

In a short epilogue, Varlık conscientiously lays out a future research agenda for plague in the early modern Ottoman Empire. Among her recommendations are: to begin the process of filling in the temporal and spatial spectrum of Ottoman plague histories during the expansionary early modern period; to open up, where sources allow, provincial and rural vistas on Ottoman plague histories; and, perhaps most importantly, to explore and develop further our understanding of how the environment affected “the etiology and epidemiology of plague in the diverse Ottoman landscape” (p. 293). Finally, Varlık makes a strong case for more comparative scholarship on disease and empire. To the list of empires (Ottoman, Mughal, Safavid, and Habsburg) which Varlık identifies as worthy subjects for further comparative study, I would add the Russian Empire, given the many and varied ecological zones encountered by the expansionary Russian state.

M. ALPER YALÇINKAYA, *Learned Patriots: Debating Science, State, and Society in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015). Pp. 314. \$50.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780226184203

REVIEWED BY BERRAK BURCAK, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey; e-mail: berrak@bilkent.edu.tr
doi:[10.1017/S0020743816000684](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743816000684)

“What were the Ottomans talking about when they talked about science?” (p. 12). This is the question that M. Alper Yalçinkaya sets out to answer in his book *Learned Patriots*. The conclusion to which he arrives is that an Ottoman “official discourse” on science focused more on the proper values that an Ottoman “man of science” needed to possess in order to better serve the Ottoman state and sultan than on how to raise Ottoman scientists per se. In arriving at this answer, Yalçinkaya has succeeded in creating one of the most exciting and eye-opening studies in the field of 19th-century Ottoman history. The study owes its success to Yalçinkaya’s deft application of a novel methodological approach, his adroit interpretation of a vast array of sources, and his lucid presentation of the findings.

Yalçinkaya employs a methodology combining concepts from science studies and the sociology of culture. This interdisciplinary approach moves away from previous one-dimensional approaches, such as those of Adnan Adıvar (*Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim* [Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943]) and Niyazi Berkes (*The Development of Secularism in Turkey* [Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964]), that treated science as a fixed entity, and towards a comprehensive reading of science as an arena with malleable borders. Yalçinkaya shows how and why “Western science” became the most important element in power dynamics among Ottomans competing to associate themselves with the state. He also shows how the construction of an Ottoman “official discourse” on science, which rested on a basis of science-cum-morality, reflected both an attempt to maintain social order and an intraelite struggle to determine how power was to be transferred within and across generations of Ottoman elites. In doing so, Yalçinkaya effectively establishes that Ottoman discussions around science brought together larger issues of culture, identity, elite formation, intraelite conflict, state formation, and social order, as the participants struggled to reinvigorate the empire.

Yalçinkaya’s interdisciplinary methodology shifts from an age-old focus on the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and modern science, which tied Ottoman-Turkish backwardness to a presence/lack of science, to new questions about the Ottoman appropriation of “Western science.” The author draws on official documents, textbooks, and the press, as well as 19th-century Ottoman plays, poetry, and novels; he skillfully integrates analysis of these sources into a rich narrative that maps the broad landscape of 19th-century Ottoman discussions around science

without losing sight of the fact that Ottoman scientism tied science to the state and emphasized the duties, responsibilities, and proper qualities of Ottoman “men of science,” who were expected to “be both knowledgeable and moral (i.e., patriotic and compliant)” (p. 154). He allows the reader to appreciate that while “literate Turkish-speaking Muslim Ottomans” (p. 12) who debated science in 19th-century Istanbul unanimously agreed that Western science was a beneficial type of knowledge, the fact that this knowledge was imported led to dissonance and multiple interpretations of the “ownership of this new knowledge, and the political implications of possessing it” (p. 16.). Yalçinkaya shows that the focus of both the official and the alternative discourses was whether one believed that the acquisition of Western science intrinsically instilled morality or that such morality needed to be inculcated separately. To provide an example, the book clearly demonstrates that Ottoman attempts at filtering the dangerous effects of Western science were central to the creation of literary stereotypes: the Tanzimat “fop,” which was intended as a critique of the Tanzimat pashas’ improper modernization based on their value-free approach to Western science, and the Hamidian “confused materialist,” which was constructed around the suicide of Beşir Fuad, widely regarded as a “lost soul” whose lack of a solid moral compass had led to his disloyalty to the Ottoman state, the sultan, and the religion of Islam. Both symbols underscored the fact that “new knowledge” was acceptable as long as it embraced patriotism, respected traditional values, and upheld religious teachings. Such successful integration of 19th-century Ottoman literature into discussions of science goes against compartmentalized approaches and establishes a much-needed link between modern Ottoman literature and the Ottoman appropriation of Western science. Similarly, Yalçinkaya successfully interweaves 19th-century Ottoman educational history, elite formation, and print culture into his discussion of science.

Yalçinkaya’s skillful navigation through a vast array of sources allows for a well-organized narrative, opening with the reign of Sultan Selim III and concluding with the Hamidian debates of the 1890s. In seven well-knit chapters, Yalçinkaya guides his readers through this complex terrain by showing how a constant redefinition of the categories “knowledge” and “ignorance,” which elevated those who possessed the “new knowledge/science” over the “ignorant,” functioned as the main mechanism of legitimization for those members of the Ottoman elite who tried to associate themselves with the state. It becomes clear, for example, that the Tanzimat pashas who were engaged in Ottomanism construed science as a universal yet fixed category of accumulated knowledge that would render all Ottoman subjects, irrespective of religion and ethnicity, loyal to the empire. In contrast, the Young Ottomans, speaking in the name of the Muslims whose privileges they believed were being eroded by non-Muslims, believed that it was necessary to synthesize “new knowledge” with “old knowledge.” As traditional knowledge conferred uprightness upon those who possessed it, the Ottoman “man of science” needed to be a virtuous member of the Muslim community. Hamidian intellectuals feared that the new knowledge would engender independent thinking among students in Western-style schools and that this could in turn foster disobedience to religion, to the sultan, and to the state. This fear pushed intellectuals such as Ahmed Midhat to interweave Western science with Islam, and pushed state officials to insert morality into the school curriculum. That targeted groups responded by emphasizing their adherence to Islam, Yalçinkaya contends, consolidated the close connection between science and morality and, as such, sealed official Ottoman discourse on science.

Yalçinkaya’s thorough examination of his source material also allows for proper contextualization of a large number of 19th-century Ottoman reformers, including early envoys sent to Europe, students in Western-style schools, representatives of the diplomatic corps, members of the ulema, and Ottoman journalists, writers, and publishers. This comprehensive account provides insight into the complexities of the Ottoman debate on science by showing the multilayered interactions between the major actors. In doing so, *Learned Patriots* makes a valuable contribution to Ottoman biographical studies that, albeit with exceptions, often tend to portray their actors as isolated from their larger historical context. Furthermore, considering that the major participants

in the Ottoman debate on science were members of the *kalemiye*, the Ottoman scribal institution, *Learned Patriots* sheds light upon the complex nature of 19th-century Ottoman bureaucratic history.

With *Learned Patriots*, Yalçinkaya manages to tie a debate that is very much alive in present-day Turkey to its historical roots without sinking into the pitfalls of the hackneyed “science versus religion” storyline. By showing the association between science and morality, the book establishes that categories such as “science” and/or “religion” cannot be studied in isolation. *Learned Patriots* not only challenges much of the earlier historiography equating Ottoman modernization with “Westernization” and depicting 19th-century Ottoman history as a site of struggle between “modernists” and “conservatives,” but also expands upon previous literature that painted a rudimentary portrait of Ottoman responses to modern scientific knowledge.

Learned Patriots is a well-researched, well-conceived, and well-written book that makes an original contribution to the study of Ottoman history, Turkish politics, and the modern Middle East. Thanks to its lucid style and organization, the book can be appreciated by a wide audience ranging from the general reader to specialists. This reviewer strongly recommends it and awaits further studies that will build upon Yalçinkaya’s excellent scholarship.

NAZAN MAKSUDYAN, *Orphans and Destitute Children in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Gender, Culture, and Politics in the Middle East (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2014). Pp. 232. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780815633181

REVIEWED BY KATHRYN LIBAL, School of Social Work and Human Rights Institute, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; e-mail: kathryn.libal@uconn.edu
doi:[10.1017/S0020743816000696](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743816000696)

Orphans and Destitute Children in the Late Ottoman Empire will be a valuable text for those seeking to better understand late Ottoman and early republican history from the vantage point of “child-saving” efforts in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Nazan Maksudyan’s monograph is one of the few book-length studies to examine Ottoman concern over how to address child abandonment and poverty as a matter of modern state practice. While she necessarily focuses on the gradual institutionalization and rationalization of child welfare practices by the state and other actors, Maksudyan also aims to “see and listen to . . . habitually ignored and essentially invisible and voiceless actors” in an effort to write an “alternative history” of the late Ottoman Empire (p. 4).

Maksudyan makes extensive use of the Prime Ministry’s Ottoman Archives, the American Board Archives, the French Foreign Ministry Archives, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Archives, as well as Capucin Archives (Archives des Capucins) and Lazarist Archives (Archives Historiques de la Congrégation de la Mission). She also draws on literary works, newspapers, serial publications of social reformers, biographies, diaries, letters, and photographs in order to analyze the broad sociopolitical and cultural contexts in which orphan and destitute children’s lives came to matter to the state in new ways.

The monograph is informed theoretically by the work of Michel Foucault, Jacques Donzelot, and other philosophers, historians, and social scientists who examined modern forms of governmentality, such as the institutionalization of children in boarding schools and orphanages, and who challenged the idea that such practices led to conditions of improved child welfare. Maksudyan argues that such institutions and practices often limited young children’s chances to survive and develop. She highlights the ways in which orphans and destitute children became valuable to the Ottoman state “as questions of citizenship and identity construction redefined the ‘control’ over