Sinop, Fourcade, French consul in the city, was absent because of his journey to Bafra, Vezirköprü, Havza, Ladik, Merzifon and Amasya. The consul returned to Sinop and met with the French diplomat who was not still recovered from the disease. According to Fourcade, Jaubert was planning to continue his route to Constantinople by land; but he feared also dangers and intrigues of the enemy, the Russia. Because of dangers of the sea and Russian consul's manoeuvres, Jaubert and Fourcade decided to go to the port of İnebolu by land by the encouragement of the Agha of İnebolu. Profiting the Jaubert's visit in his consular region, Fourcade gave him some of the reports that he prepared from the examination he had made in this re-

⁸¹ AMAE, CADN, APD, Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D, Trébizonde, Dupré to Ruffin, 8 September 1806.

⁸² AMAE, CADN, APD, Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D, Trébizonde, Dupré to Ruffin, 7 September 1806.

⁸³ Fourcade, French consul at Sinop mentioned on Jaubert's voyage from Kumcağız to Sinop on his reports, see AMAE, CADC, CCC, Sinope, Fourcade to French Foreign Ministry, 15 October 1806.

⁸⁴ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 334-346.

gion.⁸⁵ Jaubert, who departed from İnebolu on October 15, passed Amasra and reached October 23 at Bartın. Jaubert next arrived in Ereğli, an inhospitable country, and dangerous to Europeans, of which he presented his readers with an interesting account of Allier de Hauteroche, French commissioner who could reside in town only a few months. He found at this place a forty-gun frigate which in two days carried him to Tarabya where the French ambassador, General Sebastiani, was waiting for him.⁸⁶

When he arrived in Constantinople, Mirza Muhammad Riza, who was chosen as Persian envoy to Napoleon, had arrived in the capital around the middle of September 1806. However, Talleyrand advised Sebastiani to keep him there until the Emperor had decided on the most convenient place for their meeting.⁸⁷ Jaubert and Mirza Mahmud Riza then took the direction of Warsaw, where there was a Napoleon who knew his glory. After the victories of Jena and Auerstädt, the French emperor entered Berlin and then in Warsaw, after Eylau, he fell back to the castle of Finkenstein where, at the end of April 1807, that he received in solemn audience the Persian ambassador who had previously met with the French Minister for Foreign Affairs at Warsaw. On May 4, 1807, a treaty of Franco-Persian alliance, finalize the Treaty of Finkenstein, consisting of sixteen articles was signed.⁸⁸ After the treaty at Finkenstein, our traveller, Jaubert set out from Dantzick on the 21st of June, to return to France.

Conclusion

We can evaluate Jaubert's mission from different aspect, which was a result of French attempt to make an alliance with Persia in 1805-1807. First, it is not possible to say that Jaubert's mission, which reached its goal by the Treaty of Finkenstein, revealed a long-term political benefit for French foreign policy. Even, in order to finalize the Treaty of Finkenstein, on 10 May 1807 General Gardane was charged to a new mission to Persia, as minister plenipotentiary, responsible for regulating the details of the cooperation between the two powers. However, Gardane arrived in Tehran in December 1807, six months after the peace treaty between the French emperor and the tsar, the Treaty of Tilsit on July 9, 1807. This important French diplomatic shift would naturally put the mission of Jaubert and Gardane in a false position which ultimately resulted in a resounding failure. However, partly successful mission

⁸⁵ Fourcade, French consul at Sinop mentioned on Jaubert's voyage from Kumcağiz to Sinop on his reports. See AMAE, CADC, CCC, Sinope, Fourcade to French Foreign Ministry, 15 October 1806; Jaubert, *op.cit.*, p. 353.

⁸⁶ Jaubert, *op.cit.*, pp. 335-364; Jomard, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

⁸⁷ Amini, *op.cit.*, p. 112.

⁸⁸ Aditya Das, *Defending British India Against Napoleon: The Foreign Policy of Governor-General Lord Minto, 1807-13*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016, p. 37.

of Jaubert, who published his travel account, was a good example for French diplomats who accompanied to Gardane's retinue.

Of course, not all Jaubert's travelogue focuses on his diplomatic activities. Like many other diplomats or officials who have performed official duties and prepared their works, Jaubert did not prefer to talk too much about his diplomatic activities. He did not prefer to describe the official or formal side of the mission. However, he tried to draw "a portrait of Persia" from different point of view by pointing out to the reader some very remarkable passages upon the manners, religion, usages, and actual state of Persia at the beginning of the 19th century when the competitive environment between the great powers flared up. Based on experiences of Jaubert, one could make also some comparisons between the Persian and the Turks. It is possible to say that readers, who read Jaubert's travelogue and compare picture of Turkey and Persia at the period, would prefer the latter. Since, the author preferred to reflect the Persian side more positively in his chapters. In his word "whatever the loyalty, frankness and hospitality of the Turks, a European traveller will always prefer the politeness, affability, and religious tolerance of the Persians. Considered in relation to moral qualities, the Turks form, doubtless, a more estimable people; but the Persians take it infinitely in all that contributes to make the charm of life".

As a result, if we come to the question of how we should place Jaubert and his work in other French travels to Iran, we can first say that Jaubert's mission emits an important experience for later French travellers. Although the Iranian mission does not create very important consequences for the relations of the two countries, it constitutes one of the best examples of what conditions France was trying to gain influence in Persia, as we have been also supported by French archival documents. Apart from the Russian intrigues who did not want to see France influence in Persia, there was a constant turmoil in Anatolia during the period and the Ottoman-French relations was at a very slippery ground because of Napoleon's reign. Under that circumstance, the fact that Jaubert could traversed Anatolia and reached to the Persian capital, and succeeded to return to Constantinople under unchanged political conditions make us consider Jaubert's mission successful.

Öz

Seyahatnamelerin Kaynağı Olarak Diploması: Pierre Amédée Jaubert'in İran Misyonu Örneği, 1805-1806

Seyahatnamelerin kaynakları açısından bu yazın türünün ortaya çıkmasında ilk örneklerden itibaren diplomatik ilişkilerin oldukça önemli bir yer teşkil ettiği söylenebilir. Özellikle Doğu ülkeleri hakkındaki seyahatnameler içinde Avrupalı devlet adamı, elçi veya maiyetleri tarafından yazılanlar önemli bir yekûn teşkil etmektedir. Bu eserler yazarları itibarı ile diplomatik bir kaynak olarak kullanılabileceği gibi resmi olmayan bir yazın türü olmaları itibarı ile de ilgili ülke hakkında pek çok ilginç detayın bulunabileceği eserlerdir. İran hakkında çok zengin bir seyahatname literatürü söz konusudur ve bunlar İran tarihinin önemli kaynakları arasında yer almaktadır. Bu seyahatnameler özellikle 19. yüzyılda belirgin bir artış göstermektedir. Bu yüzyılın başlarındaki gelişmeler dikkate alındığında, bu döneme denk gelen seyahatnamelerin İran'ın harici siyaseti açısından daha önemli olduğu söylenebilir. Bu bağlamda Napolyon'un İran ile ittifak arayışları bazı önemli kaynakların da ortaya çıkmasına vesile oldu. Bu çalışma Jaubert'in 1805'te başlayan İran misyonu örneğinde seyahatname yazımında diplomatik görevlerin önemi hakkında bilgi vermeye çalışacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Fransa, İran, Jaubert, Seyahatnameler, Diploması, Doğu Anadolu.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Archival Documents

Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères (AMAE) (French Foreign Ministry Archives)

a) Centre des Archives diplomatiques de La Courneuve (CADC)

Correspondance consulaire et commerciale (CCC): Trébizonde, Tome 1 (1801-1811), Tome 2 (1812-1824); Sinop, Tome 1 (1801-1811).

b) Centre des Archives diplomatiques de Nantes (CADN)

Archives des Postes Diplomatiques (APD): Constantinople (Ambassade), Série D: Trébizonde, Tome 1 (1803-1814); Sinope Tome 1 (1803-1812).

B. Other Sources

Acun, Fatma, "Seyyah Söylemi ve Trabzon'a Gelen Yabancı Seyyahlar", Trabzon ve Çevresi Uluslararası Tarih-Dil-Edebiyat Sempozyumu Bildirileri, (3-5 Mayıs 2001), V. I, Trabzon: Trabzon Valiliği, 2002.

Amini, Iradj, "Napoleon and Persia", British Institute of Persian Studies, 37,

London 1999.

_____, *Napoleon and Persia: Franco-Persian Relations Under the First Empire*, Washington DC: Mage Publishers, 1999.

Avery, P.,- Hambly, G. R. G.,- Melville, C. (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 7, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Aydın, Mustafa, *Üç Büyük Gücün Çatışma Alanı Kafkaslar (1800-1830)*, İstanbul: Gökkuşbuğu, 2008.

Calmard, Jean, "Gardane Mission", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, X/3.

_____, "France II. Relations with Persia to 1789", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, X/2.

_____, *Voyages du chevalier Chardin en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient*, Paris: Le Normant 1811.

Coquelle, P., « L'ambassade du maréchal Brune à Constantinople (1803-1805) » *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, XVIII/1, Paris 1904.

Cordier, Henri, « Un interprète du général Brune et la fin de l'École des Jeunes de langues », *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France*, 38/2, Paris 1911.

Das, Aditya, *Defending British India against Napoleon: The Foreign Policy of Governor-General Lord Minto, 1807-13*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press 2016.

Dehérain, Henri, "Lettres inédites de membres de la mission Gardane en Perse (1807-1809)", *Revue française d'histoire d'outre-mer*, Tome XVI, 15, Paris 1923.

Driault, Édouard, *Napoléon'un Şark Siyaseti*, Trans. Köprülüzade M. Fuad, Prep. Selma Günaydin, Ankara: TTK 2013.

Dupré, Adrien, *Voyage en Perse, fait dans les années 1807, 1808 et 1809, en traversant la Natolie et la Mésopotamie, depuis Constantinople jusqu'à l'extrémité du Golfe Persique, et de là à Iréwan*, Tome I-II, Paris: J.G. Dentu 1819.

Eyice, Semavi, "Jaubert, Pierre Amédée Jaubert, *DİA*, vol. 23, 2001.

Hellot-Bellier, Florence, "France III. Relations with Persia 1789-1918," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X/2.

Jaubert, Pierre Amédée, *Reis in Armenië en Perzië, gedaan in de jaren 1805 en 1806*, Amsterdam 1823.

_____, *Reise durch Armenien und Persien: in den Jahren 1805 und 1806*, Weimar 1822.

_____, *Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, précédé d'une notice sur l'auteur*, par M. Sédillot, Paris : E. Ducrocq 1860.

Jomard, M., "Analysis of the Travels of M. Amedee Jaubert, in Armenia and

Persia, in 1805 and 1806", *The European Magazine, and London Review*, Vol. 82, London: Philological Society of London, 1822.

Longino, Michele, *French Travel Writing in the Ottoman Empire: Marseilles to Constantinople, 1650-1700*, New York: Routledge, 2015.

Löschburg, Winfried, *Seyahatin Kültür Tarihi*, Trans. Jasmin Traub, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1998.

MacLean, Gerald, *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*, Hamshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Malcolm, John, *The History of Persia, From the Most Early Period to the Present Time*, Vol. I-II, London: John Murray, 1815.

Manning, Martin J., "Diplomatic and Trade Missions", *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*, Ed. Jennifer Speake, New York: Routledge, 2003.

Nasiri-Moghaddam, Nader, "Jaubert, Pierre Amédée Émilien-Probe", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, XIV/6.

_____, Nader, "France VIII. Travelogues of the 18th-20th Centuries", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X/2.

Natchkebia, Irene, "Unrealized Project: Rousseau's Plan of Franco-Persian Trade in the Context of Indian Expedition (1807)," *Studies on Iran and The Caucasus: In Honour of Garnik Asatrian*, ed. U. Bläsing, V. Arakelova, M. Weinreich, Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Nouvelles Annales des voyages, de la géographie et de l'histoire, publiées par MM. J.B. Eyriès et Malte Brun, Tome XIII, Paris: Librairie de Gide, 1822

Pillorget, René, "Louis Deshayes de Courmenin et l'Orient musulman (1621-1626)", *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études francaises*, 27, Paris 1975.

Saint-Priest, *Compte de, Mémoires sur l'ambassade de France en Turquie et sur le commerce des Français dans le Levant*, Paris : Librairie de la Société Asiatique 1877.

Üçel-Aybet, Gülgün, *Avrupalı Seyyahların Gözünden Osmanlı Dünyası ve İnsanları (1530-1699)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları 2003.

Vinson, David, « Napoléon en Perse » : genèse, perspectives culturelles et littéraires de la mission Gardane (1807-1809)", *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 109/4, Paris 2009.

_____, « Napoléon en Perse » : la mission diplomatique Romieu: Un « lieu de mémoire » viatique au début du XIXe siècle," *Astrolabe*, 26, Paris 2009,

_____, « Napoléon en Perse » : la mission Jaubert (1805-1807) Entre expérience viatique et contexte diplomatique," *Astrolabe*, 20, Paris 2008.

Wannell, Bruce, "Iran/Persia", *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*, Ed. Jennifer Speake, New York: Routledge 2003.

Wright, Denis, "Great Britain VII. British Travelers to Persia", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, XI/3.

Yılmaz, Özgür, "Güney Karadeniz'de Yeni Fransız Politikası: Pascal Fourcade ve Sinop Konsolosluğu (1803-1809)", *Cahiers balkaniques*, 42, Paris 2014.

_____, "Osmanlı Şehir Tarihleri Açısından Yabancı Seyahatnamelerin Kaynak Değeri", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 28/2, İzmir 2014.

_____, "Trabzon'da Fransız Varlığının İlk Dönemleri: Pierre Jarôme Dupré'nin Trabzon Konsolosluğu (1803-1820)", *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 21, Trabzon 2016.

Yurdusev, Esin, "Studying Ottoman Diplomacy: A review of the Sources", *Ottoman Diplomacy Conventional or Unconventional?* ed. A Nuri Yurdusev, New York: Springer 2004.