

Fatma Aliye Hanım and Historiography

Cevdet Kırpık*

Abstract: Fatma Aliye (1862–1936) was a popular female author. One of the first women authors of Turkish history, she was better known as a novelist. However, Fatma Aliye also published works on philosophy, Islam, women, poetry, and history. Her identity as an historian has generally been ignored and has not been properly analyzed. Two of her works are evidence of her worth as an historian. The first one published in 1915 was titled, *Tarih-i Osmaninin Bir Devre-i Mühimmesi Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetı* (An Important Era of Ottoman History: the Kosovo Victory-Ankara Defeat), and the second one published in 1916 was *Ahmed Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı* (Ahmed Cevdet Pasha and his Time).

This article aims to analyze and evaluate Fatma Aliye as a historiographer. For this purpose, her use of local and foreign sources, her handling of historical events, her style and language, and her approach to historical events will be examined. The way Fatma Aliye -probably the first Turkish female historiographer- evaluated historical events from a woman's perspective will also be looked into.

Key Words: Fatma Aliye, historian, historiography, Cevdet Pasha, Ottomans.

Introduction

The well-known writer of a particular period, Fatma Aliye Hanım died on 14th July 1936. She has been living as a recluse in her apartments in Pangaltı and Beyoğlu under not very good conditions. She has given up writing for some time now due to her advancing illness and some other personal reasons (Aşa 1993: 39-40). The fact that this famous writer of Turkish *belles-lettres* had become a recluse was unfortunate for the cultural sphere. Who was Fatma Aliye? What did she write, what were her views and how much of an influence did she have on her readers? It is difficult to answer all these questions within the space of one article. Many studies have already examined on her work. The present study will be look at a little investigated aspect of her writing: her oeuvre as a historian.

* Erciyes University Faculty of Education / KAYSERİ
cevdetk@erciyes.edu.tr

Fatma Aliye was well-known, not only because she was the daughter of the historian and jurist Ahmet Cevdet Pasha but also because she was multi talented and she produced a wide range of works. Making her reputation in the press with her novels and the subjects she treated, she became one of the most famous female novelists until II. Meşrutiyet (Second Constitutional Period). Her fame travelled beyond the borders of the country and reached the United States, which resulted in a group of women from the United States visiting her. The women said that they had come to visit the writer of the works that they had read and liked, and they returned having concluded that it was indeed her who had written these books.¹ The reason behind her fame abroad was the Chicago Exhibition in 1893. It had been planned for Fatma Aliye to attend the exhibition; meetings with foreign female luminaries had also been planned as suggested by Abdulhamid II himself.² It is also known that Fatma Aliye had gained the Sultan's trust and that she had been assigned by him to receive certain guests coming to the country.³

It was not common for a woman to become so prominent in such spheres in the Ottoman State. However, the slow change of mentality in the country prepared the ground for such initiatives. Starting from the second half of the 19th century, the progress made on the schooling of girls (Ergin 1977: 457-459, Kodaman 1991: 97-101, Akyüz 1999: 12-32, 143 et al), changing perceptions in families concerning girls' education and the developments in published media were enhancing women's influence in daily life and in cultured circles. From the last quarter of the century, particularly as from the second Constitutional Era, women had started to vie for space in the media; they had taken their issues and demands to the level of state agenda (Zihnioglu 1999: 337-338, Kurnaz 1997: 111-134). Women writers wrote poetry, novels and short stories but generally did not produce works on historical subjects. This is where Fatma Aliye differed from other female writers. For whatever reason, the fact that a female writer had engaged in historiography was a notable phenomenon: it can even be argued that Fatma Aliye is the first female historiographer. The studies that have been carried out on Fatma Aliye so far have either treated this side of her writing only in passing or not touched on this aspect of her career at all; the focus has always been on her novels and her method of championing women's emancipation.⁴ However, her historiography also deserves attention.

In this framework, I will look at the nature of the historical education that Fatma Aliye received the roots of her interest in history, her style in historiography, the language she used and which historians influenced her. Questions about her that arise are how did she regard history? Since all historians be-

fore her were men, did being a woman affect both her approach to events and her emphases?

1. Her Education and Interest in History

Fatma Aliye was the daughter of the famous historian Ahmet Cevdet Pasha. He was born in Lofça and came from the family of Yularkıranoğulları whose roots are in Kırklareli. Fatma Aliye was born in 1862 in Istanbul. She started her education in Istanbul after her father left his post as the governor of Aleppo. Fatma Aliye spent her childhood years in various different cities due her father's job as a civil servant, and as such, her education was carried out with the help of private tutors. She took regular lessons from her brother Ali Sedat Bey's tutor Mustafa Bey. She learned to read and write, learned the Koran and fundamental Islamic principles and mathematics. At 10-11 years of age she started to learn French from the piano teacher Refika Hanım who was a convert to Islam. Then she received regular French lessons from İlyas Matar, a Christian doctor and lawyer. Since he was from Beirut, İlyas Matar also taught her some Arabic.

From a very early age Fatma Aliye was different from her peers and loved books and reading. By the age of seven she had read books such as *Battal Gazi*, *Kankardeşi* (Blood Brother), *Muhayyelât-ı Aziz Efendi* (The Imagination of Aziz Efendi) and *A Thousand and One Nights*. When she reached her teens, her love for reading grew stronger, and she started to follow the works of the great writer of the period, Ahmet Mithat. In time, they got to know one another and their relationship turned into one of student and mentor, or daughter and father. Accordingly, when speaking of Fatma Aliye Ahmet Mithat, spoke of himself as one of her teachers (Ahmet Midhat Efendi 1994: 14-31, 41-51).

Her father did not play a very active role in her education in her earlier years, but he took an interest in it when she reached the age of twenty five. For about five years Cevdet Pasha and his daughter spent the evening conversing with one another, and Fatma Aliye considered these conversations as part of her education (1915: 11, 1916: 17). In these 'lessons' many subjects⁵ such as history, philosophy, religion and logic were covered in depth (Ahmet Midhat Efendi 1994: 86-96).

Her great interest in reading, the influence of her teachers and the milieu she inhabited resulted in interest in writing as well, and she took her first step into the world of *belles-lettres* through her translation of Georges Ohnet's novel *Volonté* into Turkish as *Meram* (Toros 1998: 218). Her subsequent

short translations were published in the *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* newspaper (Aşa 1993: 90-91). Fatma Aliye was generally known as the first female Turkish novelist, and her identity as a novelist was always in the forefront although she also penned articles on philosophy, Islam and women, along with speeches and poems (Aşa 1993: 117, 376 vd.).

2. Ottoman Historiography during Fatma Aliye's Period of Time

In order to be fully able to investigate the historiography aspect of Fatma Aliye's writing, it would serve us to look at the essential characteristics of historiography written during her early years.

Ottoman historiography started in the 15th century (Afyoncu 2003: 101-106), and from the 16th century it was under the influence of Iranian historiography. Events were listed in a chronological order, and there was no analysis concerning cause-effect relations. This continued to be the norm until the Tanzimat period with very few exceptions. Ali Çelebi, Katip Çelebi, Müneccimbaşı and Naima were among the exceptions; however their cause-effect analysis lacked depth (Yinanç 1999: 573-576).

Efforts to get to know the West better starting from the 18th century and gaining momentum with Tanzimat made themselves evident in the field of history writing as well. In 1893, during the time of Selim III, permanent embassies were established in Europe, and during the reign of Mahmut II, students were sent to Europe; as a result, by the Tanzimat period the number of people who could speak European languages had risen. This made it easier for people to know both their own history and the history of Europe and the world; this also made it easier for them to understand different historiographical methods. Even though many historians came onto the scene after Tanzimat, they followed in the footsteps of their predecessors and did not engage in contemporary historiographical methods. Among the *vakanuvis* (official historians) of the period, Ahmet Cevdet Pasha and Hayrullah Efendi penned works that were comparable to the works of their European counterparts. Despite all these separate developments, from Tanzimat to Meşrutiyet (the Constitutional Period) to the Republic, historiography retains its character of advice and story-telling. The why and how type of historiography started with II. Meşrutiyet and achieved a certain level only during the republican period (Süslü 1990: 160). It can be said that modern historiography started to be practiced in Turkey only after II. Meşrutiyet⁶ (Çetinsaya 2003: 7-10).

In short, during the period that Fatma Aliye was schooled and wrote, historiography was shifting from classical to modern. The old methods of historiography were fading especially during the World War I years when books were published

3. Fatma Aliye's Historical Works

Fatma Aliye was interested in history from an early age, and the long conversations she had with her father encouraged her to pen works in this field as well (1916: 4). The two works of Fatma Aliye that I will be analyzing at within this context will be *Tarih-i Osmani'nin Bir Devre-i Mühimmesi Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetini* (1915) (An Important Period in Ottoman History: Kosovo Victory and Ankara Defeat) and *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı* (1916) (Ahmet Cevdet Pasha and His Time) published a year later. The second can also be considered a memoir.

The first book is very rich due to its style. It is not merely a history book that chronicles the events one after another, but it also includes analysis and comparisons. In the introduction of *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı* there is discussion about history and basic principles of historiography; however, there is not much commentary further into the work. Accordingly we her earlier work will be analyzed more closely.

4. Fatma Aliye's Sources

Fatma Aliye was very particular when it came to choosing her sources. She was aware that the 'history' she wrote would reflect her talents very carefully when choosing her sources. A variety of sources is crucial in order to enrich the text, to offer different viewpoints and to provide a neutral approach. Fatma Aliye said that works that are not written using a strictly historiographical method and according to scholarly criteria would in time lose their value and become mere fairy tales. In order for a work to be named a 'history' it needed to be based on documents; works other than that would not have much value when she added "a work that does not reference documents cannot find a legitimate place in the world of history" (1915: 6). She believed that because their works were based on documents, the works of *vakanüvis* were of utmost importance. That's why she must have used her father's works and the documents that her father located for her when writing *Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı*.⁷

It is clear that when writing *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetini* Fatma Aliye made use of a variety of sources, some Turkish and some foreign. She stated that among her Turkish sources, the leading ones were her father's work

*Tevârih-i Hulefa*⁸ long with Hayrullah Efendi's *Hayrullah Efendi Tarihi* (Hayrullah Efendi History). A reading of *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimet* reveals that she made use of *Tevârih-i Hulefa* (The Histories of the Caliphs) extensively and sometimes used verbatim quotations.⁹

Another work she used was the work of the famous Ottoman historian Müneccimbaşı Ahmet bin Lütfullah¹⁰ entitled *Sahaif-ül Ahbar* (The Pages of News). For discussion on the Mongols and Timur's battles, Fatma Aliye used the work of the Harizm Uzbek Khan Ebül Gazi Bahadır Han's *Şecere-i Tarih-i Türk*¹¹ (The Tree of Turkish History) which he penned in Chagatai Turkish. She references Mevlana Hatifi's *Şehname* for her discussion on the Ankara Battle (Fatma Aliye 1915: 57, 72, 98,118). She also used a work called *Melfuzat* (Sayings) written in memoir form about Timur's engagements through the references of a western writer.¹² For her methodology and philosophy of history she consulted the Tunisian historian Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddimah* among others.

Apart from the eastern sources that I have mentioned above, Fatma Aliye also used some western sources such as the works of Cesare Cantu¹³ and Juanin(?).¹⁴ However, in the book there are phrases like "in some histories written in foreign languages" and "some foreign historians" which suggest that she used more western sources than the ones she mentioned by name. Her mention of "some books", "well-known histories", "the eminent historian" also pointed to the variety of the sources she used (1915: 4, 7, 18, 89-90, 121.). These mentions also reveal that she did not apply the modern methods of referencing as we understand them today.¹⁵ For instance when she cited how Yıldırım Bayezit's son, Süleyman, fled the field during the Battle of Ankara, she only mentions the name of the writer and the book.¹⁶ Sometimes the name of the writer is given without the name of the book cited. When she spoke of Yıldırım Bayezit's infatuation with Melica,¹⁷ She sister of the Serbian King Stephan, she said "The famous historian Cevdet Pasha says of his relationship to the late Melica (Maria) that he drank red wine from her hands and forgot the business of state" (1915: 93).

While such is her use of sources and their variety in *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimet*, her method of referencing is different in *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı*. She does not cite the name of her sources in this book. However, there is some information about the sources of the work especially in the introduction and some later in the body of the text. Fatma Aliye quotes her father saying "Listen well! Learn well! You may be able to publish what I have not been able to in the future." She also says "Dear reader can rest

assured that I am quoting directly from what Cevdet Pasha has taught me. However, I cannot guarantee that he/she will find in this work all that he has told and taught me.” Cevdet Pasha taught Fatma Aliye from his own notes; Fatma Aliye took her own notes. Concerning the *mazbata ve beyannamesi* of *Encümen-i Daniş* she said: “My late father and master put copies of this official report and statement as course notes, so I will cite them here.” Elsewhere she said “This is a copy of that speech which I have noted down in my lesson notebook.” (1916: 4, 60, 70).

While her ‘lecture notes’ are important, the framework of the book was constructed according to Cevdet Pasha’s *Tezakir* (Documents). In places, information from *Tezakir* has been summarized and abridged.¹⁸ However there is some information in Fatma Aliye’s book that is not in *Tezakir*.¹⁹ Fatma Aliye did not mention in her book that she made use of *Tezakir*.

It is clear that what determines the value of a work is not the number but the quality of sources that have been used. However, it must be noted that when the conditions of her time period is considered she used relatively few sources, especially when compared to works by her father Cevdet Pasha or Namık Kemal, who both wrote many years before her and who used a greater variety of sources.²⁰

5. Historians and Writers Who Influenced Her Work

a. Cevdet Pasha and Ahmet Midhat Efendi: While the reliability and variety of sources reveal the calibre historiography, they also have a bearing on the methodology of the writer. In this context it can clearly be seen that in her history the methodology of Cevdet Pasha whose work she benefited from is omnipresent.

Fatma Aliye took history lessons from Cevdet Pasha, and evidently through these lessons she subsumed his approach to historical events and his understanding of history in general. In the work in which she speaks of the Kosova Victory and Ankara Defeat she speaks of her father’s method of teaching her these subjects, “He tried to teach this poor student the issue of historical truths which is the essence of history. And I am trying to write this account according to what he taught me.” (1915: 11). In the introduction to her book *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı* she underlined that she applied what she learned from her father in her book (1916: 4).

Cevdet Pasha constituted a model for his daughter’s history writing, and he was different from many *vakanüvis* before him in that he did not simply relate historical events but also included social analysis along with cause and

effect connections. This characteristic can be seen in Fatma Aliye's work, particularly in the one that deals with the Kosova Victory and Ankara Defeat. The influence of Cevdet Pasha on her historical writing can also be observed in the parallel ways in which they analyze. For instance Cevdet Pasha says that in writing *Tarih-i Cevdet* (Cevdet's History) he was not partial to any side, and that he included events which he concluded had truly taken place. He says that the reason histories are written should be for the benefit of the people and that can happen only when the truth is related to the people in a clear, understandable and fluent way. According to Ahmet Cevdet the goal of history writing is not to produce heavy, fancy sentences and verbal acrobatics. This would be, in his opinion, a contribution to rhetoric rather than history.²¹

Just like her father, one of the points that Fatma Aliye stressed about history writing is the issue of clarity. According to her, history should be written in very clear Turkish (1916: 5). Fatma Aliye stated that starting from the period of Sultan Abdülmecit there had been a tendency towards clearer narratives, and she added that some historians also made such efforts. She said that Hayrullah Efendi was one of them, but that when it came to reflecting historical reality, he fell short. According to her, some histories are written in language that doesn't allow everyone to understand it; that such histories are accessed only by those who are advanced in historical studies through their zealous research. Thus, historians who used too ornamented language receive harsh criticism from Fatma Aliye (1915: 8).

Fatma Aliye's concern for clear language in history writing started at an early age, and Ahmet Mithat had greatly influenced her approach. In a letter she wrote to Ahmet Mithat Efendi she spoke of what a tiring thing it is to try to read Turkish histories and complained of the complex ornamental phrases and the need to consult dictionaries for the numerous Arabic and Persian words that were inserted. She said that she found it easier to look up French histories compared to those penned in Ottoman Turkish when she wanted to find out about a certain historical event. According to her, French histories were written in a language accessible to all and this made learning much easier. She contended that there were no such books in Turkish. Fatma Aliye was quite young when she wrote this letter, and she explained why she would favour clearer language when she wrote books: "A young person who can read French will learn much more than a student who is taught in existing Ottoman schools." (Ahmet Mithat Efendi 1994: 64-65).²² However, although she stayed away from constructions that were too complex, Fatma Aliye too used various Arabic and Persian words in her writing.

Another important aspect of history writing for her was objectivity. It is clear that she was influenced by his view in this respect as well (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa 1993: 23-24). According to Fatma Aliye in order for a history to be accepted by historians and for it to have longevity, it had to be written by neutral people. Even when the historian spoke about his own nation, he needed to relate the facts as they were. When a work included impartial statements and purely hearsay information that is not supported by evidence then that work would lose its character as a real history (1915: 6-7).

Fatma Aliye practiced her views only partially. When she spoke of the Ankara Defeat, she tried to speak of the event with impartiality and tried to analyse the details of the event, the actors and their approach and behaviour objectively. She said that the information that Timur was the cause of Ottoman defeat in this war was very common, but that this was equally due to the behaviour of the other side. In fact, when she analyzed the correspondence between Timur and Yıldırım before the war, she considered Yıldırım harsher and unwilling to compromise when compared to Timur. She said that in the correspondence Timur demonstrates a modesty that he had never been seen to demonstrate, and that Yıldırım spoke about his marriage in a way to provoke war between them. When speaking about Yıldırım's captivity at the end of the war she said "Timur let him live, and live without any of the torture that some books suggest Timur subjected him to. He even showed him respect". As can be seen she was not concerned with letting the leader of the nation she belonged to appear in a good light. She related only the information she found trustworthy in the sources she used and did it at the expense of making Timur seem sympathetic. She made it clear that she believed that it was Yıldırım Beyazid who caused this war, and she blamed him for the defeat of the Ottoman State (1915: 122, 136).

However Fatma Aliye failed to show the same kind of concern for objectivity in her second book *Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı*. In this book she put Cevdet Pasha and the story of his education at the centre and spoke of his services to the state and nation in laudatory terms. She approached events from his perspective. She made it look like Cevdet Pasha had no qualities to be criticised. However, someone else received even more praise than Cevdet Pasha, and that was Reşit Pasha. Although in his own work Cevdet Pasha did not refrain from criticising Reşit Pasha, Fatma Aliye did not take that route at all.²³ According to her, the Pasha was a great statesman and able diplomat, and he shone in the "constellation of Ottoman State" like a bright star. "In the high affairs of state, it was the great Reşit Pasha who established the methodology of diplomacy."²⁴ She opponents of these Pashas who always

acted together were always people who had personal or other weaknesses (1916: 37, 41-48, 55, 58, 109-111).

b. Ibn Khaldun: Although the writer followed her father's history writing style in many respects, she consulted other figures for her methodology, and one of them was Ibn Khaldun. However, her introduction to Ibn Khaldun was also through her father. In a way Cevdet Pasha was a window into Ibn Khaldun: Pasha translated his Introduction, and when he wrote his books, he consulted Ibn Khaldun's work to a great extent (Halaçoğlu-Aydın 1993: 446, Yazan 1992: 24-28). Fatma Aliye continued on this road opened up by her father and became thoroughly familiar with Ibn Khaldun's work. The famous Tunisian historian guided Fatma Aliye when she used his writing method, criticism of history, use of sources, the approach to the expansion, stagnation and fall of states and the analysis of the attitudes of state leaders in these situations.

In her discussion of history writing methodology, Fatma Aliye spoke more of Ibn Khaldun than her father. She said that Ibn Khaldun set up the basic principles of history-writing, and that it was through these principles that she learnt to tell between real and unreal events, and that that was the reason Ibn Khaldun's work was still being translated into many other languages. Fatma Aliye recounted the following anecdote to point to the power of Ibn Khaldun's work: "When they presented the translation of Ibn Khaldun's History to Sultan Mahmut Han the Second he said 'Hush!.. one doesn't entrust the blade in the hands of a child!' What he considered to be the child was the Ottoman nation, and the blade Ibn Khaldun's History!" (1915: 6, 9).

Fatma Aliye stated that she would write *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetini* bearing in mind the basic principles that Ibn Khaldun forwarded. This is what she did and she discussed the probability of the information she found concerning Timur and Yıldırım Bayezid, the two sides of the Battle of Ankara. She related that some sources claimed that before the war, Yıldırım had dissipated into a life of sensuality, drink and enjoyment and had no use for state affairs, and that some claim that Timur had become an inhuman brute, to the extent of depicting him a monster. Fatma Aliye compared these accounts with an eye to what could be true in these narratives. She revealed that non-Turkish sources also made hyperbolic and wrong claims about Yıldırım Bayezid. According to her, foreign historians had written the aftermath of Yıldırım's captivity without giving attention to the real event and without much research (1915: 5, 90).

Ibn Khaldun's views on the founding and expansion periods of states, and the attitudes of rulers in these periods were inspirational for Fatma Aliye as well.²⁵ In *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetini* she spoke of the development of state and how it expands depending on the efforts of the sultans and statesmen of the period. She then spoke of the actions of Yıldırım Beyazıt, the Ankara Defeat and its consequences. She stated that with the efforts of the first three founding period rulers the borders of the state had expanded. Then she extended this founding period with the period of Yıldırım Bayezit. She spoke of Bayezit's attitude and approach along with some of the practices during his period, following a methodology similar to Ibn Khaldun's. Yıldırım Bayezit had had a very luxurious palace built, and he wore clothes embroidered with gold leaf and golden buttons; he used gold and silver plates. The palace was decorated with various precious stones, and the people inside used pearls in abundance. Even the animals in the sultan's garden had their share of the wealth for or instance the leopard had diamond collars and the hounds wore precious material on their backs.

Fatma Aliye argues that the growing wealth of the state and the flow of information about the practices of other states led to this sort of behaviour. The Ottomans were aware of the practices of the Abbasid period, and they were also under the influence of the Byzantine court that was right next door. Yıldırım Bayezit did not concern himself with the affairs of state as had sultans before him, and led a life of dissipation, disloyal to the heritage he had inherited. She priority of his father before him, Murad I, was to enlarge the Ottoman lands, and to that end he had married Yıldırım to Devletşah Hatun, the daughter of Germiyanoglu. This had brought Kütahya, Simav, Eğrigöz and Tavşanlı castles under the reign of Ottomans as trousseau (1915: 41-42). Fatma Aliye compared Yıldırım with his father vis-a-vis their care for the state and the people, and added that Murat I also married his daughter Nefise Sultan to the Karamanoğulları, but that Yıldırım gave away the land of the nation as if it was his own property (1915: 93).

According to her, Yıldırım Bayezit was very different from his predecessor both by way of his ruling policies and by way of his personal characteristics. Although one cannot say that he was a womanizer, he was very much infatuated with a particular one, the Serbian princess Melica (Maria). Princess Melica was very beautiful, so much so that she had Yıldırım, a man who was stubborn and headstrong towards others, under her complete control (Fatma Aliye 1915: 91-95). Yıldırım Bayezit was indirectly criticised as for being under the influence of the Serbian princess by the early ottoman historians. For example, Aşıkpaşaoğlu asserts that Sultan learned enjoying himself in

bacchanalia from the Serbian girl (Derviş Ahmed Aşıkî 1985: 71). Medmed Neşri also states that the Sultan learned how to drink and enjoy himself with others from the princess. Mehmed Neşri maintains that until Yıldırım, Ottoman generation had not drunk alcohol (1995: 333).

Yıldırım Bayezit had given away Ottoman lands won with the blood of valiant young men as presents for his own passions: "He was so conceited that he acted as if the whole state, the nation, the whole Ottoman body was nothing but himself." He had left the affairs of the state to the Grand Vezir Ali Pasha who in turn had run the state with bribery and corruption. The justice of the old days disappeared, and officers took up posts through bribery including the kadıs who were supposed to instate justice (Fatma Aliye 1915: 91-95).

Like Ibn Khaldun, Fatma Aliye attempted to reach general rules by starting with particular examples. She presented two modes of behavior and government policy, and then showed their results, thus articulating her own philosophy of history and relaying a message to her readers whichever class they may have belonged to.

Dallying with drink, women and sensuality prevents one from seeing to the business of the state and this leads to injustice, oppression and failure. Fatma Aliye supported her idea by giving examples of how Süleyman Çelebi argued with officers when he was having a bath while drunk in the hamam and how he lost to his brother Musa, comparing this with how the dissipated Abbasid Caliph Emin had been defeated by his brother.²⁶

The work cited the reasons that led statesmen to failure, and then gave examples of virtues that lead to success and successful leaders of state. The virtues that made sultans successful were exemplified in the behavior of Osman, Orhan and Murad I: being just, tolerant, brave, well-advised in affairs of state; putting the interest of the state well before their own interest, working to exalt and spread Islam, valuing the efforts of men of religion and state, and following their advice, and at a personal level being pious, modest and charitable (Fatma Aliye 1915: 89).

6. Particularities of Her Writing

Apart from Cevdet Pasha and Ibn Khaldun, the changes that occurred in the perspective of Ottoman history writing, and the methodology of contemporary historiographers also affected Fatma Aliye's writing. She developed her own understanding of historiography, sufficiently distinct from the views of the historians that have been mentioned.

When we look at the principles she forwarded concerning history writing as a writer of the II. Meşrutiyet period, we see that she followed historical developments in the country quite closely and that she tried to view these through the rules of modern historiography.

According to Fatma Aliye it was imperative to write the facts as they are. Abiding -or not- by this principle reveals the personality, character and cultural level of the writer (1916: 4). Fatma Aliye was well aware of the importance of history writing and the difficulties of being a historian, and said the following: “The science of history has progressed; it has become more difficult to write historiography. Today, when you write a book as a history, it does not follow that it will be considered a history.” (1915: 7).

Fatma Aliye was also aware of the methodology of history writing in more progressive countries and the levels they attained. She said that in modernized countries histories were written according to certain rules and criteria. In those countries, history has reached a level of strength that did not allow for lies or unbalanced reporting; there was no question of changing facts (1916: 5-6). She offered some ideas as to how a platform for writing such histories could be maintained. She emphasized that for history writing to develop, and for truth to be better understood, a liberal environment is needed. She assessed the Ottoman State in this respect and concluded that even though there were some serious developments in history writing in recent times, the world of letters was not free, and that this made the understanding of historical truth more difficult, leading to a certain degree of ignorance (1915: 8).

According to Fatma Aliye the regime of government in the country and the way it functions can have positive or negative effects on scientific development. She underlined that in a state that has no constitutional or parliamentary structure there can never be real freedom -with this statement she made an indirect reference to the period of Abdülhamit II. She said that during that period there was no freedom to publish and that thus the cultural and educational life of the society had been condemned to darkness- which in turn led to an obstacle in understanding historical events. She said that the dark period continued until the constitutional period, and that history writing developed only after a free environment was made possible (1915: 9-10). She gave examples of “the historians Ali Seydi Bey and Ahmet Refik who, she suggested, had written with “a free tongue” (1915: 9-10).

She spoke to what history writing should serve in such a free environment. According to her, history writing should be for practical benefit. Such benefit can be achieved through learning the past. She treated the importance of

learning history in the life of a people, and said that learning national history is essential. History is for the nation, it is written for the nation to know it. What is important is the nation itself. In the period she wrote, the state and society faced various grave issues. Like many other statesmen, poets and writers, Fatma Aliye too tried to offer solutions to the problems faced by society during the time she wrote. The nation is to be enlightened through history; it will learn the truth and find solutions to its problems.

Fatma Aliye pointed to history as a medium through which the nation could be informed and enlightened; however, she also emphasized certain principles when making use of this information. She was selective about historical heritage; she championed good practices and refuted bad ones. According to her, people cannot be held responsible for the the crimes and bad deeds of their ancestors. The idea was to take their good deeds as examples and to stay away from the errors that they committed (1916: 4).

While Fatma Aliye put the nation as the central player for which histories should be written, she also put it in the center of discussions of what should determine a political regime's agenda. As a believer in parliamentary and constitutional government, she emphasized the importance of reflecting the nation's will in governance. Her ideas on constitutionalism differed from her father's. Cevdet Pasha had opposed constitutional monarchy, had supported Abdülhamid's policies in closing the General Assembly, and had played an active role in the trial of Mithat Pasha during his post at the Ministry of Justice. He wrote his book *Maruzat* (Presentation) on commission from Sultan Abdülhamit and in a tone that would please him to the extent that he included some unfounded oral information (Halaçoğlu ve Aydın 1993: 445, 449).

On the other hand Fatma Aliye was the defender of the Tanzimat which was declared through the great efforts of Reşit Pasha. According to her, Tanzimat guaranteed the life, property and honour of citizens but that citizens did not understand its import. She pointed to the benefits of Tanzimat when she considered the period she herself lived in (1916: 38-39).

Accordingly she fervently criticized the political practices of Abdülhamit II for not moving toward a constitutional government after Tanzimat (Fatma Aliye 1915:8). She aired her views in an environment of liberty provided by constitutional administration as she criticized those in favor of autocracy and she suggested constitutional and parliamentary government as a model. In her opinion constitutional government would limit the powers of the sultan.

Her views against autocracy were revealed by her analysis of the historical subjects that she wrote about. She could not escape effects of the political developments of the period she lived in. She held a mirror to the past, and interpreted the image in the context of her day. What was reflected in the mirror was what she believed to be the truth which she arrived at after much deliberation and contemplation, the truth she believed that people of her period needed to hear.

Fatma Aliye articulated her criticism against autocracy through relating some of Yıldırım Bayezit's actions. According to her, the most important cause that led to Ottoman defeat in Ankara is Yıldırım's insistence on autocracy: "Five words would be enough to explain the reasons of Yıldırım Bayezit's defeat: drinking, dissipation, pride, cholera and autocracy. Had there been no autocracy, the effect of the other three would have been limited." (1915: 124).

When speaking of the reasons for the defeat in the Battle of Ankara, Fatma Aliye left the historical event aside and started to air her thoughts on freedom, her views against autocracy in her own day's discourse. She was, in a way, listing the reasons constitutional administrations were required in the world because otherwise the whole law of the nation was at the whim of the ruler; the life of the nation was dependent on his one word, yes or no; the wealth of the nation that is amassed through the strife of the people was used against the very people. Fatma Aliye stated that however powerful they may be, and however much blood they shed, autocratic rulers always loses the battle to the people, and a constitutional form of government is reached at the end.

Fatma Aliye said that such governments appear in Europe and she also touched on the ways of Ottoman governing. The Ottoman people had always stood against autocracy throughout their history, they had led revolutions, they had refused oppression and pressure, but after that they had not quite known what to do with this spirit. This vagueness in the nation's goals prevented it from moving toward a constitutional and parliamentary system. The nation that had not quite decided how they want to be ruled fell under the oppression of another ruler after it had shaken off the yoke of the previous one. Fatma Aliye rued the fact that although many libertarian governments had been founded in Europe, the Ottomans as neighbor were not affected by this trend. It was the autocratic rulers who prevented such influence. They stultified education and culture; the people had been left ignorant to such an extent that they did not know what they wanted or what was good for them.

Fatma Aliye also touched upon the role of religion in establishing an autocratic government. She said that religion is taught by oppressive rulers in the Ottoman state in a way that does not reflect its true character, and that thus it is used for the benefit of the rulers. Autocratic rulers try to make the masses forget the national and personal rights that religion gives people, and they have kept them in the dark about essential decrees of religion. They have even ordered people to do things that religion prohibits, claiming that their orders are nothing but the edicts of religion itself (1915: 125-126).

While she supported the constitution, Fatma Aliye was equally attached to classical Islamic political philosophy and she tried to reconcile the traditional with the modern. According to her the nation was entrusted to the ruler by Allah. The ruler should not act without telling his people, he should take his job very seriously, he should protect their rights and never act against these principles. Related to this, she attached great sanctity to the concept of motherland, because it is an entity that has been made through the nation's blood-shed. The ruler cannot give away lands of the people according to his whim because the land belongs to the nation, not the ruler. The ruler only has power thanks to the great efforts, self-sacrifice and sweat of the people.

Fatma Aliye spoke about the importance of political regimes in the life of the nation; however, she didn't attribute any sacred qualities to the regimes themselves. Regimes are important only to the extent that they care for the nation, to the extent that they reflect the will of the nation. What then was this nation that Fatma Aliye spoke about that needed to be enlightened and needed to be ruled by appropriate political regimes?

Fatma Aliye insisted on being an Ottomanist, during a period of intense nationalism that brought about many separations from the Ottoman body during her own lifetime. Despite the fact that the majority of the ruling classes and the population was Turkish, she preferred to speak not of the 'Turkish' but of the 'Ottoman nation'. However, she realized that during the period of its foundation the state was a Turkish one. When she spoke about the victories won in the early period of the Ottomans, she said it was the "princely nation" who won these wars (1915: 9, 13, 23, 89) which in reality is the Turkish nation.

In the period when her books were published, the Ottoman State had very few ethnicities left within its borders other than Turkish, and after the Turks, the most populous ethnicity were the Arabs. Under such circumstances, we see that she favored consolidating this bond. The period in which her books were written made use of certain concepts obligatory.

We can see the effects of the political juncture in her works. For instance *Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimet* was written during World War I. Her aim in writing this book must have been, apart from enlightening the public concerning a historical event, to point equally to the cause that led the state to victory or defeat, thereby sending a message to the rulers of her own time.

In the second work we see that some of her concern was how Mithat Pasha of II. Meşrutiyet period had been promoted at the expense of Ahmet Cevdet Pasha.²⁷ Following upon that Fatma Aliye too had fallen out of favor after the declaration of the II. Meşrutiyet. Thus, in writing this work she both defended her father and tried to fight free from the neglected situation she found herself in. While she had been famous as a female writer before, now it was Halide Edip that the ruling Party of Unity and Progress was promoting. The fact that her work wasn't getting enough attention had a negative effect on the completion of the work. Fatma Aliye all but stopped writing after that and lived a solitary life till 1936 when she died (Aşa 1993: 41).

7. Fatma Aliye Hanım as a Female Historian

Even though Fatma Aliye did not maintain her old fame during the II. Meşrutiyet and Republican periods, when we consider that women never wrote histories, she occupies a female writer this puts her in a very special place today. She viewed history from a female perspective, and her work reflected this view. This was a new opening for the Ottomans. By way of its goals, Ottoman state history always spoke about states, political actors, high level officials and the military and consequently neglected women altogether. Because historical information is important for understanding today and the future the person who records it and analyzes it is equally important. Official Ottoman historians were male. Would the character and content of the events recorded have changed had they been women and, if so, what would have changed? That is to say, is it possible for gender to influence different viewpoints?

Only a much broader study can answer all these questions. In the present study, I will look at the way Fatma Aliye treated women who came into the historical limelight to see whether there was anything we can call a female way of observation and analysis in her work. Fatma Aliye was not thought to be keen to bring women to the fore in her historical accounts or to investigate their position in particular. She only looked at women who were already in the forefront without stepping outside the boundaries she had set for herself as a history-writer. Five women came into the limelight in Fatma Aliye's historical work: Mal Hatun, Serbian Princess Melica (Maria), Germi-

yanođlu Yakup Bey's daughter Devletşah Hatun, Sultan I.Murat's daughter Nefise Sultan and the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Kantakuzen, Princess Teodara. What brought them onto the stage of history and made them visible was not a change in the social structure that gave women more social importance and visibility in general. They caught Fatma Aliye's interest in that of and other historians due to their relationship with the rulers, their influence on internal politics and the role they played in foreign relations.

The said women did not choose their own spouses, crucial life-decisions had been taken for them and they had all been married off to members of the ruling families of foreign states.

Fatma Aliye treated women who married into the Ottoman state, and who married outside the Ottoman state differently. The women who come into the Ottoman dynasty from non-Muslim countries were active or passive according to what extent the Sultan immersed himself in the business of state. They took position according to how their husbands were situated by their power of governance, their loyalty to their post or their weaknesses. That women should be influential by way of their beauty, cunning or lust for power was made possible only through the qualities -that is the say the weaknesses- of the sultans themselves (1915: 29-30, 91-92). The incoming bride was always perceived as potentially full of intrigue and prone to wrong behaviour. Fatma Aliye thus depicts a male-centered prototype of woman that is situated according to male behavior-in this approach she is in keeping with the traditional Turkish and patriarchal discourses. The girl who was given out in marriage, Nefise Sultan, was considered to have been sacrificed for the interest of the state, having no power to resist her father's wishes. According to Fatma Aliye, naturally as a girl, Nefise Sultan would have expected love and intimacy from her marriage. However, although she knew his enmity towards the Ottoman she married, Karamanođlu Ali Bey, obeying her father's order, she thus "sacrificed her own comfort and future for the good of the state." Fatma Aliye considered Nefise Sultan to have been "sacrificed like a lamb" by being married off to the Karamanođulları. Nefise Sultan was put in a very difficult position when her husband was defeated at the hand of the Ottomans. She wavered in her loyalties when she wanted to save her defeated husband, and when she asked for forgiveness for her husband she was granted her wish because the sultan felt sorry for his 'selfless' daughter (1915: 53-54).

While speaking of the guiding principle of these marriages Fatma Aliye also spoke about the ceremonies. Maybe because she was a woman, she dwelled

on the style of the ceremonies and certain rituals observed. She spoke of the wedding ceremony held by Emperor Kantakuzen in Silivri when his daughter was married to Orhan Bey, the jewellery that the Karamanoğulları presented to Nefise Sultan at her wedding and the details of the wedding ceremony when Devletşah Hatun was married to Yıldırım Bayezit (1915: 42-43, 45, 92).

In short, Fatma Aliye did not place women as her focus nor did she try to depict their place in Ottoman history in particular. She just touched on the role of women who were in the forefront due to historical developments, without stepping outside the rules she had set herself for writing history. She did not speak about ordinary women's lives. Still, the comments she made when speaking about historical events concerning women reflected her female sensibilities as a writer.

In summary, Fatma Aliye:

1. used a variety of sources besides Turkish and foreign sources, such as her father's and her personal notes and oral history,
2. preferred plainer language when writing when compared to her contemporaries,
3. was influenced by Ahmet Cevdet Pasha and Ibn Khaldun in terms of historical methodology. She tended to reach generalizations through analyzing separate events in history. She emphasized that certain modes of behaviour of rulers and statesmen could lead to success or failure. She took into account the criticism that Ibn Khaldun put forward concerning historywriting, and she followed the recent developments in this field both in Europe and the Ottoman Empire.
4. Approached certain historical events differently from her father although she was largely influenced by his philosophy and methodology of history.
5. Was not content to explain the cause events through mere political reasons but looked at its cultural, moral and psychological background.
6. Was interested in the issues of her day, and wrote with a view to building a bridge between the past and the future, comparing a victory with a defeat, revealing the lessons to be drawn from this comparison. In that sense she demonstrated a pragmatic and didactic understanding of history, and her approach was unemotional, trying her best to adhere to the criteria of objective, modern historiography.

7. Spoke of concepts such as nation, motherland, constitutionalism and nation in her work, and as such she seemed to herald the Republic which would be established in the near future.

Notes

1. A group of American women got introduced to Fatma Aliye's work through the Chicago Exhibition, and when they came to Istanbul they visited her in order to get to know her better. This is what they had to say about her after a long conversation: "We have now got to know you, and understood your views... and saw that you're at a level much higher than we were led to expect... We had thought that the work of this female writer had been written by someone else but only attributed to her name. But having seen Fatma Aliye, we see that she must have been the one who wrote those books and indeed, she is capable of writing much better ones. When we get back to the States we will speak about our time with you and your fame will become even greater." *BOA (Archive of the Prime Minister's Office), YEE (Yıldız Original Documents), 37/17, Document date: 09/N/1311/3 March 1894.*
2. (*BOA, YEE, 38/120, 6/R/1327/27 April 1909.*)
3. *BOA, YEE, 38/109, 6/R/1327/27 April 1909.* When the Sultan said; "when the foreigners come, you can come and serve" Fatma Aliye's father Ahmet Cevdet Pasha wrote a thank you letter to him.
4. Aşa spoke about Fatma Aliye's historical work shortly in her book, but did not go into an analysis of her historiography (Aşa 1993: 381-384). Taha Toros who has met the writer says; "Fatma Aliye knew the calamities that took place in the country during the period that has come to be known the 'stagnation period' like a historian who has practiced his art for many years" and adds that her most notable historical work is *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamani*. However, he doesn't go into detail about her history writing (1998: 219-220). In the articles they wrote Zihnioğlu (1999: 336-343), Göbenli (2000: 283-288) and Esen (2006: 87-96) don't speak about Fatma Aliye's historical work or her views on history.
5. The various subjects that Ahmet Cevdet Pasha taught Fatma Aliye such as hikmah (wisdom), philosophy, science of the soul, mathematics, geometry, astronomy and other Islamic sciences have been compiled in *Mecmûa-i Aliye* (Halaçoğlu ve Aydın 1993: 449).
6. Yinanç also states that many developments in the field of writing and translating in the Ottoman Empire happened after 1908, that is to say after the declaration of freedoms (1999: 573-575, 595). Arıkan says the following about the appearance of modern historiography: "The Committee of Ottoman History that was set up after the declaration of freedoms gave the first examples of how historical material should be treated, how sources should be used and how documents should be

- referenced in a modern and scientific sense” (1985: 1592). Süslü on the other hand defines modern historiography as one in which events are treated not just from a historical perspective but also from a cultural, civil and social perspective as well, and adds that this approach developed in the West as well as in Turkey only in the period between the two world wars (1990: 160).
7. Her father’s oeuvre is very valuable for her for her father is both the official historian of the state, and a statesman who has held very important positions. Fatma Aliye says that when her father Cevdet Pasha was writing his books he was making use of many sources written in Arabic, Persian and Turkey and from books and documents from libraries of Istanbul, Aleppo, Egypt and Damascus, and also from French works with the help of their French teacher Emin Efendi (1915: 10). The fact that she speaks about the range of his sources suggests that she may have used these sources as well.
 8. The original name of the work is *Kıyas-ı Enbiya ve Tevarih-i Hulefa* (Stories of the Prophets and the History of the Caliphs) (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, 1969) Yinanç evaluates this work of A. Cevdet Pasha as a compilation of information from Ibnül Esir, Ebülfida, Ibnülverdi and Suyuti and thus not of much original value (1999: 583).
 9. The same event appears in the two books in the following way: “The princes and the generals of the army were following the defeated. Yıldırım Bayezid was informed. He came and sat under the white banner that was reserved for his highness. That white banner was the banner that the Seljuk Sultan had entrusted to Sultan Osman...” (Fatma Aliye 1915: 64). “The princes and the generals of the army were watching the defeated. When Yıldırım Bayezid was informed he came and sat under the white banner that belonged to his highness. This was the same banner that was given by the Seljuk Sultan to Osman Şah Gazi.” (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa 1969: 583). For similarities in information and expression see (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa 1969: 569-570, 598-600 et al, Fatma Aliye 1915: 41-43, 94, et al).
 10. Ahmet bin Lütfullah was referred to more as the Münecimbaşı (astroscientist). He was from Salonica and died in 1702. He served as Münecimbaşı during the reign of IV. Mehmet. His book that speaks of the period from Adam to 1672 called *Cami’el Düvel* (All Countries) is quite famous. The work was written in Arabic, based on around 70 sources and was translated to Turkish by Ahmet Nedim under the title *Sahaif-ül Ahbar* in the period 1720-1730 (Babinger 1992: 258-259).
 11. The book contains information about the Şeybani starting from the second half of the 15th century. The period after 1663 is written by his son Enuş Bahadır. Ebul Gazi Bahadır Han wrote the section about Timur’s empire based on the book *Mu’izzü’l-ensâb* whose author is not known. The work was translated to Ottoman Turkish and published by Ahmet Vefik Paşa (Kafalı 1994: 358-360).
 12. Fatma Aliye says that this book concerning Timur’s life was translated to English in London in 1830, and that Sezar Kantu (Cesare Cantu) too makes references to this work on many accounts (1915: 130).

13. Cesare Cantu is an Italian writer and poet. He was born in Brivia and died in Milan in 1895. Cantu wrote on many subjects, however, his most important work is the 35 volume history of the world, *Storia Universale*. The book has had many editions and been translated to languages such as English, German, French and Spanish (www.newadvent.org/cathen/03306b.htm). Cantu was one of the historians that Ottoman historians of the late period consulted frequently (Yinanç 1999: 579). For instance in the Ottoman history that Namık Kemal wrote he is aware of Cantu's history and had the following to say about it "The famous historian Cesar Cantu, has researched both the Greek and the Roman sources of history one by one, and he concludes that all these works are written with a view to criticize or exalt certain nations of people- not in order to teach the truth- serving the historians' own purposes" (1971: 16).
14. Fatma Aliye says that she has also used the work of a writer named Juanin (?), however, my research revealed no information on the said historian.
15. Only in one citation does she give the name of the work, the number of the volume and the page (1915: 98).
16. The quote is as following "In his *Tevarih-i Hülefa* historian Cevdet Pasha says of Süleyman Çelebi's flight; he left the honour of the Ottomans to the hooves of Mongol horses and fled to Bursa. The imperial army was turning the tide towards victory but then it got defeated." (Fatma Aliye 1915: 115).
17. The name of the Serbian princess is given as Melica here, however, Uluçay says that in different sources the name of the princess is recorded as Maria, Despina and Olivera (Uluçay 2001: 8) Added to this, Uzunçarşılı says that Iorğa records the name of the said princess as Marya or Mileva (Uzunçarşılı 1994: 200).
18. When we compare the style of the two sources we come across similar expressions: "As above while that strong earthquake happened in Bursa, the Gemlik Boat took off and came to Dersaadet and it was reported that a fire over the skies of Bursa was seen from the scene. People thought it must have been a volcanic eruption. And then it was learned that it was a fire. This was not recorded and it waited for official papers to appear." (Cevdet Paşa 1986: 35).
Fatma Aliye who speaks of the same event puts it in the following way: "When that earthquake happened in Bursa the Gemlik boat came to Dersaadet and informed that it has seen a fire above Bursa. People thought it must have been a volcanic eruption, and then it was learnt that it was a fire. This was not recorded and it waited for official papers to appear." (1916: 116). Similarity in expression or even identical expressions can be found elsewhere in *Tezakir* as well (Cevdet Paşa 1986: 6-36). For similar expressions and summaries see (Cevdet Paşa 1986: 6-34, 4-71).
19. This information probably consisted of Fatma Aliye's memories and what her father had passed onto her. For instance "When my father spoke about Kezzubî Hasan Efendi when I was quite young of age, I remember him saying that he was

- very ignorant. When Kara Halil came to our house and I was in the *selamlık* (men's) section I would see my father receive him most cordially, and I would be told that some of these men were the teachers of the Pasha, my father" (1916: 19).
20. At the beginning of *Tarih-i Cevdet* Ahmet Cevdet Pasha gives the list of the many sources he has made use of with short introductions- and they are more than 50 in number (1993: 15-23). Namık Kemal in his *Osmanlı Tarihi* which he wrote towards the end of the 1880's, used, firstly, Ottoman, and then Arabic, Persian and western sources. He compares the various sources he uses and then reveals the similarities and differences between them, trying to find the most logical among them. The following are among the many historians that he makes use of: Hoca Sadeddin, Idris-i Bitlisi, Neşri, Hammer, Solakzade, Şerafeddin-i Yezdi, Ibn-i Şahne, Ibn-i Hacr, Hakifî, Şerafeddin Erzî, Aşık Paşazade, Cesar Cantu, Dukas, Halko Kondili (Şalkondil), Franzi, Cenazi, Laride (1971: 16, 178, 185, 227, 228).
 21. (Ahmet Cevdet Paşa 1993: 23). Yinanç argues that Ahmet Cevdet Pasha has written the book in an artless language (Yinanç 1999: 576). Concerning Cevdet Pasha's historiography see (Bıçak 1997: 17-57).
 22. When Fatma Aliye's articles started to be published in newspapers, the fact that she used plain language when compared to her contemporaries caused people to speculate that they had been written by Ahmet Mithat Efendi. He says the following about it: "It is natural that anyone should imitate what they like. Everyone knows that I have devoted more than thirty years to open the route to a plainer language in writing and further to develop it" (1994: 83). We can conclude that when it came to writing in a clear, plain language Fatma Aliye had been under the influence of Ahmet Mithat Efendi whose works she read a lot.
 23. Cevdet Pasha speaks about Reşit Pasha with praise, however, he does now and then criticize him as well (Halaçoğlu 1994: 25-29).
 24. It is clear that Fatma Aliye's views and information on Reşit Pasha have been gained through her father (Halaçoğlu 1994: 25-29).
 25. Ibn Khaldun says that a state is founded with hardships and much work but that after a while rulers stop enduring hardships and leave their efforts and prefer to lead comfortable and quiet lives. Such rulers build palaces with gardens and pools and wear luxurious clothes and even use luxurious plates and cutlery (1997: 424-426). Ibn Khaldun says that after the foundation of the state stability and government is ensured, and wealth ensues. According to him, during this period normal necessities leave their place to luxury. People who become used to such opulence find it hard to give these luxuries up. At the moment of foundation, wealth and luxury are driving forces, however, with time; they bring the state's downfall (Görgün 1999: 550). For further view of Ibn Khaldun see Hassan 1977.
 26. "While Halife Emin was busy fishing with his slave Kevser one of his generals came up to him running and said "your brother's army is coming" he said

“Kevser caught three fishes, and I haven’t managed to catch one, leave me alone”. Likewise Emir Süleyman said to Evrenus Bey in the hamam: “Teacher, you have gone senile, what can a lad that has grown up under our hand like Moses serve?” (Fatma Aliye 1915: 136).

27. After a short while after Abdülhamit II came to the throne he blamed Mithat Pasha for the death of his uncle Abdulaziz and had him arrested. Ahmet Cevdet Pasha was the Minister of Justice at the time. When he realized that he was going to be arrested Mithat Pasha sought refuge at the French consulate (BOA, Y.EE, 18/40, 20. C.1298/19 May 1881.). Mithat Pasha asked for asylum but the French consulate did not accept his request and gave him up to the police. Cevdet Pasha thanked the French consul for his reaction (BOA, Y.EE, 16/4, 22.C.1298/21 May 1881). Ahmet Cevdet Pasha’s role in Mithat Pasha’s arrest and his subsequent trial was quite controversial. The general view is that he intervened in the way that the trial proceeded and influenced the court to take a decision in accordance with the sultan’s wishes. For a further discussion on that see (Uzunçarşılı 1987, 2000). It is understood that Cevdet Pasha is on general good terms with Abdülhamit II. He supported the sultan when he decided to close down the parliament, and he wrote his book *Maruzat* in a way that would please Abdülhamit, befitting his mood, sometimes even making recourse to hearsay (Halaçoğlu ve Aydın 1993: 449).

References

- Afyoncu, Erhan (2003). “Osmanlı Siyasî Tarihinin Ana Kaynakları: Kronikler”. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* I (2): 101-106.
- Ahmet Cevdet Paşa (1993). *Tarih- Cevdet*. Sadeleştiren: Dündar Günday. I. İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat.
- _____ (1969). *Kıyas-ı Enbiya ve Tevârih-i Hulefa*. II. İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi (Tan Matbaası).
- _____ (1986). *Tezâkir* 1-12; 40 Tetimme. Yayınlayan: Cavid Baysun. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ahmet Midhat Efendi (1994). *Fatma Aliye Bir Osmanlı Kadın Yazarın Doğuşu*. Osmanlıcadan Çeviren: Bedia Ermat. İstanbul: Sel Yay.
- Aşa, H. Emel (2001). *Fatma Aliye Hanım (Hayatı-Eserleri-Fikirleri)*. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Akyüz, Yahya (1999). *Türk Eğitim Tarihi (Başlangıçtan 1999’a)*. İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- _____ (1999). “Osmanlı Son Döneminde Kızların Eğitimi ve Öğretmen Faika Ünlüer’in Yetiştirilmesi ve Meslek Hayatı”. *Millî Eğitim* 143: 12-32.
- Anıkan, Zeki (1985). “Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Tarihçilik”. *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*. C. VI. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 1592.

- Babinger, Franz (1992). *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*. Çeviren: Coşkun Üçok. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yay.
- BOA (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi), YEE (Yıldız Esas Evrakı), 37/17, *Belge tarihi: 09/N/1311/3 Mart 1894*.
- BOA, Y.EE, 18/40, 20. C.1298/19 Mayıs 1881.
- _____, 16/4, 22.C.1298/21 Mayıs 1881.
- _____, 38/120, 6/R/1327/27 Nisan 1909.
- _____, 38/109, 6/R/1327/27 Nisan 1909.
- Berktaş, Fatmagül (2003). *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: Metis Yay.
- Bıçak, Ayhan (1997). "Cevdet Paşa'nın Tarih Bilinci". *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa (1823-1895) Sempozyum Bildirileri Kitabı*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay. 17-57.
- Çetinsaya, Gökhan (2003). "Türkiye'de Siyasî Tarihçiliğin Yükselmeye Düşüşü: Gök Ekini Biçmiş Gibi". *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi I (2)*: 7-10.
- Derviş Ahmed Âşıkî (1985). *Âşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*. Hazırlayan: A. Nihal Atsız. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yay.
- Ergin, Osman (1977). *Türk Maarif Tarihi I-II*. İstanbul: Eser Matbaası.
- Esen, Nüket (2006). "Bir Osmanlı Kadın Yazarın Doğuşu". *Modern Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Okumalar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 87-96.
- Fatma Aliye 1331 (1915). *Tarih-i Osmanî'nin Bir Devre-i Mühimmesi Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetini*. Dersaadet (İstanbul): Kanaat Matbaası.
- _____, 1332 (1916). *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı*. Dersaadet (İstanbul): Kanaat Matbaası.
- Göbenli, Mediha (2000). "Ahmet Midhat Efendi ve Osmanlı Türk Kadın Yazarları Fatma Aliye Hanım ve Şair Fitnat Hanım". *Tarih ve Toplum* 203: 283-288.
- Görgün, Tahsin (1999). "İbn Haldun". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. C. XIX. İstanbul: Diyanet Vakfı Yay. 538-555.
- Halaçoğlu, Yusuf ve Mehmet Akif Aydın (1993). "Cevdet Paşa". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. C. VII. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay. 449.
- Halaçoğlu, Yusuf (1994). "Ma'ruzat ve Tezahir'de Mustafa Reşid Paşa ve Tanzimat Erkanı". *Mustafa Reşid Paşa ve Dönemi Semineri Bildirileri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi. 25-29.
- Hassan, Ümit (1977). *İbn Haldun'un Metodu ve Siyaset Teorisi*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
- İbn Haldun (1997). *Mukaddime I*. Çeviren: Zakir Kadirî Ugan. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Kafalı, Mustafa (1994). "Ebül Gazi Bahadır Han". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. C. X. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay. 358-360.
- Kodaman, Bayram (1991). *Abdülhamit Devri Eğitim Sistemi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yay.

- Kurnaz, Şefika (1997). *Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Türk Kadını*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yay.
- Mehmed Neşrî (1995). *Kitab-ı Cihan-nümâ Neşrî Tarihi*. Yayınlayanlar: Faik Reşit Unat ve Mehmed A. Köymen. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yay.
- Namık Kemal (1971). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. Bugünkü Dile Aktaranlar: Ulviye Ilgar ve İhsan Ilgar. İstanbul: Hürriyet Yay.
- Süslü, Azmi (1990). "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e: I". *Fırat Üniversitesi Tarih Metodolojisi ve Türk Tarihinin Meseleleri Kolokiyumu Bildiriler*. Elazığ: Bizim Büro Basımevi. 159-163.
- Toros, Taha (1998). *Mazi Cenneti*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Uluçay, M. Çağatay (2001). *Padişahların Kadınları ve Kızları*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1994). *Osmanlı Tarihi I*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- _____ (1987). *Mithat ve Rüştü Paşaların Tevkiflerine Dair Vesikalar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- _____ (2000). *Midhat Paşa ve Yıldız Mahkemesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Yazan, Ümid Meriç (1992). *Cevdet Paşa'nın Toplum ve Devlet Görüşü*. İstanbul: İnsan Yay.
- Yinanç, Mükrimin Halil (1999). "Tanzimat'tan Meşrutiyet'e Kadar Bizde Tarihçilik". *Tanzimat*. C. II. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi. 583.
- Zihnioğlu, Yaprak (1999). "Erken Dönem Osmanlı Hareket-i Nisvanının İki Büyük Düşünürü Fatma Aliye ve Emine Semiye". *Tarih ve Toplum* 31(186): 337-338.
- www.newadvent.org/cathen/03306b.htm

Fatma Aliye Hanım'ın Tarihçiliği

Cevdet Kırpık*

Özet: 1862 yılında doğup 1936'da ölen Fatma Aliye, popüler olmuş bir yazardı. O, Türk tarihinin ilk kadın yazarlarından olup daha çok romancılığı ile tanınmaktadır. Fakat felsefe, kadın, İslamiyet, şiir ve tarih gibi alanlarda da eser vermiştir. Yazarın tarihçiliği ise şimdiye kadar ihmal edilmiş, ciddi bir değerlendirmeye tabi tutulmamıştır. Hâlbuki tarihçiliğinin ortaya konulmasında son derece kıymetli bilgiler içeren iki adet eseri bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki 1915 yılında yayınlanan *Tarih-i Osmanînin Bir Devre-i Mühimmesi Kosova Zaferi-Ankara Hezimetî*, ikincisi ise bundan bir yıl sonra yayımlanan *Ahmet Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı*'dir.

Bu makalede yazarın tarihçiliğini ortaya koymak için kullandığı yerli ve yabancı kaynaklar, tarihi olayları ele alış tarzı, kullandığı üslup ve dil ile tarihe yüklediği misyon gibi konulara değinilmektedir. Belki de ilk Türk kadın tarih yazarı olan Fatma Aliye'nin tarihi olayları bir kadın gözüyle nasıl değerlendirdiği de ayrıca incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Fatma Aliye, tarihçi, tarihçilik, Cevdet Paşa, Osmanlı.

* Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi / KAYSERİ
cevdetk@erciyes.edu.tr

Историография Фатма Алие Ханым

Джевдет Кырпык*

Резюме: Фатма Алие, родившаяся в 1862 году и умершая в 1936 году, была популярным писателем. Она явилась одной из первых женщин писателей в истории Турции и более известна как романтический писатель. Но она имеет также работы в таких областях, как философия, женщина, ислам, поэзия и история. Историография автора до сих пор пренебрегалась и не подвергалась серьезной оценке. Тем не менее, имеется две ее работы, содержащие ценные сведения по историографии. Первая работа -напечатанная в 1915 году «Тарих-и Османнин бир девре мухимеси Косова зафери-Анкара хезимети», а вторая -выпущенная годом позже «Ахмет Джевдет паша и его время».

В этой статье историография автора рассматривается посредством его использования отечественных и зарубежных источников, методов анализа исторических событий, использованного стиля и языка, видения миссии, возложенной на историю. Также рассмотрен анализ исторических событий глазами исторической писательницы-турецкой женщины Фатма Алие.

Ключевые Слова: Фатма Алие, историк, Джевдет-паша, история, Османская империя.

* университет Эрджиес, педагогический факультет / Кайсери
cevdetk@erciyes.edu.tr