

**MAHMUD RAİF EFENDI AS THE CHIEF
SECRETARY OF YUSUG AGAH EFENDI, THE
FIRST PERMANENT OTTOMAN-TURKISH
AMBASSADOR TO LONDON (1793-1797)***

*Mehmet Alaaddin YALÇINKAYA***

a) A brief intrduction to sources

In 1792, in the early stages of the reign of Selim III (1789-1809) the Ottoman empire initiated to reorganise some of its basic institutions along European lines. The Sultan was determined to prevent his empire from declining and meant to transform it into a modern state. His principal intention was to reorganise his empire in order to restore its former power. He strongly believed that this object could be achieved only by modernising the vital institutions of the empire, namely the military, administration, politic, economic, and diplomatic ones, along European lines. In Turkish history these series of the reforms are known as the *Nizam-ı Cedid* (New order).

One of the vital reforms of the period concerned diplomatic practice and the this study examines the establishment of the first permanent Ottoman-Turkish embassy to London and the work of Mahmud Raif Efendi, the chief secretary of Yusuf Agah Efehdi, the

* I am greatly indebted to Dr. Johann Strauss for teaching me to translate and use French primary sources during my doctorate research. Dr. Strauss and Dr. Rhoads Murphey's many comments and suggestions have been very valuable and greatly appreciated. I should like to express my thanks to the staff of the Başbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul and Public Record Office, London, for their co-operation while I was working in the archives. I should also like to thank the directors of Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi and of Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi in Istanbul, for allowing me to work in their libraries and for providing microfilm copies of the accounts of Yusuf Agah Efendi and Mahmud Raif Efendi.

** Dr. (Assistant Associate Prof. Dr.) M.A. Yalçinkaya is currently working at the Karadeniz Technical University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of History.

first permanent ambassador to London embassy (1793-1797)¹. The diplomatic reform first attempted by Selim III has had a long lasting effect from 1793 to the present time. Ottoman diplomacy was one of the principal channels through which European ideas and methods were transmitted to the Ottoman empire. This required the existence of permanent Ottoman embassies in Europe. However, there were no such permanent embassies in any of the major European capitals.² The aim of this study primarily concerned the work of Mahmud Raif Efendi during his secretaryship under the embassy of Yusuf Agah Efendi. This study is based extensively on the journal of Mahmud Raif³ and materials from the Prime Minister's Archive in Istanbul and from the Public Record Office in London.

Turkish researchers have studied the activities of the first permanent Ottoman embassy in London, but they have mostly neglected to use the materials of the Turkish and British on this matter. With a few exceptions historians have failed to produce scholarly studies using both British and Turkish sources. They have mainly concentrated on political, economic and military matters, but they have hardly touched matters concerning diplomatic practice, social and cultural activities of the embassy in London. Some of Turkish

1. It is worth to mention here that there is a recent Ph.D thesis on the establishment of the permanent Turkish embassy to Europe see, Mehmet Alaaddin Yalçinkaya, *The First Permanent Ottoman-Turkish Embassy in Europe: The Embassy of Yusuf Agah Efendi to London (1793-1797)*. (University of Birmingham, 1993). Hereafter Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*.

2. For general historical studies of the Ottoman diplomacy see F.R. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Sefaretnameleri*. (Edited by B.S. Baykal, Ankara, 1987; first edition 1968), hereafter Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*; İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara, 1984; first edition 1948), hereafter Uzunçarşılı, *Merkez Salname-i Nezaret-i Hariciye*, (İstanbul, 1302) and A. Süslü, "Un aperçu sur les ambassadeurs ottomanes et leur sefaretname", *TAD* 14/25 (1981-1982), 233-260, hereafter Süslü, *Sefaretname*. For more detailed information on the diplomatic reforms of Selim III see the following works see E. Kuran, *Avrupa'da Osmanlı İkamet Elçiliklerinin Kuruluşu İlk Elçilerin Siyasi Faaliyetleri*, (Ankara, 1968), hereafter Kuran, *İkamet Elçilikleri*, T.Naff, "Reform and the Conduct of Ottoman Diplomacy in the Reign of Selim III 1789-1807", *JAOS* 83 (1963), 295-315, hereafter Naff, *Diplomacy* and also see T. Naff, *Ottoman Diplomacy and the Great European Powers, 1789-1802*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation University of California, 1961), hereafter Naff, *Ottoman Diplomacy*, E.Z. Karal, *Selim III in Hat-ı Hümayunları-Nizam-ı Cedit- 1789-1809*, (Ankara, 1988; first edition 1946), hereafter Karal, *Selim III*, S. Shaw, *Between Old and New The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III 1789-1807*, (Massachusetts, 1971), hereafter Shaw, *Old and New*.

3. Mahmud Raif Efendi, *Journal du Voyage de Mahmoud Raif Efendi en Angleterre écrit par lui même*. This manuscript of Mahmud Raif Efendi is preserved in the library of Topkapı Palace Museum, III Ahmed Kütüphanesi Yazma no: 3707. It is 87 pages, but a page is omitted in the librarian's count and page 42 follows the page 40 instead of 41. Thus, it is counted as 88 pages. Hereafter Mahmud Raif, *Journal*.

researchers have largely published documents about political and military subjects. These documents, sometimes in the original and sometimes transcription, have been inserted into those studies without any critical analysis. Copies of several of these documents are available in British archives and libraries, both in translation and, rarely, in Turkish. Therefore, they can be profitably compared, and this has been done in the footnotes of the text.

In this paper, the documents published by Hammer, Uzunçarşılı, Karal, Unat and Fıkırkoca are the most important. As a first research in this matter, the work of Hammer, who translated Yusuf Agah's report of his public entry into the court of George III (r. 1760-1820) on 29 January 1795, is particularly important.⁴ Uzunçarşılı is also prominent in this field; he has dealt chiefly with Anglo-Ottoman political relations on the basis of the documents. He transliterated the documents looted in the *Name-i Hümayun Defteri* no: 9 about Yusuf Agah's letters of credentials and his presents for the king the other members of the royal family, the Prime Minister Pitt and the Foreign Minister Grenville⁵. Unfortunately, some of his citations in his other works relating to the Ottoman institutions are open to serious criticism. Karal's work is more varied, comprehensive, and thorough. However, his studies based on these documents are not always reliable; his work contains many errors not only of fact, but in his citations and bibliographies, and some of his generalisations and conclusions are open to serious criticism. Nevertheless, his work in editing and making available documents from the Turkish archives has been fundamental and invaluable. He transliterated the conversation between the Reis Efendi, Mehmed Raşid Efendi and the British ambassador, Sir Robert Ainslie, on 13 July 1793 about the establishment of the first permanent embassy to London (*mukaleme mazbatası*)⁶ Unat's work is also worth mentioning. Unfortunately, some of his citations and unfounded conclusions are open to criticism. Nevertheless, his work has based directly on the accounts of Yusuf Agah and Mahmud Raif⁷. Fıkırkoca translated part of Mahmud Raif's account from French into Turkish⁸.

4. Ritter Joseph von Hammer, "An account of the Mission of YUSUF AGHA, Ambassador from Turkey to the British Court", in: *Transaction of the Royal Asiatic Society*, VII (1833), 496-504.

5. İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, "On Dokuzuncu Asır Başlarına Kadar Türk-İngiliz Münasebetlerine Dair Vesikalar", *Belleten* XIII (1949), 573-648. Hereafter Uzunçarşılı, *Türk-İngiliz*.

6. Karal, *Selim III*, 162-186.

7. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 169-179.

8. C. Fıkırkoca, "Bir Osmanlı Gözüyle İngiliz Siyasi Sistemine Bakış", *Tarih ve Toplum* sayı: 10(1984), 65-7.

The historical works of Ottoman historians such as Vasif and Cevdet include the texts of documents and record contemporary accounts of events during the first permanent Turkish embassy in London Vasif (?-1806) is especially important because he was a contemporary of Mahmud Raif. His work on this period is contained in a supplementary volume to the *Tarih-i Enveri* (April 1789-July 1794) which is used in this study⁹. His work extensively based on the archival materials with which I have compared similar documents in the Turkish archives in the footnotes. Cevdet (1822-1895) is the only historian in the field who gives a large amount of information about the establishment of the first permanent embass and Yusuf Agah's embassy and his chief secretary. In this study, volume six of his *History* has been extensively used.¹⁰ Some of his information about the early stages of the first permanent embassy in London was derived largely from Vasif's work. This volume like his others was based to a very large extent on archival sources which he quotes or summarises. When he used archival sources, he rarely cited them inaccurately, but he also used them in his own style. Cevdet recorded several accounts of the same event using European as well as Ottoman sources. His work is remarkably accurate and reliable, when he used the documentary sources of European archives. All in all, this work of Cevdet contains the most accurate and most comprehensive information about Yusuf Agah's mission.

The Turkish archival sources for this period are very well known to many researchers, but have not been fully utilised. Therefore some brief comments might be useful. Firstly, the documents in the Prime Minister's Archive (*Başbakanlık Arşivi*) in Istanbul concerning this period in question are classified under different categories.¹¹ Cevdet Hariciye (*CH*) contains a collection of documents, 9328 in total, concerning the foreign affairs of the Ottoman empire. The documents collected in *CH* were catalogued by a team headed by Muallim Cevdet between 1932 and 1937, and the catalogues are written in Latin script. The documents in this collection are howev-

9. Ahmed Vasif Efendi, *Tarih-i mehasin ül-ısr ve hakayık ül-ahbar*, Istanbul University Library, Türkçe Yazmalar no: 5978. Hereafter Vasif, *Tarih*.

10. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet, tertib-i cedid*. Vol. VI, (Istanbul, 1303), hereafter Cevdet, *Tarih VI*.

11. For general information on the Ottoman archival materials see M. Sertoglu, *Muhteva Bakımından Başvekalet Arşivi*, (Ankara, 1955), A. Çetin, *Başbakanlık Arşivi Klavuzu*, (Istanbul, 1979) and S.J. Shaw, "Archival Sources for Ottoman History: The Archives of Turkey", *JAOS* 80 (1960), 2-6.

er in a bad condition compared to the other documents. The catalogues of Ali Emiri are collections of documents concerning various topics in the day-to-day affairs of the Ottoman empire from Osman I (1281-1324) to Abdülmecid (1839-1863). In this paper only the documents concerning the reign of Selim III (1789-1807) will be considered. *AES III* was catalogued by Ali Emiri and his team between 1918 and 1921. The catalogues, which are written in Arabic script, contain altogether 24, 747 documents. *Hatt-ı Hümayun (HH)* collection contains imperial rescripts by the Ottoman Sultans. There are 58,419 documents dating from 1713 to 1832. The catalogues of *HH* are written in the Latin script. *Name-i Hümayun Defteri* is a collection of correspondence between the Ottoman Sultans and Muslim and Christian states and vassal states. It also contains *hatt-ı hümayun* (imperial rescripts), *muahadename* (treaties), *ahd-name* (pacts or treaties), *tasdikname* (letter of confirmations), and *temessük* (title deed) etc. It also covers important correspondence between 1699 and 1917. In this study, I shall use only *NHD 9* (1772-1803). The *Bab-ı Defteri Başmuhasebe kalemi (DBŞM)* is a collection of documents on the expenditure of the departments of the Ottoman administration. In this paper, *DBŞM* no: 6133 (İngiltere'ye elçi tayin edilen Yusuf Agah Efendi'nin takrirlerinin sureti 1207-1217) is also used.

Apart from these Turkish archival documents I have also looked at the collection of documents concerning Yusuf Agah's embassy in the Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi in Istanbul.¹² This manuscript was catalogued by Ali Emiri and can be found in the Ali Emiri Tasnifi, no: 840. This manuscript is entitled as *Havadisname-i İngiltere* (Accounts of Events in England). This manuscript is also known as the sefaretname of Yusuf Agah. Basically, the *Havadisname-i İngiltere* consists of two parts. The first part totalling twenty-four and a half pages is concerned with British and European affairs, summarised from the newspapers with Yusuf Agah's comments. This part contains 178 cases covering various events. The second part deals with the instructions given to Yusuf Agah by the Porte, his reports sent to the Porte on his diplomatic and commercial activities and some treaties signed between France and her rivals. This second part contains eighteen and a half pages and deals with 42 cases. It is important to indicate here that we have

12. Yusuf Agah Efendi, *Havadisname-i İngiltere*, Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi, Ali Emiri, no: 840. Hereafter Y.A.E. *Havadisname-i İngiltere*.

found two cases repeated twice. They are the cases 18 and 30, and also cases 19 and 31. The *Havadisname* was written in the *rik'a* style of Ottoman Arabic script and the cases in this account cover the period from 1795 to 1797.

Also in this study, the account of Mahmud Raif (*Journal du voyage de Mahmoud Raif Efendi en Angleterre, écrit par lui-même*), the chief secretary of Yusuf Agah, has been extensively used and an English translation is given as an *appendix* at the end of the text. This account is located in the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Yazma no: 3707. It is the first ambassadorial account written in French instead of Turkish. At the same time, it is also the first treatise written in French by a Muslim subject of the Ottoman empire. It was completed after the termination of Yusuf Agah's embassy, either in late July or early August 1797. It is written in simple French and contains 87 pages. This account can be divided to three sections. The first contains the journey of the Ottoman mission from Istanbul to London via Austria, Germany and Belgium from 14 October to 21 December 1793. It also covers the early days of the embassy in London, gives brief information about the royal family and their activities at court and describes the ceremony of the public entry of Yusuf Agah to the court of George III on 29 January 1795. This latter section covers pages 1 to 26 of the text. The second section consists of descriptions of British institutions including the constitution, parliament, armed forces, cabinet political parties, trade companies, and the economic, social and cultural life of the time, and is found on pages 27 to 62. The third section consists of a description of London with its palaces, parks, churches, hospitals, schools, and factories, which is found on pages 63 to 88.

As regards the British archival sources, I have used all the correspondence sent by the British ambassadors, Ainslie and Liston, and the *chargé d'affaires* Smith in Istanbul between 1793 and 1797, which are found in the Public Record Office, FO 78/14-18. In these files I have been found an enormous amount of information without which this paper would have been incomplete. These files include some copies of documents originally sent by the British consuls of Izmir, Alexandria, and Salonika to the British ambassadors in Istanbul who despatched them with introductory remarks to the British Foreign Office. These files also contain the correspondence between the Ottoman embassy and the Foreign Office. Some of these

documents were duplicated and can be found in the same file or the file of the following year. Most of the documents are written in English, but there are some documents in French and a few in Italian and Turkish. There are copies of some documents in both English and French, and in one case in English, French and Turkish. It can be inferred from these documents that the correspondence between the Ottoman embassy and the Foreign Office was written in French, but in a few instances Persian, chief interpreter of the Ottoman embassy, used English for private matters. These documents are quite well preserved compared with Turkish archival materials, however, some are quite badly damaged. These documents are concerned with, principally, political matters and to some extent commercial affairs. I have used the correspondence between the British ambassadors and the Foreign Office and also between the Ottoman embassy and the Foreign Office. Some of the instructions of the Porte can be only found in these documents in French translation. In one case, duplicate copies of one of the Porte's instruction to Yusuf Agah can be found both in the file of the FO 78/17 and in the *Havadisname-i İngiltere*. Although these files are open to historians and researchers, they have not been very extensively used. For example, Kuran and Naff have also studied in this field and produced works on the history of Selim III's diplomatic reforms and Anglo-Ottoman diplomatic relations, but there is no single reference to these files in Kuran's work.¹³ Although Naff seems to have used these files, he did not exploit them fully, since his main focus was on other aspects of the period.¹⁴

FO 95/8/14 contains only two documents. These two documents are concerned with the political activity of the Ottoman mission in London. In this paper, I have also used FO 7/35 which is dated to 1793 and I have quoted a report of Morton Eden British ambassador in Vienna between 1793 and 1794, on the arrival of Ottoman mission at Vienna. I have also used the Levant Company's records (Turkey Company) SP 105/109, 121, 122 in order to clarify the relationship between the Levant Company and the Ottoman embassy.

For this study I consulted all the available Turkish archival materials including the *Havadisname-i İngiltere* and Mahmud Raif's account as well as the works of the Ottoman historians Vasıf and

13. Kuran, *İkamet Elçilikleri*.

14. Naff, *Ottoman Diplomacy*.

Cevdet. These documents often contain similiar information. Duplicate copies of important documents were given to various departments and the court historians also used them directly or indirectly. As the cataloguing system at the *BBA* is not very thorough, the content of a document can be determined only by reading most, if not all of it. The British material compensates for some of the deficiencies in the Turkish sources. In brief, I have found the Turkish materials less informative than I had expected. On some matters, such as the names of the members of ambassador's retinue, commercial activities, the recruitment of western experts, social activities and the return of the Ottoman embassy, both Turkish and British archival sources failed to provide detailed information. However, among other contemporary sources. *The Times* newspaper is of great value, especially for determining the reaction of the British public towards the Ottoman mission.

The establishment of the first permanent Ottoman embassy in a European capital laid the foundations for modern Ottoman diplomacy. Apart from a PhD thesis, no major study has so far been produced on the first permanent Ottoman embassy and on the adoption of the European diplomatic system by the Ottomans.¹⁵ This matter is only mentioned in studies of Ottoman and European diplomatic relations dealing with the diplomatic reforms of Sultan Selim III which claim that the Porte failed ultimately to continue the reforms by the establishment of embassies in major European capitals. One category, modern studies on diplomatic history, includes the works of Kuran, Naff, Uzunçarşılı, Karal. The second category, studies on political history, includes the works of Shaw¹⁶, Soysal¹⁷, Findley¹⁸, Lewis¹⁹ etc.

b) General information on Ottoman missions and their reports (Sefaretnames)

Prior to the eighteenth century the Ottoman state had dispatched many ambassadors (*sefir* or *elçi*)²⁰ to foreign countries

15. See note 1.

16. Shaw, *Old and New* and also see S.J. Shaw "Selim III and the Ottoman Navy" *Turcica* 1 (1969), 212-241.

17. İ. Soysal, *Fransız İhtilali ve Türk Fransız Diplomasi Münasebetleri (1789-1802)*, Ankara, 1987; first edition 1964).

18. C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire-The Sublime Porte 1789-1922*, (Princeton, 1980). Hereafter Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform*.

19. B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, (New York, 1982) and also see B. Lewis, "The Impact of the French Revolution on Turkey", *JWH* 1 (1953), 105-125.

20. On this term see 'Elçi' Mecduud Mansuroğlu, *JA* and Bernard Lewis, *EP*.

when the need arose. Until the establishment of permanent Ottoman diplomatic representation in the major European capitals, starting on 21 st December 1793, embassies were dispatched on an *ad hoc* basis for specific purposes.²¹ For their part, the European states had representatives in Istanbul as early as 1454 (Vencie), 1475 (Poland), 1497 (Russia), 1525 (France), 1528 (Austria), 1583 (Britain) and 1612 (Holland)²² Ottoman missions were dispatched to such European capitals as Vienna, Paris, Petersburg, Stockholm, Berlin, Warsaw, and Madrid and to the capital cities of the Muslim states of Asia and Africa such as Tehran, New Delhi, Bukhara, Cairo and Rabat from the last decade of the fourteenth century, starting with Egypt in 1396.²³

It is essential to analyse the reasons why the Porte did not establish permanent embassies abroad before 1792. One consideration might have been that the period of expansion the Ottomans saw their state as a great power and therefore they did not need to send representatives to the rest of the world. Ottoman foreign relations were handled with the European ambassadors in Istanbul. It is interesting that Istanbul was one of the few capital cities in Europe where embassies and representatives of all the Western states cooperated with the Sultan and his ministers to further political and commercial interests. It appears that this policy continued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Another possibility is that permanent embassies were not used by earlier Muslim states and the Ottomans followed this practice. Moreover, European states were Christian and according to Islamic law, Muslims considered themselves as superior to the non-Muslims and their institutions and they did not need to imitate the actions of non-Muslims. It was also the case that Muslim states were not allowed to sign peace treaties with non-Muslim states on the ground that Islam considered the lands of the non-Muslims as 'the house of war' (*Dar'ülharb*)²⁴.

21. For bibliographic and general historical studies of the Ottoman ambassadors see note: 2 and the first chapter of Yalçinkaya also deals with the Ottoman ambassadors and their reports until the establishment of the permanent embassies in Europe. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 1-28.

22. Ibid, I. For more detailed information see B. Spuler, *Die Europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel*, (Breslau, 1935), 35. Uzunçarşılı, *Merkez*, 268-70. And from the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent to the publishing date of the *Salname-i Nezaret-i Hariciye* in 1302 (1886/7), names and durations of the foreign ambassadors (envoys) are also recorded in the year-book of the Ottoman Foreign Ministry.

23. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, I. Uzunçarşılı, *Merkez*, 268, Süslü, *Sefaretname*, 237-49. Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 221-36.

24. For these discussions see Kuran, *İkamet Elçilikleri*, 10, Naff, *Diplomacy*, 296, Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 14 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 1-2.

These are some of the reasons the Ottoman state might have refrained from establishing permanent embassies abroad until 1792. It was not common practice in other European states, but the Ottoman state, probably as a sign of its hospitality and greatness, provided the travel expenses and the rations of foreign envoys on their arrival and departure until 1794.

This does not mean of course that the Ottoman state had sent no embassies abroad. From the sixteenth century, ambassadors were classified as either *Büyük Elçi* (ambassador) or *Orta Elçi* (envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary) depending on the importance of the duties assigned to them or of the greatness of the foreign countries to which they were sent. There was also the *Nameres* whose duties were less important than those of the ambassadors. These officials carried royal letters (name-i hümayun) for a particular purpose to foreign countries. If the envoy carried a message of a secondary importance he was called *Çavuş*. The *Çavuşes* had no responsibilities other than to carry out the specific orders given to him. Although the ambassador was usually sent by the Porte we know that in an exceptional case a messenger or ambassador, İshak Beg, was sent by the heir apparent Şeyhzade Selim III during the reign of Abdülhamid I to King Louis XVI of France to ask for his cooperation against Russian and Austrian aggression.²⁵ It is possible that this envoy was categorised in the same class as those sent by the Sultan himself. There is evidence indicating that not only the Porte, but also the vassal states to the Porte and some of the governors of the frontier provinces sent ambassadors to other countries. The Ottoman ambassadors were usually sent with a special purpose to:

- a) announce the accession of a new Sultan
- b) transmit a ratified treaty
- c) attend the accession of a new king or empiror
- d) renew friendly relations between the two countries
- e) establish friendly relations (with new powers)

25. These missions or envoys are inferred from the list given in the work of Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 221-36. [I-XVI]. The descriptions of these terms see Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 19. On the mission of İshak Beg see İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, "Selim III'un Veliiaht iken Fransa Kralı Lui XVI ile Muhabereleleri", *Bellekten* II (1938), 191-246. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 2.

- f) exchange ambassadors according to treaties
- g) observe the civilisation of the European countries
- h) deliver a letter of the sultan²⁶

Unfortunately there is little evidence and detail about the names, ranks or grades and the diplomatic responsibilities of the early Ottoman envoys sent to other states up to the second half of seventeenth century.²⁷ Before the second half of the seventeenth century the Ottoman state was not overly concerned with sending diplomatic representatives to observe European civilisation. Until this period the Ottomans were economically and politically almost self-sufficient enough to cope without any alliance with the great powers of the time. However, when the Ottoman elite became concerned about the decline of the state its military defeats in the European frontiers, they looked for remedies to solve these problems after the second half of the seventeenth century and onwards. One solution was to observe developments in Europe, particularly military developments more closely and to establish close links with the great powers for future cooperation²⁸. During the eighteenth century it became increasingly important for the Ottomans to improve diplomatic relations with Europe, because the European states were then beginning to build up their supremacy over the Ottoman state both militarily and politically.²⁹ Therefore the Porte needed to more closely observe European civilisation in every as-

26. Ibid, 2-3, Uzunçarşılı, *Merkez*, 274-75, Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 17-9, F.M. Göçek, *East Encounters West France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, (New York, 1987), 14-17, hereafter, Göçek, *East Encounters*. N. Itzkowitz & M. Mote, *Mübadele-An Ottoman-Russian Exchange of Ambassadors*, (Chicago, 1970), 4, hereafter, Itzkowitz, *Mübadele*. And also see Karal, *Selim III*, 163-71.

27. The evidence about the early Ottoman missions to foreign countries was studied by Hammer. It is possible that he quoted from Feridun's work for these early diplomatic missions. See Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, Volume 9, (Graz, 1963; first edition 1833), 326-34.

28. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 3-4. For more detailed information see Karal, *Selim III*, 164-5, Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform*, 126-31 and Itzkowitz, *Mübadele*, 1-14.

29. For more detailed information see footnote 2 and the activities of the great powers' ambassadors in Istanbul and the developments leading to the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1787 are discussed in detailed by Bağış A.İ. Bağış, *Britain and the Struggle for the Integrity of the Ottoman Empire, Sir Ainslie's Embassy to Istanbul 1776-1794*, (Istanbul, 1984). A brief information on the eighteenth century Turkish diplomacy see D.S. Margoliout, "Turkish Diplomacy in the Eighteenth Century", *MW* 7 (1917), 36-54, this work is mostly biased and J.C. Hurewitz, "Ottoman Diplomacy and the European State System", *MEJ* 15 (1961), 141-152.

pect. From the beginning of the century many ambassadors were dispatched with their retinues to the capitals of European and Muslim states. As can be seen from the reports of the ambassadors of this period the Ottoman state was well aware of the importance of sending diplomatic missions to Europe in order to find allies against the threat of Russia and Austria. After the defeats on the frontier zones against Russia and then Austria, the Ottomans concluded well known treaties i.e. Küçük Kaynarca in 1774 and Yaş (Jassy) in 1792 with Russia and Zistovi in 1791 with Austria. These treaties show us that the Ottomans had become more concerned about diplomatic affairs at the international level.³⁰

When Selim III became sultan in 1789, he was initially unable to initiate any reforms because of the lengthy wars on the European frontiers of the empire against Russia and Austria. However in 1792 after the conclusion of the above mentioned treaties, the new Sultan started to reorganise Ottoman institutions, in accordance with European practice. This reorganisation was not wholesale, but mostly confined to military institutions. These reforms were called by the Ottomans *Nizam-ı Cedid* (New Order)³¹. One change was the establishment of permanent Ottoman diplomatic representatives at the major European capitals in 1792. This reform was the only original one and it had greater implications for the Ottoman state than the other reforms at the time, as the diplomatic regulations of the *Nizam-ı Cedid* have had a lasting effect from that time onwards.³²

According to this diplomatic reforms, ambassadors were to be appointed to the major European capitals as permanent resident envoys. They were to be replaced every three years, along with their staff, which consisted of the Chief Secretary (*Ser katibi*), First and Second Interpreter (*Tercüman-ı evvel ve sani*), Attaché (*Ateşe*), Treasurer (*Hazinedar*) and some young men from good families (*Kişizadeleri*) who were sent by the Ottoman state for training. Am-

30. Yalçinkaya discusses in detailed all aspects of the reports of the Ottoman ambassadors before the establishment of the permanent embassies in Europe. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 1-16. Also see Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform*, 126 ff. and Shaw, *Old and New*, 185-91.

31. For more detailed information on *Nizam-ı Cedid* see the following works Karal, *Selim III*, Shaw, *Old and New*, Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform*, and N. Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (Montréal, 1964), esp. 71-85.

32. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 4-6. The discussions on the establishment of the permanent embassies also see Karal, *Selim III*, 165-7, Naff, *Diplomacy*, 303, and Kuran, *İkamet Elçilikleri*, 15.

bassadors were to have two main functions in their diplomatic missions: The first was to represent Ottoman interests and to have young men in their retinues whom they trained to become civil servants by learning foreign languages and improving their general and scientific knowledge. Secondly to protect the interests of the Ottoman tradesmen in their commercial activities.³³

The appointment of the ambassador and the preparation for the embassy followed official procedures. The arrangements started with the officials appointment of the ambassador by the cabinet to represent the Ottoman state abroad. When the ambassador was named, he was invested with an caftan by the Sultan. The nature of the established protocol, the presents, supplies, provisions, and retinue of the embassy (*ma'iyet memuru*) were dully orginised by the officials who recorded and kept the files. Then the ambassador had an audience with the Sultan in the company of the Grand Vizier and *Şeyhülislam*. There he received the royal letter (*name-i hümayun*) from the Sultan. Ambassador was chosen by the sultan, the Grand Vizier, the Reis Efendi and the *Baş tercüman* (chief translator), who were responsible for the direction of the Ottoman foreign policy. The ambassadors were generally selected from officials in high administrative positions who knew at least one foreign language. The knowledge of a foreign language was a very important factor in choosing the ambassador; people of German or Polish origin were frequently preferred in the sixteenth century. The character and reputation of the candidates and their performance in their posts also contributed to a large extent to their appointment as ambassadors. They were, according to the court historian Raşid, required at least "to have attained knowledge of arrangements of discourse and intrigues' of Christians". This demonstrated that they were competent to conduct Ottoman diplomacy abroad.³⁴

33. On the diplomatic reform of Selim III, Ahmed Cevdet Paşa notes that "...Devlet-i aliyenin dahi düvel-i fehime-i Avrupa nezdinde birer ikamet ilçesi bulundurması derece-i vucubede görülmekle düvel-i merkume nezdinde birer ilçi gönderilüb ve üç sene müddet tekmilinde anlar celb ve i'ade ve yerlerine başkaları irsal ile minval-i mesruh üzere hem umur-ı sefaret idare itdirilmek ve hemde bu tarıkla ahval-ı düvele vakıf bazı zatlar yetiştirilmek üzere nizam-ı saire sırasında sefaret usulüne dahi hüsn-i rabita ve nizam virilmek..." Cevdet, *Tarih VI*, 73-4. This information is are inferred from Cevdet's work by Naff, Kuran, Yalçınkaya and other researchers.

34. The necessary procedures for amssadors and embassies are birefly described by Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 6-7. For more information also see Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 19-42, Göçek, *East Encountres*, 12-4, Itzkowitz, *Mühadele*, 15 ff. and Süslü, *Sefaretname*, 235.

Before the second half of the seventeenth century it was uncommon for the ambassadors or one of their retinue to write a general account (sefaretname or sefaret takriri) of their travels, observations and experiences in addition to their official reports which were regarded as state secrets.³⁵ A great number of these sefaretnames have survived in part or in full. These ambassadorial reports are kept in various countries' libraries and archives. More than forty-five sefaretnames survived and they are mostly in Turkey and can be found in the libraries of France, Austria, Germany and Egypt. The sefaretnames are all written in Ottoman Turkish, with one exception, the French "Journal du Voyage du Mahmoud Raif Efendi en Angleterre, écrit par luy meme", by Mahmud Raif Efendi, the chief secretary (*ser katib*) of Yusuf Agah Efendi. This report is the cornerstone of our study of the first permanent ambassador's journey, his activities and the institutions of Britain.³⁶

Sefaretnames as a source of diplomatic history: The ambassadors' reports were also a prime source of information for the Ottoman leadership in its conduct of foreign affairs. The great majority of the sefaretnames deal with European countries and their civilisations. The Ottoman state turned towards the West in its attempt to reorganise and reform its institutions. These reforms and reorganisations are called, in general, 'modernisation', and by the some historians the 'westernisation' of the Ottoman state. Western influences on the Ottoman state are undeniable, but they were sometimes very limited. The Ottomans intended to acquire every development of military technology, science, industry and the arts of the time. The sefaretnames, which contained first hand knowledge of Europe, were the first Ottoman sources to provide the Sultan and his ministers with accurate information. The sefaretnames are, therefore, the only reliable reports of direct Ottoman experience of Europe. To some extent the sefaretnames may also be regarded as a historical source for European history.³⁷

In general, the sefaretnames are written in *nesih, rik'a* and *rik'a kırmısı* script, well structured and very carefully written. The sefaretnames varied in quality and quantity; some contain only a few pages and others over hundred pages. In order to present and sub-

35. On this description see note 20, Unat, *Osmanlı Sefirleri*, 1, 43-6 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 3, 7 ff.

36. Yalçinkaya gives substantial informations on the ambassadorial reports and their style and format. See Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 7-13.

37. *Ibid.*, 13-4.

mit the sefaretnames the sefaretnames to the Sultan, the Grand Vizier and other dignitaries of the state, the accounts were composed by the ambassadors or members of their retinues, who were the official representatives of the Ottoman state abroad. The sefaretnames have serious limitations as a source for Ottoman diplomacy, because of their official character. The Ottoman ambassadors did not record the official reports in their accounts, since they contained official instructions and possibly secret information on the foreign policy of the empire. Moreover, ambassadors were dispatched on the *ad hoc* basis for a short time until the establishment of the permanent embassies in Europe. When they returned from their missions, they had an audience with the Sultan, the Grand Vizier, and the Reis Efendi in order to inform them about the negotiations and make observations. These documents are, however, preserved in the archives of Turkey. So, the information given in the sefaretname is very often formal and limited to one specific part of the relationship with a foreign country. Generally, the sefaretnames reveal some of the reasons for the missions of the ambassadors³⁸.

Sefaretnames will be studied from several related points of view. Firstly, they can be used as a work of travel literature, a record of the Ottoman envoys' impressions of other worlds, especially Europe. Secondly, they can be considered as a source for the social and cultural history of the Ottoman Empire. Thirdly, they were of great importance in providing the reformers with sufficient knowledge of Europe to recognise the institutions of the empire along European lines. Fourthly, they provide an account of history of the cultural interaction between the Ottoman Empire and the West. Fifthly, they can be referred to as a diplomatic source, a collection of the correspondence between the Porte and its ambassadors. Finally, they shed light on the role of the envoys as diplomatic representative of the empire in western countries³⁹.

It might be useful to give a brief information on the content of the sefaretnames. Not all, but some of the sefaretnames begin with praise of God, seek his protection for the duration of the journey, and end with a prayer thanking God for their protection. They also

38. Ibid, 14.

39. Ibid, 14-5.

include verses (*ayet*), short surahs of the Quran and references to 'hadis' (the sayings of the prophet).⁴⁰

The sefaretnames generally follow a stereotypical pattern in their description of the events that took place from the appointment of the ambassador until his return. They usually contained the same successive stages. At the beginning, there was usually a prayer in which the author praises God, his prophet, and then the Sultan and his state. Then a brief explanation of the reasons for the appointment was given. A description of ceremony and protocol in Istanbul is generally a characteristic of this part. One of the most important parts of the sefaretnames dealt with the description of the journey and the place of quarantine if there was one. Some sefaretnames gave vivid details of the journey to the capital city of the foreign country and their stay. This was usually followed by a description of the arrival of the mission and the activities that followed. They never left out the details of the reception and their audience with the King and/or the Queen and other high dignitaries of the foreign state. The description in this section of the civilisation of the country, especially its military, financial, scientific, political and socio-cultural organisations, was very important. Negotiations with officials and foreign representatives are sometimes mentioned. From the second half of the eighteenth century information about European affairs was increasingly included and became characteristic of sefaretnames. The last part of the sefaretname was usually devoted to the return of the mission to Istanbul⁴¹.

It can be deduced from this discussion that the sefaretnames are not a prime source for Ottoman diplomatic history, but could be classified as travellers accounts. Although they illuminate only a part of Ottoman diplomatic procedures and protocol at the time, they provide a picture of European society and give the reactions of the Ottomans to Europe as a whole. On the other hand, the reports of the ambassador endeavoured to make alliances or obtain military assistance, commercial privileges, and foreign loans. Some sefaretnames illustrate the impression made by public opinion on the ambassadors and the reaction of the media on their arrival. The sefaretnames show that the Ottomans used diplomatical and technical

40. Ibid, 15. Rusya Sefaretnamesi of Mehmed Emni Efendi is a good example. On this report see M. Aktepe, *Mehmed Emni Beyefendi (Paşanın Rusya Sefareti ve Sefaretnamesi*, (Ankara, 1974).

41. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 15-6.

language, which might suggest that there some interaction between the East and the West.⁴²

c) The Appointment of Mahmud Raif Efendi as the chief Secretary of the Ottoman Embassy

It might be useful to give some information about the antecedents to Mahmud Raif Efendi before his appointment to Ottoman embassy's secretaryship in London. He was born either in 1760 or more probably, in 1761 in Istanbul. Mahmud Raif Efendi was also known as *İngiliz* and *Tanburi* Mahmud Raif Efendi⁴³. The contemporary of Mahmud Raif, Ainslie, the British ambassador in Istanbul (1776-1794), also confirms the latter information. According to Ainslie, when Mahmud Raif appointed in August 1793, he was thirty two years of age and was a native of Istanbul with a reputation for fairness.⁴⁴ Prior to his appointment, he was employed for some years in the office of the Vizierate, where he had been promoted to one of the Chief Clerks (*Baş kalfa*). Ainslie's report to Grenville, the Foreign Secretary between 1791 and 1801, dated 24 August 1793, gives the information about the appointment. It is clear that the Ottoman Government did not waste time in appointing Mahmud Raif as the Chief Secretary on 12 August 1793 after the appointment of Yusuf Agah as Ambassador on 23 July⁴⁵. Between these dates, Emanuel Persiany appointed as the chief Interpreter to the embassy.⁴⁶

42. Ibid, 16.

43. There are many little articles or notes on Mahmud Raif, but they are very inadequate. For more information on his life and works see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, İhsan Sungu, "Mahmud Raif ve Eserleri", *Hayat Mecmuası* no: 16 (1929), 9-12 and H. Halit, "Hatırat-ı Tarihiye, İlk Sefaret", *Servet-i Fünun*, Yedinci Sene 13/318 (1313, 3 Nisan), 85, 87-88. ARslan Terzioğlu-Hüsrev Hatemi's introduction to their edition of the *Tableau Des Nouveaux Reglements De L'Empire Ottoman, Composé par Mahmoud Raif Efendi, ci-devant Secrétaire de l'Ambassade Impériale près de la Cour d'Angleterre* was published in Üsküdar by the printing press of the Mühendis-hane in 1798, "Mahmud Raif ve Eserleri Hakkında", in *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Yeni Nizamların Cedveli. İngiltere Krallığı nezdindeki, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Sefareti Başkatibi Mahmud Raif Efendi Tarafından tertip edilmiştir.* (Istanbul, 1988), IX-XXI, hereafter Terzioğlu-Hatemi, *Yeni Nizamların*.

44. Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no:20, 24 August 1793. It is clearly known that Mahmud Raif Efendi was born in Istanbul, but Terzioğlu-Hatemi, *Yeni Nizamların*, the date of his birth is never clearly mentioned. According to Ainslie he must have been born around 1760 or 1761. Turkish sources suggest that he was 47 years old in 1807, when he died. See also Terzioğlu-Hatemi, *Yeni Nizamların*, XV.

45. On the antecedents and the appointment of Yusuf Agah see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 30-31, 35-36. Also on his appointment see Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14, no: 18, 25 July 1793.

46. On the life and the appointment of Persiany see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 36 and Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 19, 10 August 1793.

On 12 August Mahmud Raif Efendi was invested with the Ciftan after being appointed as Secretary to Yusuf Agah. It can also be inferred from this document that Mahmud Raif's appointment was suggested by Mehmed Raşid, the Reis Efendi, who was his good friend⁴⁷. It seems that Mahmud Raif was chosen by the Grand Vizier Damad-Melek Mehmed Paşa (4 May 1792-19 October 1794). Mahmud Raif was a fervent supporter of Selim III's reforms in every field. In the preface to his book *Tableau Des Nouveaux Reglements De L'Empire Ottoman* he writes about his desire to improve his knowledge of the West and how pleased he was to receive this appointment:

Quelque constante que fut mon application, j'é sentois que pour trouver des Sources où il me fut facile de puiser les connoissances qui m'étoient nécessaires, j'avois besoin de faire un voyage en Europe et d'apprendre une langue étrangère. Je le désirois ardemment, mais mes vœux ont été long-tems infructueux, mais. Ce n'a été qu'en 1208 de l'hégire (1793 de l'Ere chrétienne) qu'ayant été nommé secrétaire de la première Ambassade Ottomane permanente à Londres, j'ai conçu l'esperance de voir mes projets se réaliser.

Je n'ai balancé un seul instant d'accepter la commission dont je me trouvois honoré, je me suis aussitôt disposé à mon voyage. Plein de mes idées, mon premier soin a été de me procurer une Grammaire Française et un Dictionnaire. Je me suis arrêté à l'étude du François par ce que cette langue étant universelle, elle remplissoit mon objet.⁴⁸

d) Preparations of the Ottoman embassy

The establishment of a permanent embassy in London was decided at a meeting at *Bebek* in Istanbul in July 1793. The Porte's choice for the place of the first permanent embassies in Europe was Britain, with whom she had long had good relations. The Porte had also had amicable relations with France for a long time. Therefore, sending the first permanent mission to Paris instead of London was considered, but the Porte was concerned that this move might offend the other great powers of Europe who were at war with France

47. Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 20, 24 August 1793.

48. This treatise is one of the first works written in French by an Ottoman Turkish intellectual. See also the reprint with a Turkish translation by Terzioğlu-Hatemi, *Yeni Nizamın*, 3-4.

at this time, and they might refuse to accept an Ottoman minister. There is no doubt that the Porte did not consider sending the first permanent ambassador to any other European country at this early stage. According to the Turkish and the British sources the meeting was held on 13 July. It can be inferred from these documents that there were six distinguished personalities present, on the Turkish side Mehmed Raşid Efendi, the Reis Efendi, Tatarcıklı Abdullah Efendi, the former Kadiasker of Rumelia, and Gheorge Constantine Morozi, the Dragoman of the Pote (1792-1794), on the British side Robert Ainslie, the British ambassador, Stephano Pisani, the interpreter of the British Embassy, and Plobrond, Ainslie's Secretary. Tatarcıklı Abdullah Efendi was acting as secretary to the Chairman of the meeting. The meeting lasted four hours and ended at midnight.⁴⁹ This meeting was held in a villa called *Bebek Sarayı* on the Bosphorus, where the Reis Efendis resided at that time.⁵⁰

During the meeting topics concerning the establishment of the permanent embassy of the Ottoman Empire in London were discussed. The discussion focused on the necessity and importance of the permanent embassy and both sides explained the necessity and importance of the permanent embassies and reciprocal diplomacy between different countries. The necessary formalities concerning the appointment of the ambassador were also discussed. At the same meeting there was also discussion of the ceremonies and honour of the Ottoman Ambassador in the court of London and the route of the journey of the Ottoman envoy to London. Finally during the meeting following four categories of diplomatic representations were discussed:

- 1) Ambassador (Fevkalade Büyük Elçi or Büyük Elçi)
- 2) Envoys extraordinary and Ministers plenipotentiary (*Fevkalade Orta Elçi*)

49. This meeting for the establishment of the first Turkish embassy to London is discussed in detail by Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 30-35. For this meeting see HH 15090A *Mukaleme Mazbatası*, 4 Zilhicce 1207 ad Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 18, 25 July 1793. Naff and Kuran suggest that the meeting was held on 10 July 1793, but this is impossible, because there is no such meeting on 10 July. For more detailed information on the date of the meeting see, Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 56 note: 15.

50. The Reis Efendi conducted his private meetings with the foreign ambassadors and ministers in the Bebek Saray. On this information see, J. Dallaway, Constantinople, Ancient Modern, with Excursions to the Shores and Islands of the Archipelago and to the Troad, (London, 1797), 125, Hereafter Dallaway, *Constantinople*.

3) Minister resident (*Orta Elçi* or *Ministeri recidan*)

4) Chargé d'Affaires (*Maslahatgüzar*)⁵¹

Robert Ainslie, who had the rank of ambassador in Istanbul, was referred to as "*Büyük Elçi*"⁵² During the discussions, both sides ruled out the status of a Minister resident, because this category was considered very low. The rank of of the Ambassadors and Ministers plenipotentiary was almost identical, apart from the expenses and the protocol. The Ambassador's expenses were 250 purses (*kise*) per year higher than those of Ministers plenipotentiary. Ainslie also suggested that the rank of the Ottoman Ambassador should be between that of an Ambassador or a Minister plenipotentiary.⁵³ However, it was not until 6 August that the Ottoman government determined to give the first permanent ambassador Yusuf Agah Efendi a similar rank to that of the British Ambassador⁵⁴.

The expenses of the Ottoman Mission are set out both in Turkish and British documents. The Porte had allocated 79.500 piastres per annum for the expenses of the Ottoman mission of which 50.000 were allocated to the Ambassador, Yusuf Agah, 10.000 to be secretary of the Embassy, Mahmud Raif, 8.000 to the principal and 6.000 to the second interpreter, and 3.000 to the Muslim and 2.500 to the non-Muslim Nobleman⁵⁵. Furthermore, the documents reveal the travel expenses (*harcırah*) allocated to the ambassador and his party, which were as follows:

51. On these discussions see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 31-34. *HH* 15090A *Mukaleme Mazbatası*, 4 Zilhicce 1207 and Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 18, 25 July 1793. In this discussions both the British ambassador and the Reis Efendi were aware of the regulations of international diplomacy and the Law of Nations. However these regulations were not entirely fixed internationally, but were mostly traditional and reciprocal between two states. Sir Ernest Staw's research on diplomatic practice is the most useful and the standard work. E. Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, Vol. Second and Revised edition (London, 1922). Hereafter Satow, *Diplomatic Practice*.

52. *NHD*, 9, varak 307.

53. For more information see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 33-35.

54. *Ibid*, 35. On this information see Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 19, 10 August 1793.

55. The expenses of the first permanent embassy is discussed in detail by Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 38-9, 52-3. On these expenses also see Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14, 25 September 1793. *NHD* 9, varak 302. Vasıf, *Tarih* 186, Cevdet, *Tarih VI*, 74, Karal, *Selim III*, 176. I assume that Vasıf, a contemporary historian used the same document. Cevdet copied from Vasıf, but incorrectly. Karal quoting from Cevdet's work, perpetuates the mistake. These figures are also found in *DBŞM* 6133, varak 14, 16 and 17.

to the Ambassador	15.000
to the Chief Secretary	4.000
to the Principal Interpreter	3.000
to the Second Interpreter	2.500
to the Muslim Nobleman	2.000
to the non-Muslim Nobleman	1.500

Towards the middle of October 1793 the Ottoman mission was provided with the necessary provisions, present, expenses and staff by the Ottoman government. A copy of the list of the preparations regarding these were submitted to Ainslie, Yusuf Agah and the Ottoman Master of the Ceremonies (*Teşrifati Efendi*)⁵⁶. According to the documents, the members of Yusuf Agah's retinue, his baggage and the presents were embarked on board of the Ragusan (Dubrovnician) ship 'Colombo Fortuna' under Captain Antonio Pavovick. The ship was hired to 15.000 guruş and left for London on 12 October 1793.⁵⁷ It was to undergo quarantine in Leghorn [Livorno]. At the same time, Yusuf Agah received a list of the presents for the King the Queen, members of royal family and Pitt, the Prime Minister, and Lord Grenville. Probably Yusuf Agah took possession of the presents in the ceremony that took place in the presence of the Grand Vizier, in October. It is also possible that on Saturday, 12 October 1793, he had an audience with the Sultan and received the Sultan's letter from Grand Vizier who was also present at the meeting.⁵⁸

e) the journey of the Ottoman embassy

The date of departure of the Ottoman mission is confirmed by both Mahmud Raif and Ainslie. Thus, Yusuf Agah left Istanbul with his retinue on Monday 14 October 1793. Yusuf Agah's retinue consisted of 14 persons: the secretary of the Embassy, two Greek Interpreters, four other Interpreters, two of them Turks and two Greeks and seven Servants, in all 15 Turks and Greeks. In the light of the Turkish and British archival sources we can conclude that

56. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 39. On this information see, Reis Efendi to Ainslie, FO 78/14, 11 October 1793. There are two copies of the same documents in FO 78/14. esp. 247 and 254.

57. *DBŞM* 6133, varak 16 and 17.

58. For more information see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 40 and *NHD* 9, varak 297-8. The document dated 5 R. 1208 is transcribed by Uzunçarşılı, *Türk-İngiliz*, 284-9.

the retinue of the ambassador consisted of 6 persons other than the servants. Their names and their titles are as follows:⁵⁹

Mahmud Raif Efendi, Chief Secretary (*Ser Katibi*)

Mehmed Derviş Efendi, Treasurer of Attaché (*Hazinedar or Ateşe*)

Mehmed Tahir Efendi, Muslim Nobleman (*Ehl-i İslam kişizâdesi*)

Emanuel Persiany, First Interpreter (*Tercüman-ı evvel*)

Gregorio Valerianus, Second Interpreter (*Tercüman-ı sani*)

Yanko Savrud, Non-muslim Nobleman (*Hristiyan or Zimmi kişizâdesi*)

The precise route taken by the Ottoman to London is problematic. Information is very scanty and inadequate. Our documents rarely mention dates or the whereabouts of the mission during its journey. Therefore, the proposed route suggested here is based mainly on the information available for the route that was usually followed by the other ambassadors despatched to Europe such as Ebubekir Ratib Efendi (Austria, 1791-92), Mustafa Rasih Paşa (Russia, 1793-1794) and Mehmed Vahid Efendi (France, 1806). It is certain that the Ottoman mission set off their journey on October 14. Judged on the basis of other journeys, they must have passed via Küçükçekmece, Silivri, Çorlu, Babaeski. On the 18th October, in all probability they must have called at Edirne. It can be presumed that they stayed overnight and departed from Edirne on the 19th. Following that they probably used the route that passed via Karnobat, Shumen and Razgrad.⁶⁰

59. For the date of departure and the retinue of Yusuf Agah see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 40-1. On these informations also see Mahmud Raif, *Journal* 1, Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 24, 25 October 1793. For the activities of Muslim Noblemen, Mehmed Derviş and Mehmed Tahir and chief secretary Mahmud Raif see *AES III* 4903. Yanko Savrud's name mentioned only in the salary rolls. *CH* 3207. According to the Turkish document he was chosen by the Prince of Wallachia. *DBŞM* 6133, varak 17.

60. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 41. For the route of the other ambassadors see Y. Ercan, "Mehmed Vahid Efendi'nin Fransa Sefaretnamesi", *OTAM* 2 (1991), 73-125. The same sefaretname translated into French by A. Süslü, "Sefaretname de Seyyid Mehmed Emin Vahid Efendi", *Belleten* 50 (1986), 127-167. See, then Itzkowitz, *Mühadele*, 17. On Abdülkerim's journey from Istanbul to Küçükçekmece. This was the main route from Edirne to Ruscuk at that time. See Daniel Panzac, *La Peste Dans L'Empire Ottoman 1700-1800*, (Leuven, 1985), 599.

Mahmud Raif's report states that the Ottoman mission arrived at Ruscuk [Ruse] (on 22 October 1793) nine days after they left Istanbul, where they probably spent the night. It is possible that the following day they crossed the Danube and may have called Yerköğü [Giurgiu], where they found the carriages, which had been sent for them by the Prince of Valachia Alexander Moousi (December 1792-17 August 1796)⁶¹. On 25 October, they were brought within two days to Bucharest where they had to stay almost seven days in order to obtain the necessary provisions and means of transport for the rest of their journey and to undergo the quarantine, of which they had been informed in advance. On 1 November 1793 it seems they departed from Bucharest and crossed the border of Transylvania into Austrian (Habsburg) territory. It is certain that the Prince of Valachia was in charge of the arrangements for the Ottoman mission from Bucharest to Hermannstadt, including the quarantine and reception. It is most probable that six days later, on 6 November, they crossed the river Olta by boat and arrived at the place of quarantine in Transylvania where they remained for nine or ten days. The place of quarantine was very close to Hermannstadt [Sibiu]. It is very difficult to ascertain the exact position of the place of quarantine. Mahmud Raif's description implies that it was situated on the right bank of Olta river in Transylvania, whereas, Yusuf Agah states that it was one the left bank of the river in Transylvania⁶².

Since the Porte had requested from Ainslie to assist the Ottoman-Turkish Ambassador on his journey from the Ottoman border to London. Ainslie had corresponded with Sir Morton Eden, the British Ambassador in Vienna, in order to organise the Ottoman envoy's travel to Vienna and then towards Ostend. The wish of the

61. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 41 and Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 1-2. Ebubekir Ratib Efendi who departed from Ruscuk also called at Yerköğü. C. Bilim, "Ebubekir Ratib Efendi, Nemçe Sefaretnamesi", *Belleterin* 54 (1990), 261-95.

62. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*. 41. On these informations see Mahmud Raif, *Journal* 2-3 and *CH* 4714, in a private letter sent by Yusuf Agah Efendi to his close friend Ebubekir Efendi, he notes that they arrived at Bucharest twelve days after their departure from Istanbul and they stayed for six days. It should be noted that there is a difference of one day between the dates given by Yusuf Agah and Mahmud Raif. I assume that Mahmud Raif adds the day of their arrival or departure, whereas Yusuf Agah seems not have counted the day of arrival or departure. For the description of the quarantine place see *CH* 4714, "Ol mahalden [Bucharest] hiram ve altıncı güninehr-i Olta bot ile ubur ve lazıme mürrur ve iktiza-yı müddete nezaret ile dokuz gün istirahat ve aram olunarak bundan dahi hareket...", on the other hand Mahmud Raif reports that "Sept jours après nous arrivames à la quarentaine en Transilvanie, où nous arrètames dix jours". Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 2-3.

Ottoman government and of Yusuf Agah, was to pass through Germany, and all the way to London, under the guidance and direction of Morton Eden. The Ottoman Ambassador was in charge of his own expenses during his journey. He was advised by the Porte not to take any travel allowance from Britain⁶³. The Ottoman envoy probably left the quarantine on 15 November and the same evening arrived at Hermannstadt, where they spent the night. Sir Morton Eden's servant supervising the journey of the Ottoman mission. The next day, they departed from Hermannstadt and arrived three days later, on 18 November in Temesvar. The following day, they left Temesvar for Buda where it is likely arrived on 21 November. They presumably left Buda on 22 November and arrived at Vienna on 24 November. Yusuf Agah and his retinue were joined by Morton Eden who provided for their lodging at Vienna. The Ottoman mission stayed four days in Vienna and left the city on 29 November 1793.⁶⁴

Yusuf Agah's private letter to his friend, Ebu Bekir Efendi, only says that the following journey took fifteen days and nights without any break and lodging until they arrived at Ostend⁶⁵. Mahmud Raif's report informs us about their route from Vienna to Ostend through Germany and Belgium. Under the guidance of the British steward they passed through Ratisbon, Wurzburg, Frankfurt, Coblenz, Bonn, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle [German territory], Liege, Brussels, Ghent, and Bruges [Belgian territory]⁶⁶. They must have arrived at the port of Ostend on 13 December 1793. They waited three days for their ship to cross the Channel. The Ottoman envoy may have left Ostend for Dover on 16 or 17 December. Yusuf Agah reports that the crossing took three days and night. It seems to have been quite difficult and stormy. At noon on December 1793 the Ottoman mission arrived at Dover⁶⁷. They were in

63. For more information see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 42-3. On these informations see, Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14 no: 24, 25 October 1793 and Ainslie to the Porte, FO 78/14, 19 November 1793. For the travel allowance see Cevdet, *Tarih VI*, 106-7. Cevdet notes that "Bundan akdem taraf-ı Devlet-i Aliyeden sefaretle İngiltere'ye gönderilen Yusuf Agah Efendiye İngilterelü tarafından tayin teklif edildiği halde kabul etmemesi hususı hin-i azimetinde telkin ve tenbih olunmuştu".

64. For more detailed information see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 41-4. Also see Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 3-8, Eden to Grenville, FO 7/35 no: 72, 28 November 1793, CH 4714.

65. Ibid and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 44.

66. For more informations for the descriptions of these cities see Ibid, 44-5. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 8-12.

67. Ibid, 12-3. CH 4714, *The Times*, 17 December 1793, on the arrival of the Turkish ambassador. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 45.

their Hotel by evening. Colonel Bastard met and saluted the ambassador. They could not attend any social activities, "...from the fatigue of a very bad passage", as Edward Smith reported. The next day, 20 December, Yusuf Agah was invited to a breakfast with Colonel Bastard. He was also welcomed by General Smith with whom Yusuf Agah had coffee. Smith says of the ambassador that "He and his Secretary speak only their own language. He is an amiable and Respectable Old Man. His Secretary young & Sensible. His Interpreter appears to have some share of cleaverness."⁶⁸ Smith informs us of the departure of the Turkish mission from Dover" as the Officers and ladies of the Garrison all assisted the Castle detachment then coming the Street was lined, he was properly escorted, and on leaving the Town he was then properly Saluted by our Town Batteries"⁶⁹ At the same time, the similiar description was given on the events in Dover by the Ottoman mission.⁷⁰

The Ottoman mission left Dover on 20 December. On the way to London they were welcomed in many places. In Canterbury a reception was given in Yusuf Agah's honour and they spent the night there. They were also received well there by British officers. And the next day, 21 December 1793, the first permanent Ottoman-Turkish Ambassador arrived at London⁷¹. *The Times* reports (21 December 1793):

The ambassador has suite of about twenty persons, amongst which is an Aga of the Janissaries. On his landing, the guns from the Castle and Forts were fired; a guard of Grenadiers ordered from the Devonshire Militia; and their band plays before the Inn he is at.⁷²

f) *The Embassy in London*

Ainslie's report informs us that the arrangements for lodging the Ottoman Ambassador and his retinue were made by Peter Tooke, Yusuf Agah's Banker in Istanbul, who directed William Robinson in London to hire a hotel for the Ottoman Embassy. The Turkish documents say that Tooke (*Dük*) also transferred the salar-

68. Ibid, 45 and on this information see, General Edward Smith to Grenville, FO 78/14, 21 December 1793.

69. Ibid and Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 45.

70. Ibid, 45 and Mahmud Raif, *Journal* 13-4.

71. Ibid, 14, *CH*, 4714 and *CH* 4250. Cf. *The Times*, 21 December 1793.

72. Ibid.

ies and expenses of the Ottoman Embassy from the Ottoman Ministry of Finance through a certain Tecelli Efendi⁷³. The Ottoman ambassador and his retinue were to stay at the Royal Hotel, in Pall Mall in the centre of London for the time being. The next day, on 22 December 1793, Mahmud Raif, the secretary to the Ottoman Embassy, had the first official meeting with Goddard, private secretary to Lord Grenville, the secretary of the state for the Foreign Affairs (1791-1801). It is most possible that Persiany was also present at the meeting. The meeting is reported by *The Times* as:

Yesterday at noon his Excellency's secretary waited on Mr. Goddard, private secretary to Lord GRENVILLE, to know when the new Ambassador might have the honour of paying his respects to his Lordship. He will not be introduced to the KING till New Year's Day.⁷⁴

On the same day, most probably in the afternoon, George Aust, one of the under secretaries of state for Foreign Affairs, paid a visit to the Ottoman Ambassador at the Royal Hotel in Pall Mall. He paid his respects to the Turkish Ambassador and congratulated him on his arrival in Britain⁷⁵. In his account, Mahmud Raif also briefly reported that 'le lendemain Lord Grenville Ministre des affaires Etrangères nous envoya Son Secrétaire pour nous complimenter'⁷⁶. While these events were taking place, a problem arose. Mahmud Raif was greatly concerned at hearing that he would not be received as Secretary of the Embassy, when he met with M. North in his office in Lower Grovenor Street in the evening of 3 January 1794⁷⁷. He consulted with North in a friendly atmosphere. They discussed the situation and North told him he would solve this problem in consultation with Lord Grenville and Aust. It is most likely that Persiany was also present at the meeting. Here North remarked that:

Mahmud Efendi was here last night in great concern at hearing that his, specific Credentials would not allow him to be received as

73. For more detailed information see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 46. Ainslie to Grenville, FO 78/14, no: 24, 25 October 1793. For the Turkish archival sources see CH 2307 and CH 5064, NHD 9, varak 302 and DBŞM 6133, varak 14.

74. *The Times*, 23 December 1793 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 46-7.

75. *Ibid*, 47 and *The Times*, 23 December 1793.

76. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 14-5.

77. North to Aust, FO 78/15, 4 January 1794. The identity and christian name of this official could not be identified.

Secretary of the Embassy, & consulted me, as a friend, to know what could be done. I explained to him, as clearly as I could the Impossibility which there was for Lord Grenville to take official cognizance of any thing but the Credentials of the Ambassador, but that, as His Excellency has particular Orders from the Porte to Present him as Secretary of the Embassy, & to hold no Conference, & take no Steps, without his participation, I said, that, I believed, from my knowledge of the established Custom of other Courts, that his presentation might be considered as sufficient that, at all events, the Degree of Confidence reposed in him by the Porte was nothing to the purpose till his Credentials should arrive, in case Lord Grenville persisted in requiring them. I hope, I have not done wrong in the advise I gave him, or in communicating to you, for I hope to save inconvenience & trouble to L.d Grenville & Yourself in informing of you such little misunderstandings in time to prevent them from becoming subjects of official Discussion.

...At least, pray let me know what I should lead them to expect about Mahmud's Credentials, for he must assist at the final visit, which the Ambassador is to pay to Lord G. [Grenville] on Sat. & give me my cue that I may not get them into any scrape by directing them otherwise that you should wish⁷⁸.

After a while, the problem of the secretary was solved soon⁷⁹. On 7 January 1794 Aust sent the following governmental instruction on the Ottoman Embassy from Downing Street to Persiany:

Monsieur Aust fait bien ses Complimens a Monsieur Persiany, et le prie de vouloir bien assurer L'Ambassadeur de La Sublime Porte du respect infine[i] qu'il porte pour Son Excellence; et qu'il n'a pas manqué de rendre Compte a My Lord Grenville du Contenu de sa Note. Il prie Monsieur l'Ambassadeur d'etre persuadé que Son Audience du Roi demain ne recontera la moindre Difficulté, Non plus que La Présentation du premier Secrétaire et du premier Interprète de Son Excellence; et que Le Chevalier Cottrell maitre des Cérémonies aura. L'Honneur de se rendre chez son Excellence pour La conduire au Palais, avec sa Suite.⁸⁰

78. North to Aust, FO 78/15, 4 January 1794.

79. Cf. Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 48 and Aust to Persiany, FO 78/15, 7 January 1794 and Persiany to Aust, FO 78/15, 7 January 1794.

80. Aust to Persiany, FO 78/15, 7 January 1794.

After having received the instruction of the Foreign Office, Emanuel Persiany dispatched compliment letter to Aust in the name of the Ambassador on the same day, namely, 7 January. Here Persiany remarked that:

L'Ambassadeur de la Sublime Porte en faisant mille compliments a Monsieur Aust les prie de vouloir bien présenter Ses respects a Mylord Grenville Secrétaire d'état & a & a en le remerciant de l'aucoil [accueil] amical que Son Excellence l'a honoré. Dont Satisfait ne manquera pas de l'annoncer à La Sme Porte, il espère aussi d'avoir l'honneur de Se présenter demain a Sa Majesté avec Le Secrétaire, & Le Pr. Interprète d'Ambassade, les quels aspirent des S'aussi Lier devant Le Trone de Sa dite Majesté tel étant aussi le désir de la Sublime Porte qui les a destinés. a cet effet le Sudit Ambassadeur Sera à la Maison Nouvellement prise a Adelphi a attendre les ordres que Son Excellence lui envera. En attendant il prie Monsieur Aust de lui donner ce Soir une ligne de réponse & avec la plus parfaite estime, & consideration ha l'honneur d'etre⁸¹.

Yusuf Agah Efendi, his secretary Mahmud Raif ad the chief Interpreter Persiany attended the King's Levee at St. James's for the first time on 8 January 1794. They were introduced by Sir Clement Cottrell and Yusuf Agah delivered his credentials to the King. The corps diplomatique were also present in this audience⁸². Yusuf Agah had his first interview with William Pitt, the Prime Minister, at Number 10, Downing Street, on Wednesday 15 January 1794 at noon. Mahmud Raif and Persiany also attended the meeting which lasted almost half an hour and they had coffee with the Prime Minister. Then, they returned to their Hotel in Pall Mall⁸³. One the same day, they dined with Pitt, Lord Grenville, several other high Officers of the State and the Members of the 'Levant Company' [Turkey Company] at the London Tavern. The dinner was given in honour of Yusuf Agah by the 'Turkey Company'. *The Times* reported that 'the dinner was most magnificent'⁸⁴.

81. Persiany to Aust, FO 78/15, 7 January 1794.

82. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 48-9. The Times, 9 January 1794. The copy of a credential letter of Selim III to George III of England, accrediting Yusuf Agah Efendi as ambassador; dated 3 Cemaziyellelvel, 1208, is preserved in the British Library, Oriental collections. It is a single sheet and in cursive Neshi Divani. Also a separate sheet contains a contemporary French translation dated 5 Janvier 1794. The British Library, Oriental Collections, Add. 21, 561.

83. The Times, 16 January 1794.

84. Ibid and for more information on these meetings see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 49-50.

Yusuf Agah was presented to the Queen Charlotte at St. James's on Saturday 18 January 1794. He, then, attended the Queen's Drawing-room. On the same day, Yusuf Agah, his secretary Mahmud Raif and his interpreter Persiany had a private audience with the Queen. Furthermore, Yusuf Agah, his chief staff and the rest of the corps diplomatique dined with Lord Grenville at his house in St. James's Square. The dinner was given on the occasion of her Majesty's Birthday⁸⁵. It seems that Yusuf Agah, as the head of the Turkish mission, was invited on 21 January, to the House of Lords where the King the Prince of Wales, and the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester were also present. Yusuf Agah had his first audience with the Prince of Wales at Charlton House, on Thursday 23 January in accompany of the rest of the corps diplomatique⁸⁶. On Tuesday 28 January, Yusuf Agah dined with the Duke of Norfolk, in Oxford. While he was at dinner, he met Dr. James Dallaway (1763-1834), who was to accompany Robert Liston, the ambassador to Istanbul as a chaplain and physican. He was appointed to this post through the duke's introduction⁸⁷. He is well known as the auther of a detailed work about Istanbul which was published a few years after his return⁸⁸. It is certain that all these meetings Yusuf Agah was accompanied by his secretary Mahmud Raif and his chief interpreter Persiany. In his account Mahmud Raif sums up the events that took place during the first month of the Ottoman embassy and informs us about weekly events in London as follows:

Nous primes chacun nos maison particulieres dans le quartier nommé Adelphi près de la Tamise, et commençames à aller regulierement à la cour toutes les Semaines les jours de Ambassadeurs, et à frequenter les Assemblées de la noblesse⁸⁹.

As a secretaryship to the Ottoman Ambassador, Mahmud Raif was second diplomatic representative in charge of the Ottoman embassy after Yusuf Agah. He conducted his secretaryship duties according to the contemporary established diplomatic regulations of Europe. As a secretaryship he was accompanied to the ambassador

85. *Ibid*, 50 and *The Times*, 17, 20, 22 January 1794.

86. *Ibid*, 20, 24 January 1794 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 50.

87. *Ibid* and *The Times*, 30 January 1794.

88. Dallaway, *Constantinople*. His life and works see "James Dalaway" *DNB*.

89. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 15-17. At the same time Yusuf Agah Efendi describes the start of these events in his letter (*CH* 4714), but at the end of the letter some three inches of the paper along the entire lenght of left side of the document has been eroded and its contents can be only partly reconstructed.

every official or ordinary meeting. He was also Yusuf Agah's adviser in every field. Mahmud Raif was also present when Yusuf Agah attended the King's levee every Wednesday and the Queen's Drawing-room every Thursday in a large apartment in St. James's.⁹⁰ The protocols of these meetings attracted the attention of Mahmud Raif and therefore in his account he elaborate on the details of the King's levee and the Queen's Drawing-room. Moreover, it can be inferred from the account of Mahmud Raif and The Times that it was one these occasions that the foreign travellers as well as the native people were present; always first at the King's court, except the ladies, who were presented to both their Majesties at the Queen's court. When other majestic ceremonies took place, such as at court the birthdays of the King and Queen were celebrated, Yusuf Agah and his secretary Mahmud Raif were also in attendance on their majesties' birthday. At the same time, in the evening, they were also present when the Queen held a magnificent ball attended by the courtiers and the rest of the diplomatic corps⁹¹. Mahmud Raif describes how 'the lords and great ladies dance there with all the royal family'⁹². On one or two occasions Yusuf Agah and Mahmud Raif were also invited to the opening of parliament⁹³.

When Yusuf Agah completed three years of his mission as ambassador in London, a new ambassador should have been appointed to take his place. However, although the three years period had expired, the Porte still did not appoint a new ambassador to London, although the ambassadors to other major European capitals had been nominated already. Yusuf Agah pressed the Porte to appoint his replacement, as the and his retinue wanted to return to Istanbul as soon as possible for various reasons. Firstly and most importantly, the Porte had not sent the expenses of the embassy on time; as a result of which Yusuf Agah and his retinue sometimes had financial difficulties. Secondly, they were not accustomed to the British weather⁹⁴. These reasons were briefly described by Mahmud raif in his account of the embassy:

90. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 134 ff. For more information on the diplomatic procedures see Sataw, *Diplomatic Practice*.

91. Mahmud Raif, *Journal* 22-4 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 137.

92. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 36.

93. Yusuf Agah dispatched the King's speech at both Houses of Parliament on 6th October 1796 to the Porte. Y.A.E. *Havadisname-i İngiltere*, 15b, case 21.

94. For more detailed information on this matter see Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 145-6.

notre Sejour entier en Angleterre à [sic] été trois ans neuf mois [...] je m'y Suis assez bien porté malgré l'instabilité du ciel; car le climat quoique très hunide et continuellement chargé de brouillards, n'est pas malsain il est meme remarquable que les Etrangers S'y portent mieux que les gens du Pays⁹⁵.

The Porte accepted Yusuf Agah's request and nominated İsmail Ferruh as the new ambassador to London at the end of October 1796. İsmail Ferruh left Istanbul on 9 April 1797 for London. After his nomination the Porte informed Yusuf Agah that İsmail Ferruh was to replace him, when he arrived at London. Only after his arrival was Yusuf Agah permitted to return to Istanbul. At the same time, Yusuf Agah was instructed to train İsmail Ferruh in the administration of the embassy and the situation of Britain. Having his instructions, Yusuf Agah started his preparations for his journey and informed Grenville of the latest developments a few times in June and July⁹⁶. Therefore, Yusuf Agah had his final audience with the King to receive his Majesty's permission to return to Istanbul on 19 July 1797. Yusuf Agah was regarded as an excellent ambassador by the British government. On 23 July İsmail Ferruh arrived in London. He was met by Yusuf Agah who also arranged his stay at Osborne's Hotel, in Adam Street, Adelphi. The new ambassador's retinue and servants consisted of 15 persons, which consisted of 6 persons other than his servants: Yusuf Efendi, Secretary to Embassy, Hacı Süleyman Efendi, Chaplain (*İmam*), Hasan Begzade, Muslim-nobleman, John Archiropolo, the first Interpreter, George Archiropolo, the second Interpreter, and John Stefan, non-Muslim nobleman⁹⁷.

As planned İsmail Ferruh had an audience with George III on 26 July 1797 and delivered his credentials. The following day Yusuf Agah had his 'audience of Leave' with the Queen before his departure, during which İsmail Ferruh was ready to deliver his credentials⁹⁸. While this event was taking place, Yusuf Agah asked Grenville to provide a vessel to convey him and his retinue from London to Ostend or Calais. On 25 July 1796, Canning to Under

95. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*, 21.

96. On these developments in London and in Istanbul see Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 146. For these informations see, Smith to Grenville, FO 78/17 no: 21, 1 November 1796 and Smith to Grenville, FO 78/18 no: 6, 10 April 1797. *HH* 10823 Gurre-i Ca. 1211 (2 November 1796), and Y.A.E. *Havadisname-i İngiltere*, 22a, case 41.

97. For more information see, Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 146-8.

98. *Ibid*, 148-9. *The Times*, 27, 28 July 1797.

Secretary of Grenville, wrote to Admiralty to hire a vessel for this purpose and to ensure a safe journey for the ambassador and his retinue. Therefore, Lieutenant Norris was assigned to transport Yusuf Agah from Wapping to Ostend. They sailed on 1 August 1797 and next morning arrived at Baylis's Hotel in Ostend. There the ambassador was received with all honours⁹⁹.

We do not have details about the journey. However Smith, the *chargé d'Affaires* of the British embassy, gives the date of their arrival as 14 or 15 September 1797. In his report to Grenville, he informs us that 'His Excellency Yusuf Aghia Effendi is returned to this capital from his embassy in London in perfect health'.¹⁰⁰ Smith's report also reveals some details about the journey of the secretary of the embassy. Here he noted:

It appears that incompatible tempers occasioned a separation between him and the Secretary of Embassy, Mahmud Raif Efendi as soon as they reached the Ottoman confines: when the latter personage with Mr. Emanuel Persiani the first Interpreter quitted his Excellency; and took the route of Varna: from hence they made their passage hither by the Black sea in a coasting vessel. They all use ostensible language highly to the advantage of the English character¹⁰¹.

Unfortunately, Yusuf Agah and Mahmud Raif left no clear account of their return or their activities afterwards. Only thanks to a translation of the King's letter to the Sultan, we guess that Yusuf Agah, like all previous ambassador, seems to have had an audience with the Sultan accompanied the Grand Vizier and Reis Efendi, where he would have submitted King Geogre III's letter to the Sultan. In this meeting he would have had the opportunity to give the Sultan the account of his embassy which was written in French by Mahmud Raif on behalf of Yusuf Agah.¹⁰²

99. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 149. For these informations see, Nepean to Canning, FO 78/18, 26 July 1797 and Nepean to Canning, FO 78/18, 8 August 1797, Norris to Nepean, FO 78/18, 6 August 1797. *The Times*, 9 August 1797.

100. Cf. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 149. Smith to Grenville, FO 78/18 no: 20, 16 September 1797.

101. *Ibid.*

102. See Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 150. The translation of the King's letter to the Sultan is found in *NHD* 9, varak 352 which is dated to 20 September 1797 (28 Rebiülevvel 1212). This letter was given to Yusuf Agah on 20 July 1797 by Grenville and was to be handed over to the Sultan.

One of the aims of the Ottoman embassy was to have on its young men whose duties would include learning languages and other subjects that might be useful in the service of the Porte. At the time of Yusuf Agah's embassy there were three trainees, Mahmud Raif, the secretary to the embassy, Mehmed Derviş, a Muslim nobleman and the treasurer to the embassy, and another Muslim nobleman named Seyyid Mehmed Tahir. These men originally worked in the scribal departments. Some documents in question in this study deal with the training of these men in London. They studied the French language for at least one and an half years. They wrote letters in French which were dispatched by Yusuf Agah to the Porte in the middle of 1795 in order to demonstrate the success of his staff in London. The Porte had encouraged them with the award of stipends. Derviş Mehmed's stipend was 750 guruş and Seyyid Mehmed Tahir's stipend was 850 guruş. There is no information however about Mahmud Raif's stipend, though it can be assumed that he received the highest amount.¹⁰³

It can be inferred from the same documents that the Sultan issued a firman and gave an allowance to these three young men for their study of foreign languages in order to encourage other servants of the state¹⁰⁴. It appears that these three were the first Turks to study non-technical subjects in Europe. French was the international language of diplomacy and therefore chosen for study by Ottoman students. Although I have not found private letters from these men in archives or their letters to the Porte, there is no doubt that Mahmud Raif produced the embassy account on behalf of Yusuf Agah in London. Mahmud Raif's account on journey to London, Britain and British institutions is of great interest for several reasons. It is the only ambassadorial account in Ottoman history, written in a language other than Turkish. This account is also the first treatise written in French by an Ottoman subject other than the Greeks, Armenians, Jews and other non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman empire. It is especially interesting to read the genuine and first-hand impressions of Britain and British institutions by a young

103. Cf. Yalçınkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 139 and for the information see, *AES III* 4903. These documents are very important for the following reasons: it contains four documents date 1215 (1800-18001) which were written after the embassy of Yusuf Agah. These documents consist of correspondence between Seyyid Mehmed Tahir Efendi and the Ottoman treasury. These documents also include information about the educational activities of the Ottoman embassy in London and indicated how the stipend was spent by the ambassador.

104. *Ibid.*

Turk who was serving as the first permanent ambassador's chief secretary.¹⁰⁵

Mahmud Raif's account was written at the request of Yusuf Agah and was probably intended to illustrate to the Sultan and the Porte the importance of the permanent embassies which had just started to operate in the major European capitals. Other countries in Europe had different institutions, but British institutions were among of the most developed and highly regarded at that time. Among these institutions the Parliamentary system was of paramount importance. Therefore, Mahmud Raif devoted a large section of his account to a description of it and its function. The constitution of Britain was described in considerable detail in the account of Mahmud Raif. He also examined the government and its ministers. Particular attention was paid also to the British army, defence and financial affairs. Social life and customs in Britain did not however escape his attention. His description of the police as a strong force in serving law and order and the functioning of the courts in this respect is also of particular interest. The city of London was also described as a major capital city with its attractions and monuments. He talks about the palaces he visited such as palaces of St. James's and Windsor Castle. The large parks, bridges, theatres, operas, churches, hospitals, museums, schools, streets and other monuments attracted his attention. He also mentioned industrial sites, roads, canals, and postal services, and made a comparison between the boats on the Thames and at Istanbul¹⁰⁶.

The British public had paid great attention to Yusuf Agah and also Mahmud Raif, because they were the first Ottoman representatives in Britain¹⁰⁷. To give an example of success of public attention of Mahmud Raif, Walsh, who was Captain of the ninety-third infantry regiment, and together with Mahmud Raif in the Egyptian campaigns, referred to Mahmud Raif¹⁰⁸, following terms:

105. Mahmud Raif, *Journal*. He also wrote *Tableau Des Nouveaux Règlements De L'empire Ottoman*.

106. For more detail information on the view of Mahmud Raif Efendi on Britain and British institutions see, Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 170-7. Especially the translation of Mahmud Raif's treatise is given at the end of the text.

107. The reactions of the British public on the Ottoman mission in London is discussed in detailed by Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 45-50 and 140-5.

108. Mahmud Raif Efendi was promoted to Reis Efendilik in August 1800 and retained this position until August 1805. See İ. Hami Danişmend, *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, Osmanlı Devlet Erekanı*, Vol. V, (İstanbul, 1975).

The Reis Efendi, or principal secretary of the empire, is well known in England, where he was secretary to the Turkish embassy. His knowledge of European manners and politeness procured him the greatest advantages in the intercourse with our army. He can speak French with the greatest fluency, and can also write in European characters¹⁰⁹.

Apart from Mahmud Raif's western manners and training, his experience and his influence on Ottoman foreign policy was also highly regarded by Walsh:

He is a great favourite of the grand vizier, over whom he has a powerful ascendancy. He possesses very good very good talents, is cunning, extremely avaricious, and supposed to favour the French, for whom he has a great predilection.¹¹⁰

After his diplomatic experience in the embassy in London which lasted for more than three and a half years, Mahmud Raif had taken an active part in 1801 the war against the French occupation of Ottoman Egypt. The change in policy, the adoption of European style diplomacy and the role of western trained Ottoman Turkish diplomats by the Ottomans was observed by Walsh:

The reason of the chief officers of the Ottoman empire, civil as well as military, accompanying the army, is that the Porte, or court, is always supposed to be with it, and all orders of the sultan are deemed to be issued by him from his stirrup. Such was the case in former wars, when the conquering sultans commanded their armies in person¹¹¹. Yusuf Agah, as ambassador and his chief interpreter, Persians had a similar experience to Mahmud Raif during the first permanent embassy in London. During their journey to Istanbul a rift developed between Yusuf Agah and Mahmud Raif and Persians. As soon as they reached Ottoman territory, Mahmud Raif and Persians left Yusuf Agah, but gave no reason for this split when they arrived in Istanbul. The observation of Smith, the British chargé d'Affaires in Istanbul, about the Ottoman diplomats was similar to that of Walsh: "They all use an ostensible language highly to the advantage of the English character"¹¹².

109. Thomas Walsh, *Journal of the Late Campaign in Egypt*, (London, 1803), 153. Hereafter Walsh, *Egypt*.

110. Ibid, 154 and Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 184.

111. Walsh, *Egypt*, 154.

112. Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 185.

These favourable assessments were overlooked by other researchers, who mostly claim that the first permanent Ottoman embassies were unsuccessful. To understand the establishment of permanent embassies by the Ottoman empire, one has to start with the establishment of the first Ottoman embassy to London. However, historians in this field may be criticised for drawing general conclusions about the whole of Ottoman diplomatic practice as well as the establishment of the permanent embassies to Europe based on their own ungrounded negative opinions. Such negative opinions are found not only in the works of the Turkish historians; but also the western counterparts. Historians are also to blame for neglecting the sources of other countries and sometimes even the native sources of their own countries. One of the difficulties in this field is inadequacy of cataloguing system at the *BBA* which means that the contents of Ottoman Turkish documents or files can be determined only by reading them in their entirety. The diplomatic history of the Ottoman empire, especially up to the 1830s, is very little known. As the first permanent Ottoman embassy, Yusuf Agah's embassy in London affected subsequent Ottoman embassies to other major European capitals and made an impact on Ottoman foreign policy.

The Porte used Yusuf Agah's presents to the court of London, the London embassy's expenses and salary of Yusuf Agah and his retinue as a standard for its other European embassies. The ambassadors to Berlin, Vienna and Paris, Ali Aziz Efendi, İbrahim Afif Efendi and Seyyid Ali Efendi, and İsmail Ferruh Efendi, when he replaced Yusuf Agah in London, prepared their presents, expenses and staff according to the standards set by Yusuf Agah's embassy. Therefore, Yusuf Agah's embassy provided a useful pattern for the Porte, which learnt how to handle the embassies' problems relating to expenses and preparations of their embassies. Both the Sultan and his government paid great attention to the correspondence with Yusuf Agah during his embassy and later collected them in a separate file which was the *Havadisname-i İngiltere*. Sultan in person read Yusuf Agah's reports and sometimes made remarks on them. These remarks were also recorded in the margins. The reformer Sultan Selim III was gathering first-hand information about the country in which his first permanent ambassador was residing. It seems that some of the reports were regarded as a valuable source of intelligence. The contents of the reports reveal that the Sultan was particularly interested not only in military concerns, but also the administration, politics, and economy of the British empire. In spite of

the great differences between the British and the Ottoman institutions, his reforms 'New Order' had already created the conditions for the Sultan himself and other Ottoman reformists to use foreign models to rebuild the institutions of the empire. On the other hand, Yusuf Agah's reports contained valuable information for the Porte in conducting its foreign policy and in formulating its reforms according to the practices of the great European powers¹¹³.

The Ottoman state not only benefited from the contents of these reports, but they also gained the first treatise to be written in French by an Ottoman diplomat. For the first time in the history of the Ottoman empire, Ottoman students studied non-technical science in one of the biggest European capital cities. They learnt French which was the international language of diplomacy at the time. One of these students, Mahmud Raif, later became the Reis Efendi of the empire (1800-1805). At the same time, he conducted the longest period in charge of this office after the administration of Naili Abdullah Efendi (1747-1753) until the transformation of the *Reis Efendilik* to the Foreign Ministry in 1836. The people who had trained in Europe held very important positions after the embassy of Yusuf Agah. Yusuf Agah strongly opposed the French oriented foreign policy of the Porte which prevailed during the administration of Ebubekir Ratib Efendi. No one, including the Sultan, heeded Yusuf Agah's advice, and if the Sultan and the Porte had attached importance to Yusuf Agah's warnings, they would have been aware of French plans to launch an expedition against Ottoman Egypt in 1798. It is likely that the success of Yusuf Agah's embassy was due to Mahmud Raif's cleverness and Persian's loyalty.¹¹⁴

All in all, Yusuf Agah and his premier team successfully defended their country's interests generally following the instructions of the Porte with a few exceptions. They were able to confront the difficulties and when they did not receive any instructions, they used their own initiatives to solve the problems. When Yusuf Agah considered the policy of the Porte to be mistaken, he was especially brave in criticising his superiors in Istanbul including the reforming Sultan. As an ambassador, he was supervised by five dif-

113. Ibid, 186-7. On this information see Y.A.E. *Havadisname-i İngiltere*. These remarks can be found in the second part of the report see the cases 6, 7 and 8.

114. The Ottoman foreign policy and diplomatic activities of Yusuf Agah are discussed in detailed by Yalçinkaya, *The Embassy of Yusuf Agah*, 67-104.

ferent Reis Efendis in his ambassadorship in London. It is natural that when the Reis Efendi and the dragoman of the Porte were changed so often, the foreign policy of the empire was also affected. In site of the changes in personnel in Istanbul, Yusuf Agah and his team successfully completed their mission.

APPENDIX

Diary of Mahmud Raif Efendi's Voyage To England, Written by Himself

The Sublime Porte having named me Secretary to the Ambassador at the court of London, we left Constantinople with the Ambassador on 14 October 1793; after nine days we arrived in Ruscu-ki, where we crossed the Danube on the other side of which we found the carriages which the prince of Walachia had sent for us and which took us in two days to Bucharest. We stayed there for one week in order to obtain and prepare everything we needed to continue our journey. Seven days later we arrived at the quarantine in Transilvania, where we stopped for ten days. This place is noteworthy for the high mountains which enclose it, and for the torrent called the Olta which runs through it. We left there for Hermanstadt, an attractive town, where we slept. From there, we arrived after three days at the fortress of Temesvar, which is very striking. Transilvania and all the countryside up to the approach to Temesvar is very mountainous, and the intersected landscape offers and interesting variety of sites. This last town is situated in a very unhealthy location. In general the inhabitants are pale and wan. Almost all the Bannat of Temesvar causes fever because of the amount of stagnant water which it is difficult to get flowing. We then left Temesvar for Bude; this town, the most important in Hungary, is situated in beautiful, fertile countryside beside the Danube, with a large pontoon bridge, and is enclosed within ancient fortifications. Between Temesvar and Bude is a continuous plain, with neither hills nor trees; being mainly pasture land, there are many animals. From there we left for Vienna, which is a journey of three days. This capital is one of the most densely populated in Europe; we stopped there for a very short time in order to study the great number of remarkable things which this capital and its surroundings present to the traveller. The town itself is not large; like all old towns it is irregularly dissected by narrow streets. The houses there are very tall, with six or seven storeys. The various suburbs are extensive and regularly constructed, and the slopes which separate

them from the main town are well maintained and give the whole a very pleasant appearance. The barracks, the arsenal, or arms depot, the picture gallery, the Emperors' tomb, the military academy, the school of oriental languages, as well as several other public institutions, the majority of which date from the time of Marie Therese and Joseph II, are worthy of study. We left this town and made our way towards Ostend, a journey which took us through Ratisbonne, Nuremberg, Wurtzburg, Frankfurt-am-Main, Koblenz, Bonn, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, Liege, Brussels, Ghent and Bruges. Generally speaking, Germany is a sparsely populated country, but as there are many small sovereignties the traveller notices a great difference in the situation of the inhabitants from one country to another, depending on the government and whether the administration of justice protects them against oppression. The whole of Belgium is a superb country, well cultivated and densely populated. The Brabant, particularly between Brussels and Ghent, is like a park. The inhabitants of Belgium in general are comfortably off and even rich.

Ratisbonne is an imperial city where the diets of the Empire are held; Nuremberg is another imperial city, famous for its fine engineering works; Wurtzburg is the most charming for its location, the palace, and its prince's the beautiful gardens; Frankfurt is the richest and the most commercial; Koblenz is situated in a magnificent region; Bonn is the residence of the Elector of Cologne, for he cannot live in Cologne, which is an imperial city; Aix-la Chapelle is another imperial city, famous for its mineral waters and the throng of foreigners; Liege is large and populous, and its prince resides there; Brussels, a fine, large city, is the residence of the governor of the Low Countries; Ghent is also a fine, large city, but it is sparsely populated. Bruges is noteworthy for its canal; Ostend is a commercial port and the end of our voyage on the Continent. It is there that we embarked for England, but our crossing was not pleasant. We weathered a storm and more than once we found ourselves on the point of perishing. At last we disembarked at Dover, where we were received with many honours, for General Smith sent a high official to greet us; the castle's cannon was fired and regimental music was played in front of our inn while they carried out various manoeuvres. The next day we were invited to lunch with this general; the troops were lined up en haye along our route as far as the outskirts of the town in the direction of our departure from Dover after lunch. On arriving in Canterbury, we likewise

found troops under arms. At last we went to London on 21 December 1793. The next day, Lord Grenville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, sent his secretary to greet us. Several days later we visited Lord Grenville, who received us with every possible consideration, assuring us of the pleasure which the embassy of the Sublime Porte gave to His Majesty, and the king's desire to see us before the day of the ceremony. Several days later we were presented to the king, who received us in a private chamber and talked with us for a very long time. The following week, the queen likewise received us in private; afterwards we also saw the Prince of Wales in his palace, and then Mr. Pitt and some other ministers. We each took separate houses in the quarter called Adelphi near the Thames; we began to go to court regularly every week on the days the ambassadors went, and to frequent the receptions of the nobility.

Eight months later the ship carrying His Highness the Great Lord's gifts to the king of England, our baggage and servants, arrived from Constantinople. As the king was leaving at that time for the country, we delayed handing over the gifts and our credentials until the re-opening of Parliament, which took place on 29 January 1795. Only then did we make our grand entrance. So that the procession would take a longer route, we left a royal house for invalid soldiers located two miles from the king's palace, after a most magnificent lunch ordered by the king. All the troops in this palace were under arms; the procession was composed of more than twenty carriages, each with six horses, preceded by two hundred constables. The horses sent as gifts were covered in all their ornaments and riches. Crossing St. James' Park, we saw the king and all the royal family at the windows of the queen's palace from whence they went before us to St. James' Palace. After crossing the park we went along some very fine streets and arrived at the king's palace at one o'clock in the afternoon. It all passed off with great dignity and splendour. An air of pleasure and satisfaction prevailed on both sides, and the ceremony finished at about four o'clock. We had a wonderful time, despite it being in the middle of winter. We had arrived in London almost fourteen months before this ceremony, and we stayed there for the space of another two years and seven months, so that our stay in England totalled three years and nine months. I have been well, despite the unstable nature of the weather, for the climate, although very humid and continually heavy with fog, is not unhealthy. It is even remarkable that foreigners are fitter than the natives.

The king holds court every Wednesday in an apartment in St. James' Palace. All the Foreign Ministers go there at the same time as the Lords of the country. There is very little established etiquette for these occasions; only that the Lords of the court, the Ministers of State, and those who hold certain high positions, assemble in the antechamber which is nearest to where the king receives. When the court is about to start, it is customary for the Foreign Ministers to enter first, including the ambassadors; otherwise there is nothing fixed about their precedence. Each positions himself in the order in which he enters. The king then begins by speaking to the Ambassadors and then to the junior ministers, according to where they are standing, continuing like this with the rest of those present. On Thursdays then queen holds court in a large apartment in the same palace, with the king and all the royal family present; the great ladies are there in court dress. Here, there is no kind of etiquette: each positions himself where he likes and waits for the king and queen to address him. It is on these occasions that foreign travellers as well as native people are presented; always first at the king's court, except the ladies, who are presented to both Their Majesties at the queen's court. Every Friday the king holds a meeting with his Interior Ministers; he would only hold it on Sundays in urgent and extraordinary circumstances. The king has seven sons and six daughters. These seven sons are the Prince of Wales, heir apparent to the throne, the Duke of York, the Duke of Clarence; and four without titles, that is to say the Princes Edward, Ernest, Augustus and Adolf. The Prince of Wales married the Princess of Brunswick; the Duke of York married the Princess of Prussia; the Princess Royal married the hereditary Prince of Wirtemberg. The king was born an Englishman and is aged fifty-nine years, but the queen is a princess of Mecklemburg in Saxony.

The English constitution differs from all others, it being a mixture of monarchy and republic. Only Parliament, composed of two chambers, the Lords and Commons, has the right to create laws, while the king alone has the right to have them carried out. It is not to be concluded from this that the king has no power over Parliament. Firstly, the laws created by Parliament are in force only after the king has sanctioned them; moreover, the king convenes and adjourns Parliament when he pleases. His power stretches to dissolving it, if he thinks it appropriate, in order to establish a new one. The constitution of England is therefore one that is composed of three powers; that of the people, or the House of Commons; that of

the Lords; and that of the king, and in all decisions these three powers should be in agreement. It must be added that although the king is responsible only for the execution of laws, he nevertheless has the right to pardon. When he pleases, the king may make war, peace, and alliances, but may not as a consequence introduce any tax without the consent of Parliament, which alone has this right.

The House of Lords is composed of two hundred and eighty-seven members, of which four belong to the royal family, two are archbishops, nineteen dukes, eleven marquises, eighty-eight counts, fourteen viscounts, one hundred and nine lords, twenty-four bishops, and sixteen Scottish lords, elected in their country. All are called lords indiscriminately; they sit in Parliament, a hat on their head, and dressed in white furs, which distinguish their titles. The Lord Chancellor, who keeps the seal of the kingdom, is the President of the House of Lords. If the number of votes in the discussion of a matter is equal on both sides, the opinion of the Lord Chancellor is sought. On the death of a lord, the eldest son inherits his titles and possessions; the younger son of a duke holds the title of lord, but does not enter the House of Lords. If a lord dies without children, the king gives his title to whomsoever he pleases.

The House of Commons is composed of five hundred and thirteen members; the lords are not admitted there. All the members are the deputies for their county; however, once gathered in Parliament they no longer act in the name of their county, but in the name of the country. Elections to this chamber are held every seven years. Sometimes the two houses meet in Westminster Hall in order to judge certain specific cases such as the trial of Mr. Hastings, who had been Governor of the East Indies, and who, upon his return to England was accused of various injustices. This trial lasted eight years and cost the accused, who was acquitted, seventy thousand pounds sterling and Parliament one hundred and forty thousand. The East India Company reimbursed the seventy thousand to Mr. Hastings, who moreover had a pension of five thousand pounds sterling for a certain period of time.

Parliament is divided into two parts, the ministers and the opposition. In the House of Lords, the opposition leaders are the Duke of Norfolk, the Duke of Bedford, etc.; in the House of Commons, Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, etc. Parliament opens its sittings in about December, and adjourns around mid-summer. It is the king himself

who opens Parliament, where he arrives in great pomp in a huge coach surmounted by a crown, decorated with statues and sculptures, and magnificently gilded all over. It is drawn by eight horses of extraordinary beauty and unusual colour; it is preceded by an infinite number of constables and surrounded by a large troop of mounted guards, sabres in hand. The same ceremony takes place when the king is going to adjourn sittings, which is called 'proroguing' Parliament. Apart from this, there are very few ceremonies in England. At court the birthdays of the king and queen are celebrated, and on these days the lords and great ladies put on a magnificent show. Lord Grenville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, gives the Foreign Ministers a most splendid meal on the same day; in the evening, the queen holds a magnificent ball attended by the courtiers and all the Foreign Ministers. The lords and great ladies dance there with all the royal family.

There is also a separate Parliament with two chambers, the Lords and Commons, in Ireland. However, the Irish lords are not admitted to the House of Lords in England unless the king makes them lords of England; they have entered the Commons only. However, Irish and Scottish dukes may enter the English House of Lords without having the decoration of the dukes of England.

The leading man of the city of London is called the Lord Maire, in English, 'Lord Major'. He is chosen every year from the merchant class, and his installation takes place at a magnificent feast. He goes to Westminster by land and water to take his oath. His coach, drawn by six horses, is almost as large and sumptuous as that used for the king's ceremony. It is accompanied by many other carriages, as well as by a number of boats on the Thames. All these boats, but especially his, are very large and superbly decorated, they resemble a little the Bucentaure in Venice, or the little cek-tiri in Constantinople. Every year he gives two grand dinners followed by a great ball where the nobility and businessmen flock. He enjoys very great authority in the city, but his reign is short-lived, since he is replaced every year. He is obliged to do honour to his position and pay out a great deal from his own pocket.

The cabinet of England is composed of seven leading men Mr. Pitt is like a Prime Minister, but his title is 'First Commissioner of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer', with four assistants. Lord Grenville is the Minister for Foreign Affairs; the Duke of

Portland is Minister of State; Lord Spencer is Minister of Naval Affairs; under him there are six other lords called Commissioners of the Admiralty; Mr. Dundas is Minister for the Colonies; Mr. Windham is Minister of War; Lord Chatham is President of the Privy Council and holds the king's seal.

The Duke of Norfolk is hereditary Grand Marshal of England, holding the baton of his dignity from the king. But the Duke of York, the king's second son, is Grand Marshal of the Army. The Duke of Gloucester, the king's brother, is Field Marshal of the Army. The Duke of Richmond and the Marquis of Cornwall are both generals and commanders of artillery. The English army is composed of about ninety thousand men, distributed between England, Scotland, Ireland, Gibraltar, western America, and the East Indies. The land troops are not as highly regarded as the sailors; there is no force as strong at sea as England. She maintains five hundred and fifty warships thirt-one with three bridges and between eighty and one hundred and twenty cannons; one hundred and seventyfour with two bridges and between fifty and seventy-eight cannons; two hundred frigates with between twenty and forty-four cannons; one hundred and forty corvettes, chebecs and launches with between four and eighteen cannons. There are seven naval arsenals in England, five on the coast, of which the most important is the very large one at Portsmouth; one on the banks of the Thames at Greenwich; and another on the banks of the Medway at Chatham. All these arsenals are very noteworthy, the last two being used only for ship building. I was at Chatham to see the launch of a large ship with three bridges and one hundred and ten cannons, called by City of Paris. In each naval arsenal there are fine, large docks which serve for the building and repair of vessels. It is very easy to build docks there with the help of the tides. They are very useful for repairig and preserving ships which, by this means, may be kept in service for more than sixty years.

In peacetime the English government always has twenty thousand sailors, but in wartime the number can increase to over one hundred thousand. These sailors, like all the naval officers, are full of activity and zeal for their profession, and superior to those of all other nations.

The income of the English government amounts to about twenty-two million pounds sterling Customs duties make up half of this,

and taxes the other half. These revenues are fixed by Parliament. The king is given one million for his own expenses, and half a million to share between the queen, the Prince of Wales and all the royal family. About twelve million is paid as interest on the national debt, and the rest is spent on the army and navy, and on various other ministerial affairs; all these expenditures must also be determined by a Bill of Parliament. The king pays all his domestic officers' pensions, the judges, and civil expenses, and gives the Foreign Ministers a sum when they return home.

The government's revenue is sufficient in peacetime, but in wartime it is obliged to borrow more than twenty million a year from merchants. When we arrived in England, the national debt amounted to two hundred and forty million, and in four years, over one hundred and twenty million has been borrowed for the war against France, making altogether three hundred and sixty million. Interest on the debt is paid in different ways: interest on the old debt is paid at the rate of three per cent; but on the new debt it is paid at the rate of four-and-a-half or five per cent per annum. The bank receives the money from individuals at the rate of four-and-a-half or five per cent per annum. The bank receives the money from individuals at the rate of three per cent, but in wartime it is obliged to give a higher interest rate; it lends to businessmen at five per cent. Bank notes belong to the bank and not to the English government. The government takes forty, fifty and even more per cent for the import of foreign goods; it takes nothing for the export of English goods. Taxes collected on goods coming from the East or West Indies are given to the merchants when those goods are not destined for England but pass to another country; only one third of the tax imposed on exported sugar is taken. There are taxes on almost everything: on houses, windows, servants, coaches, horses, dogs, leather, fabrics, hair powder, wine, beer, spirits, etc. Because of their privileges, Foreign Ministers are exempt from all taxes; they are even protected from legal proceedings with respect to debts.

English money is divided into gold guineas and half guineas; silver crowns, half crowns, shillings and half shillings; and copper pennies and halfpennies as well as farthings, which are worth a quarter of a penny. The guinea is worth twenty-one shillings, fifteen gurus in Turkish money. The pound sterling is worth twenty shillings, but although commerce reckons in pounds sterling it no

longer exists in reality as far as a bank note is concerned; it is accepted at the rate of the coin of the realm.

English commerce is very considerable, for there are more than twenty-five thousand merchant ships, which go to all parts of the world, above all to the East Indies. There are merchant ships which go to the Indies and which are as large as ships of the line. English merchants are extremely rich, some companies possessing several million pounds sterling. There are various companies, but the East India Company is the main one. All these companies govern themselves; the English government does not interfere in their affairs.

Everywhere in England the land is extremely well cultivated; life is expensive there, but production is very high and none of the necessities is lacking. The native people, and especially the lords, generally dislike outward magnificence, that is to say that all the lords go about in the street on foot without servants, and dress like ordinary people. The king's brothers and sons do the same, and the Prince of Wales goes to many private meetings. In the street one cannot distinguish a lord from anyone else, but on ceremonial days there is a distinction. Usually the men are dressed in woollen cloth, the women in muslin, all the year round; they never wear fur or brightly coloured clothes. Englishmen are fine men with a serious nature; the women are the most beautiful in Europe. There is a lot of science and education; the people, although coarse, are better educated than those of other nations; they acquire knowledge by reading public papers.

The police force in England is completely different from that of all other countries. Guardsmen are not to be seen on the streets at all, but if some disorder occurs, one of the constables is sought. These are men charged with seeing that good order is kept, and appear armed with only a long club, painted and marked; for they are immediately assisted by the people. However, at night in every street there are armed men called 'Watchmen', who call out the time and when the need arises assemble in an instant at the sound of a cresselle which they never fail to have with them. Although the laws are rigorously observed, everyone has the freedom to speak and write as he pleases; not in attacking the laws, but the reputation of often very important people, who are referred to without being named. Even the king is not protected from these insolences which appear every day in caricatures.

For the execution of laws there are extremely useful courts, those with juries of twelve people. They are taken indiscriminately from all classes of citizens, and may be challenged by the accused if he puts forward good reasons against them such as enmity or a bad reputation. Peers and peeresses may be judged only by the House of Lords.

Description of the City of London

This city, one of the largest and richest in Europe, is situated at fifty-one degrees latitude north and near the English prime meridian which passes through Greenwich. It is about twenty-seven miles in circumference, seven-and-a-half miles long and three-and-a-half wide. It is divided by the Thames, over which are erected three magnificent stone bridges. The first and finest is Westminster Bridge; the second is called Blackfriars Bridge; and the third, London Bridge. The city is divided into three parts: the city of London, Southwark, and Westminster. All the lords and people of distinction live in Westminster, the greatest merchants live in the city. The Tower is near London Bridge. All the merchant ships stop along the Thames towards the Tower, where they number several thousand. It is at the Tower that a regiment guards the crown jewels; many interesting things can be seen there, such as the armour of former kings and other things which belonged to them; the figure in stone of Queen Elizabeth ready to mount a horse; a very considerable arsenal of arms; and large artillery magazines. State prisoners, when there are any, are kept there while their trial is in progress; nearby there is a zoo for wild animals, lions, tigers, etc. Near London Bridge is a great column known as the Monument; this column was erected on the spot where the great fire stopped, which consumed a large part of the city in 1666.

In city is situated the great church of St. Paul, which is worthy of admiration for its size and the perfection of its modern architecture, although it is very inferior in area and magnificence to several others, such as St. Peter's in Rome and some other churches. The architect of this building is Sir Christopher Wren. Two large buildings in the city are the Bank [of England] and the Stock Exchange; the Bank which possesses the money of individuals and of the government; and the Stock Exchange where businessmen meet to talk of their affairs.

The district of Westminster takes its name from the church of Westminster, an ancient building whose foundation goes back to

the year 1000, and which is very remarkable for its immense size and the beauty of its gothic architecture; it is here that the kings of England are buried and crowned. Monuments to all the great men, be they soldiers, in the magistrature, or the arts and sciences, can also be seen there. In all the city of London there are two hundred and eighty churches of different religions; but none has the right to bells except those of the Anglican religion, which has as its head the king. Charitable establishments are very considerable. The Academy of Sciences, or the Royal Society of London, is situated in the building called Somerset House in the Strand, on the banks of the Thames. The British Museum, another building which houses a vast library and a very considerable exhibition of natural history and a fine garden, is in Great Russell Street near Bloomsbury Square.

The king's palace, called St. James' Palace, was formerly nothing but a hospital; some large rooms have been built there, where the king holds court. He does not live in this palace at all; he lives in the queen's palace called Buckingham House, which is situated near St. James' Palace in the same park. It is from there that he goes two or three times a week to St. James' Palace to receive ambassadors and members of the court. St. James' Park, which has a circumference of over one mile, and is made more attractive by several long avenues and a canal, adjoins Green Park, that is to say, Parc verd, beyond which, after crossing Piccadilly, one finds oneself in Hyde Park, the finest and largest of all. It ends in Kensington Garden, which is extremely pleasant, and where there is another of the king's palaces, which he never lives in, however. The king gives some of the apartments and lodgings there to various eminent people. This palace, and above all Kensington Garden, are outings for the public, who go there on Sundays in vast crowds. The Prince of Wales has a large, superb palace with a garden in a street called Pall Mall, which is next to St. James' Park in which they communicate. Admiralty House and several ministerial departments are situated next to St. James' Park in Whitehall. The department of Lord Grenville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, also joins St. James' Park. The Houses of Parliament sit in Westminster. In the city there are about twenty public 'places', called in English 'squares', that is to say, quarrs, although some are square, others round and others oval; they all have a very pleasant garden in the middle, enclosed by railings, at the centre of which is sometimes found a statue of the king. The equestrian statue of Charles I is in Charing Cross; it

looks along the street where the Palace of Whitehall is, in whose courtyard this king died.

In general, the streets of the city are lovely, wide, and kept very clean; they all have freestone pavements for pedestrians. The longest streets are Oxford Street, Piccadilly the Strand, Fleet Street; and the most commercial is East Cheapside, full of fine, expensive shops where the goods are displayed in large windows. At night the shops and all the city are lit up.

The number of houses amounts to one hundred and thirty thousand; but they are small, built of brick, and almost all laid out in the same way, with a kitchen and some rooms below ground. The number of inhabitants is claimed to be one million. There are one thousand hackney carriages, and a great number of sedan chairs. They are placed in the middle of the street in fixed places certain distances apart throughout the city, prices are fixed by arrangement for each journey, according to the distance. There are in London eight or nine theatres: the first and largest is the Grand Italian Opera; the Drury Lane and Covent Garden are also huge and very beautiful; the others, which are smaller, are used for summer shows. There are about twenty public gardens, of which two are worthy of note; the first is the Vauxhall, where there is music at night, and superb lighting in summer; this walk, which is extremely gay, is famous throughout Europe. The Ranelayh, situated in a garden where fireworks are let off, is a magnificent, vast rotunda, where the highest ranking members of society take a stroll.

Near London there are two royal establishments, one at Chelsea for disabled soldiers, the other the Greenwich for disabled sailors. The latter is much larger and more magnificent than the former. Both are on the banks of the Thames.

There are a number of hospitals established for the sick; orphanages; prisons, where important people participate as volunteers in the management of these institutions. But those involved in their daily running have a regular salary like the doctors and surgeons. The hospitals for the sick are schools for young doctors and surgeons. There is a public school at Westminster; the sons of the dukes and peers of England are sent there, as well as those of the middle class. There are schools of this kind in several parts of the country, some larger, some smaller. Young people are then sent to study at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in England, and Edinburgh in Scotland.

To facilitate the transportation of products, canals have been created, whose number increases every year, and main roads built; there are a number of public coaches; three postal services, that is to say, foreign, general internal, and district for the city of London, which goes at different times during the day within the city and for some distance all round. There are boats in quantity on the Thames; they are very fine, but not as fine and attractive as those in Constantinople.

Around London there are a great number of factories and workshops, for woollen cloth, paper, plate glass, etc. The roads throughout England are smooth, convenient and well maintained. Twelve miles from London there is also Hampton Court Castle, and twenty miles away Windsor Castle, the only two palaces worthy of a king of England. I have been to see the latter, which is a huge, ancient building, unusual for a large number of fine paintings. The king spends a large part of the year at Windsor, however, he does not live in the palace itself, but in a house near this palace. It is situated on the side of a steep mountain near the Thames, on a very large terrace where the king is in the habit of walking with his family, and dominates a very extensive park; one has a very good view from there. The king also spends a large part of the summer at...

The country houses in general are very pleasant; and the lords spend a great part of the year there; the gardens and parks are very beautiful and numerous. The English enjoy riding very much, particularly hunting. English horses are large and very fine.