

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE REPUTATIONAL TRAJECTORIES
OF TURKISH WOMEN INTELLECTUALS
FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

HALE ŐAŐMAZ

BOĐAZIĐI UNIVERSITY

2015

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE REPUTATIONAL TRAJECTORIES
OF TURKISH WOMEN INTELLECTUALS
FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Hale Şaşmaz

Boğaziçi University

2015

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Hale Şaşmaz, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date

ABSTRACT

A Comparative Study on the Reputational Trajectories of Turkish Women Intellectuals from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic

How do woman intellectuals go beyond the sexism of intellectual field and achieve fame? To answer this question, this thesis examines the reputational trajectories of Turkish woman intellectuals from the late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire to the early Republican era through biographical and archival material. It focuses on five intellectual women who have been called the Great Women: Fatma Aliye, Emine Semiye, Nigar bint-i Osman, Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin. Analysing women's reputational trajectories in three periods -the Hamidian Era, the Second Constitutional Era and the Early Republican Era-, this study identifies four strategies the Great Women employed while negotiating patriarchal practices in intellectual milieus: collaboration, acquiescence, subversion and defiance. The findings show a) that strategy is indeed decisive in fighting patriarchy and what determines success is one's resources and how she puts them into use and b) that the proper evaluation of changing resources in historical and political transitions is crucial both in making reputations and furthering them.

ÖZET

Osmanlı Devleti'nden Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ne Türk Kadın Entelektüellerin İtibar Kazanma Süreçlerinin Karşılaştırmalı Çalışması

Kadın entelektüeller entelektüel ortamların cinsiyetçi yapısını aşarak nasıl itibar elde ederler? Bu soruyu cevaplamak için bu tezde on dokuzuncu yüzyıl Osmanlı Devleti'nden erken cumhuriyet dönemine Türk entelektüel kadınların entelektüel kariyerleri biyografi ve arşiv materyalleri kullanılarak incelenmiştir. Büyük Kadınlar adı verilen beş kadına odaklanılmıştır: Fatma Aliye, Emine Semiye, Nigar bint-i Osman, Halide Edib ve Nezihe Muhiddin. Kadınların itibar elde etme süreçleri üç ayrı dönemde -2. Abdülhamid dönemi, İkinci Meşrutiyet ve Erken Cumhuriyet dönemi- analiz edilerek, ataerkil uygulamalara karşı başlattıkları müzakere süreçlerinde dört strateji kullandıkları belirlenmiştir: işbirliği, kabullenme, yıkma ve reddetme. Bu çalışma stratejinin ataerkiyle mücadelede belirleyici olduğunu ve bu süreçte kişinin kaynaklarının ve bunları nasıl kullandığının önemini göstermektedir. Ayrıca tarihi ve siyasi dönüm noktalarında değişen kaynakların doğru değerlendirilmesinin itibar elde etmede ve daha fazla itibar kazanmada önemli olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A lot of people directly or indirectly contributed to the process of writing this thesis, and I would like to offer my gratitude to all of them. First and foremost, I'd like to thank my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Barış Büyükokutan. He has supported me since my undergraduate years, and has had full confidence in me. He has always been open minded throughout the process of writing, listened to my ideas patiently and always provided me with critical feedback. I'd also like to thank Assist. Prof. Tuna Kuyucu, who offered very helpful critiques and suggestions from the very early stages of this study and taught me how to approach social phenomena. He has been very supportive and encouraging during the entire process. Assist. Prof. Didem Havliođlu agreed to be on the committee and kindly spent time with me discussing the project and my findings. My conversations with her have always been inspiring.

I'd also like to thank TÜBİTAK, the Turkish Scientific and Technical Research Council, for funding this project (project number: 114K098).

I would like to offer my special thanks to some of the professors at Bođaziçi University who, beyond teaching a course, made a difference in my life. I'd like to thank especially Prof. Abbas Vali for his support and helpful guidance, and for his thrilling classes which critically contributed to my sociological thinking. Dr. Anthony Pavlik, my student advisor during my undergraduate years, taught me to follow my dreams wherever they went and never give up no matter what. He has been one of my best readers and has always provided fantastic "instant" feedback. Dr. Esra Dicle Bařbuđ, always warm and kind, supported this study from its very early stages, shared her lecture notes with me and was always willing to discuss my findings. Assist. Prof. Louis Mazzari shared my excitement on the project and always

encouraged me throughout my years at Boğaziçi. Assist. Prof. Bülent Küçük provided important comments on the thesis, and also introduced different subject matters to me in the field of sociology.

The process of writing could have been much harder if I had not had my friends by me. Eda Yüerman always had more confidence in me than I did in myself. Feyza Harman, whom I luckily got to know while writing this thesis, offered her invaluable friendship and constant support when I needed it most. Tuğçe Koç, Merve Nur Demir, Asude Karaaslan, Ajda Keleş and Elif Taşkın were always there to share my happiness and enthusiasm and eventually became great friends.

I'd also like to thank Peggy Alptekin, the editor of the Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences, for her contributions.

Finally, my special thanks go to my mother and father, who loved me deeply and stood by me no matter what and always trusted me and my decisions in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: IN SEARCH OF AN ACCOUNT.....	10
2.1 Personal circumstances	10
2.2 Ideological congruence	14
2.3 Seeking women’s agency in the world of men of letters.....	19
2.4 Towards an account.....	20
CHAPTER 3: STRATEGIES AND PATRIARCHAL BARGAINS.....	24
3.1 An overview of strategies and bargains.....	24
3.2 Problems with Kandiyoti and Bourdieu: A reconciliation.....	27
3.3 Bourdieu and gender studies	31
3.4 A discussion of fields and women intellectuals	32
CHAPTER 4: STRATEGIES OF REPUTATION MAKING AND BARGAINING WITH PATRIARCHY.....	36
4.1 The making of women intellectuals in the Hamidian era	38
4.2 The making of women intellectuals in the Second Constitutional era.....	62
4.3 Diverging reputational trajectories: The early republican era	85
4.4. Conclusion	98
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	100
5.1 Evaluation of the Great Women’s strategies.....	100
5.2 Discussion.....	109
APPENDIX A: ORIGINAL QUOTATIONS IN OTTOMAN TURKISH	114
APPENDIX B: GUIDE TO INTELLECTUALS MENTIONED.....	120
APPENDIX C: NIGAR BINT-I OSMAN’S NETWORKS	129
REFERENCES	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Birth and Death Dates of the Great Women	2
Table 2. The Relationship between Personal Circumstances and Reputation	14
Table 3. The Relationship between Ideological Congruence and Reputation	15
Table 4. Strategies of the Great Women over Three Regimes.....	22
Table 5. List of the Strategies and Women’s Actions	23
Table 6. Three Strategies for Dealing with the Male Bias Pervading the Ottoman Intellectual Circles in the Hamidian Era (1895-1908).....	41
Table 7. Four Strategies for Dealing with the Male Bias Pervading the Ottoman Intellectual Circles in the Second Constitutional Era.....	66
Table 8. Distribution of Fatma Aliye’s Publications during Two Regimes.....	80
Table 9. The Strategies for Dealing with the Patriarchal Benevolence of the Kemalist Regime	88
Table 10. Components of the Strategies in the Hamidian Era	102
Table 11. Components of the Strategies in the Second Constitutional Era	103
Table 12. Components of the Strategies in the Early Republican Era.....	106
Table 13. The Strategies Employed in Case of Ideological Congruence and Reputation	107
Table 14. The Strategies Employed in Case of Non-ideological Congruence and Reputation	107
Table 15. The Factors behind Emine Semiye and Selma Rıza’s Diverging Reputational Trajectories during the Hamidian Era	109
Table 16. The Factors behind Nezihe Muhiddin and Şukufe Nihal’s Diverging Reputational Trajectories in the Early Republican Era.....	109
Table 17. Evaluation of Strategies in Two Dimensions.....	111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

How do some intellectuals achieve great fame whereas some simply sink into oblivion? What, if any, are the guidelines for intellectual recognition? From Mannheim's sociology of knowledge to Bourdieu's sociology of academia (1988, 1994) and Collins's sociology of philosophies (1998), scholars have dealt with this issue and developed complex institutional and network models (e.g. Bartmanski, 2012; Lamont, 1987; McLaughlin, 1998). However, these studies have one big lacuna: They say nothing about women. The exclusion of women writers as a part of the gentrification of the literary process in the Victorian Era in England (Tuchman & Fortin, 1984), the case of disappearing lady painter-etchers despite their etchings' comparable quality (Lang & Lang, 1988) and the repudiation of women's historical existence in the music field by limiting their access to publishing and performing in the nineteenth-century US (Wood, 1980) are just a few examples of the denial of women's accomplishments. How does this exclusion operate? Conversely, how did some women such as Simone de Beauvoir, Mary Shelley and Azra Erhat manage to go beyond the sexism of the intellectual field and achieve fame? It is my purpose, therefore, to examine the conditions under which women intellectuals acquire their reputations.

To do this, I have focused on five women who have been called the "Great Women"¹ (Kızıltan, 1990; Çakır, 1994; Bekiroğlu, 1998) of the late nineteenth

¹ These women have been referred to as "büyük kadınlar", "öncü kadınlar" and "burç kadınlar" in the literature.

century Ottoman Era: Fatma Aliye, Emine Semiye, Nigar bint-i Osman, Nezihe Muhiddin and Halide Edib (for the birth and death dates, see Table 1). They were all contemporary women writers and activists who attained recognition, albeit at different levels, in intellectual milieus in an era when “women were imprisoned in the shackles of tradition and superstition” (Sirman, 1989, p. 5) through the responsibility of being mothers and wives for the well-being of Ottoman men.

Table 1. The Birth and Death Dates of the Great Women

The Great Women		
	Birth	Death
Fatma Aliye	1862	1936
Nigar bint-i Osman	1862	1918
Emine Semiye	1864	1944
Halide Edib	1882	1936
Nezihe Muhiddin	1889	1958

Looking at the conditions of the era, I address the following questions: How was it possible to gain recognition as an intellectual woman in a period of strong patriarchal exclusion?² How did “the great women” tackle this exclusion? What strategies did they employ? While there were very many other active women writers in the period, particularly Makbule Leman and Fatma Fahrünnisa and Selma Rıza, what brought the Great Women and not these other three women into prominence? How did the strategies of the Great Women diverge from other women in that era in terms of challenging the patriarchal codes? In this challenge, what kind of patriarchal bargains (Kandiyoti, 1988), if any, did they strike? In short, what factors determined the

² While patriarchal exclusion has mostly been the reason behind the underrepresentation of women in the intellectual field, it was especially intense in the era of Great Women (see e.g. Arat 1999; Göle 1996; Sirman 1989).

reputational variation among the Great Women? In addition, can the same factors account for the lack of prominence of other women?

Since the 1980s scholars have sought to expose women's invisibility in Ottoman history. Up until that point, women's voices in the mainstream historiography had been largely muted, and it was believed that Turkish women were given rights without having to ask or fight for them. With the growing influence of the feminist movement in the 1990s, scholars have tried to amplify women's earlier muted voices. As a result of this scholarly attempt, there is today a large body of works offering a general overview of women's movement in the late Ottoman Era (see e.g. Çakır, 1994; Demirdirek, 1993, 1998; Karakaya-Stump, 2003; Kurnaz, 1996). In addition, writings and activities of women before and during the constitutional era have been widely studied. Among these, scholars have focused on women's journals (Aşa, 1989; Demirdirek, 1993; Çakır, 1991; Taşkiran 1973) and women's organizations (see Çakır, 1991; Frierson, 1996; Karakaya-Stump, 2003; Keskin, 2003). There is also a growing body of work on pioneering Turkish women intellectuals such as writers and poets. Presenting biographical information in a chronological manner, these studies offer individual life histories of women. However, there remains a paucity of literature examining Ottoman intellectual women from the perspective of sociology of intellectuals. Mostly descriptive, the existing studies on intellectual women, as Havlioğlu (2010) argues, are far from situating women vis-a-vis the dominant patriarchal culture, and thus they do not particularly address women's struggles and strategies against a set of concrete constraints produced by patriarchy.

This study, therefore, first and foremost situates intellectual women vis-a-vis the patriarchal rules of the intellectual milieu of the late Ottoman Empire, and examines how they were able to become a part of the Ottoman intellectual field and gain recognition. It also goes beyond the individual accounts of intellectual women, and adds an in-depth case example to the literature by bringing five intellectual women together and provides, ^{for} the first time, a comparative account of their reputational trajectories. In addition, this study offers a theoretical contribution to the literature by combining Bourdieu's theoretical framework with Kandiyoti's concept of patriarchal bargains.

In *the Making of an Intellectual Woman*, Toril Moi argues that several recent French books on intellectuals from the Dreyfus affair to our days manage not to mention a single woman. The patriarchal arrogance of such enterprises is compounded by the fact that the very same books often go to great lengths to include even extremely obscure male (Moi, 2008, p. 33).

Beauvoir's intellectual trajectory has shown that the exclusion of women from the intellectual field is in no way unique to France or any other country. The Great Women went through the same processes, and managed to achieve fame despite the patriarchal rules of the intellectual field. There are, of course, local differences, and intellectual women in each setting went through different struggles influenced by local dynamics (the regime, culture, existing social and cultural institutions, the kinds of role assigned to women and so forth). This study, therefore, is an attempt to understand the Great Women's reputational trajectories through an examination of cultural, political and economic exigencies of their time. It covers the transition from a multi-ethnic Empire to a nation state. The intellectual trajectories of women were

influenced by the changing political cultures of their societies. They had different reactions and do not represent a homogenous entity.

An intellectual's reputation, in this thesis, is evaluated based on five criteria: (i) participation in intellectual milieus (literary salons, tea parties, social gatherings), (ii) membership to cultural institutions, (iii) peer recognition and praise in written form, (iv) support of the leading male intellectuals in the form of writing prefaces for their books, and co-authoring books and (v) the circulation of works in the national and international milieus and translation of works into different languages. The term reputational trajectory describes the change in these criteria over time.

It is also useful to distinguish between the two aspects of reputation: recognition and renown. Recognition refers to the esteem in which others in the same "art world" (Becker, 1982) hold the artist. It depends largely on evaluations of artistic output by teachers, professional peers and other significant insiders (Lang & Lang, 1988, p. 84). Renown, on the other hand, signifies a more cosmopolitan form of recognition beyond the esoteric circles in which the artist moves. The indicators of renown consist of sales, press notices, and other attention to the work and persona of the artist (Lang & Lang, 1988, p. 85). These two aspects complement one another, for recognition alone may not bring along fame. Similarly, pure renown does not guarantee recognition by others within the same millieus. Therefore, I pay attention to both aspects of reputation while evaluating the reputational trajectories of the Great Women. The first four criteria of evaluation of reputation measure recognition whereas the last one is an indicator of renown.

This study is based mostly on primary sources such as women's own articles, correspondence, autobiographies, diaries and memoirs. I reviewed women's

periodicals in which the Great Women wrote. These newspapers show the mentality and the perception of women in Ottoman society although at times they had male editors. Still they are very important documents providing first hand information. I reviewed most of the articles written by the Great Women in the following periodicals: *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, *Mehasin*, *Kadın*, *İleri*, *İnci*, and *Türk Kadın Yolu*. Apart from articles, I also reviewed letters to Nigar bint-i Osman from a number of intellectuals such as Ahmed Midhat, Ahmet Rasim, Celal Sahir, Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem and Süleyman Nazif. These letters are available at Aşiyen Museum. Letters between Ahmed Midhat and Fatma Aliye³ were also reviewed. In addition, Fatma Aliye, Nigar bint-i Osman and Halide Edib's autobiographies and Halide Edib and Nigar bint-i Osman's diaries were examined. I also examined women's public speeches during the Balkan Wars and World War I. Finally, secondary sources such as biographies of the Great Women and other prominent figures of the period, articles and books were reviewed.

To account for the reputational trajectories of the Great Women, I examined two variations: intra-group variation among "Great Women" and inter-group variation between "Great" and other women who could not achieve the level of repute as did the Great Women, using the latter as the functional equivalent of a control group. While analysing these two variations, I employed the comparative method.

Comparison, based on its potential, has been implemented in two broad ways in social science. In the first, formalistic way, comparison was used to attain the

³ 245 letters by Ahmed Midhat 19 by Fatma Aliye available at Atatürk Kitaplığı, Fatma Aliye Hanım Evrakı Kataloğu. These letters have also been transliterated and published by F. Samime İnceoğlu and Zeynep Süslü Berktaş, 2011. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

scientific rigour of statistical or variable-based inquiry (McMichael, 1990) trying to establish a causal logic that holds across a variety of supposedly equivalent cases (e.g. Ragin, 1987; Skocpol, 1984; Stinchcombe, 1978; Tilly, 1984, Wallerstein, 1974). However, with sociology's historic (McDonald, 1996) and cultural (Bonnell and Hunt, 1999) turns, scientific orthodoxy was replaced with interpretation of social and historical processes, rejecting sociology's epic quest for social laws (Sewell, 1996, p. 110). Rejecting purely theoretical and structural accounts, supporters of the historic and cultural turns have started a reflexive trend about the categories they use, and treated social processes as inherently contingent and open-ended. I used comparison in this second way.

The women in this study went through three regimes, and their trajectories diverged at these critical junctures. Therefore, I present the analyses of their strategies in three periods: the Hamidian Era, the Second Constitutional Era 1908-1922, the Republican Era and the Reforms Period 1923 onwards. At each juncture, examining women's resources they gained out of the historical conditions, I analyse their strategies they developed to pass as an intellectual woman. I also explain the advantages and the disadvantages these strategies provided women with. In addition, I also seek to explain the factors that led to diverging reputational trajectories among the Great Women and the other women.

The findings of this study show that the Great Women's reputational trajectories cannot be explained by an evaluation of their personal circumstances and their ideological congruence with each regime alone. Rejecting these simple accounts, this study argues that women struck patriarchal bargains and implemented strategies against the constraints they were confronted with. By presenting evidence

from women's intellectual trajectories, I show that strategy is indeed decisive in fighting patriarchy and that what determine success is one's resources and how she puts them into use. Also, the proper evaluation of changing resources in historical and political transitions is crucial both in making reputations and also furthering them. Finally, in the conclusion section, a new theoretical dimension to the concept of strategy is introduced through the findings.

In Chapter 2, I show that any attempt to account for the Great Women's reputational trajectories through their personal circumstances such as familial and educational background cannot alone explain how they could enter the intellectual milieus and gain recognition. Similarly, I argue that ideological congruence, despite being an important factor in making reputations, is not the predominant factor to explain women's reputational trajectories. I also reject the view that women's trajectories were enabled by men of the era, a view that robs women of their agency. After discussing and rejecting these simple explanations through examples from women's lives and their writings, I offer a different approach to evaluate women's reputational trajectories, one which is a combination of strategies (Bourdieu, 1990) and patriarchal bargains (Kandiyoti, 1988).

In Chapter 3, I elaborate on the notion of strategy and patriarchal bargains, and discuss how these concepts can offer better analyses of women's reputational trajectories. I argue that each bargain is at the same time a Bourdieusian strategy due to the similarities both concepts share. Therefore, I propose considering them together in the analysis of how the Great Women gained reputation. While explaining the concept of strategy, I also introduce the term habitus and explain why it is important. Discussing the problems with Bourdieu and Kandiyoti's accounts, I

explain how they can complement each other to offer more enriched analyses. I also offer a preliminary discussion of fields and capital, and argue that I will treat the Ottoman intellectual circles as the Ottoman field of cultural production in its broadest sense.

Chapter 4 offers the analysis of the Great Women's strategies and the bargains they struck in three periods: the Hamidian Era 1876-1908, the Second Constitutional Period 1908-1922, and the Early Republican Era 1922 and onwards. I argue that the Great Women made use of four strategies to enter the Ottoman field of cultural production: collaboration, acquiescence, subversion and defiance. In each period under examination, I compare the Great Women's reputational trajectories among themselves, and also offer analyses as to why some other contemporary woman writers could not achieve the level of repute as did the Great Women. Chapter 5 concludes this thesis with a summary of my findings and a discussion of the implications of my findings. Then I close with questions for future research within the field of sociology of intellectuals and gender studies.

CHAPTER 2

IN SEARCH OF AN ACCOUNT

The Great Women's reputational trajectories in the late Ottoman Empire when patriarchal exclusion was especially intense could be explained by (a) their personal circumstances and (b) ideological congruence with each regime. However, these explanations either by themselves or in combination tend to simplify women's extremely complex intellectual trajectories, and also leave women without agency. So before moving on to account for women's reputational trajectories, I will briefly discuss why these simple explanations ultimately fail to account for Great Women's reputational trajectories.

2.1 Personal circumstances

An initial look at the trajectories of the Great Women may give the impression that the recognition and renown they acquired were mere consequences of their personal circumstances such as their family and education. The Great Women belonged to the elite families of the Empire. Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye were daughters of Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, a prominent bureaucrat, intellectual and historian. Nigar bint-i Osman was the daughter of Osman Pasha, a Hungarian convert to Islam who served the Empire as a sergeant, also a talented musician and painter. Halide Edib's father Mehmet Edib was Sultan's *başkatip* (secretary general). Nezihe Muhiddin was the daughter of Muhiddin Bey, a well-known judge and prosecutor. Muhiddin was brought up within an intellectual environment where daily problems were the subject matter of the discussions at home. As young children, all members of the Great

Women had access to the intellectual and political milieus of their era through their fathers, described as “men with bright minds” (Bekiroğlu, 1998, p. 35).

The Great Women’s family background and their fathers’ privileged positions in society provided them with a unique set of opportunities to receive education first, and then to pursue their intellectual aspirations as writers, editors, poets, columnists and activists. Nigar bint-i Osman attended a French primary school while Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye were home-schooled in foreign languages, literature and music by the most renowned tutors of the time. Muhiddin also had private tutors, and her cousin Nakiye Hanım, a leading intellectual of the period, had a great impact on her education. Halide Edib was the first Muslim graduate of the American College for Girls with a B.A degree (Patrick, 2001, p. 141). Semiye had the opportunity to go to France and study sociology there. Totally impressed by her daughter’s intelligence, Fatma Aliye’s father himself taught her philosophy for five years, and similarly Nigar Hanım’s father was to come down and correct her when she played a wrong note while playing the piano.

These men with bright minds did not only permit their daughters to pursue their intellectual dreams but also encouraged them to produce intellectual works. Osman Pasha himself got Nigar’s first book sent to the publisher. It was again Osman Pasha who introduced his daughter to his male friends, through which Nigar Hanım first established networks with leading male intellectuals of the era such as Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem and Süleyman Nazif. Similarly, impressed by Aliye’s prowess, Cevdet Pasha provided all opportunities for Aliye’s intellectual development. Fatma Aliye and her sister Emine Semiye’s names in *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete* appeared after their father’s names as the daughters of revered

sergeant Cevdet Pasha. Their fathers' position in society and their affluent familial conditions provided the Great Women with a considerable amount of educational capital compared to other women in the Ottoman society in the nineteenth century in an era when public schools for women were not widely available. The Great Women received the necessary legitimacy to make their careers in a strongly patriarchal world from their father's status and their networks.

However, there were also women who came from a similar background. Serpil Çakır (1994) explains that those women who wrote for the *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete* were either wives or daughters of the leading bureaucrats (p. 72). For example, Makbule Leman (daughter of the *daire müdürü* of Murad 5th) and Fatma Fahrünnisa (granddaughter of Ahmet Vefik Paşa) also came from a privileged background, but they could not achieve the level of repute as did the Great Women despite their efforts based on the criteria for reputation explained in the first chapter. These women who could not gain the title of the Great Women in fact wrote in the same newspapers; Makbule Leman was the editor-in-chief of *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete* in its first 48 issues, worked in various women's foundations and shared intellectual circles. However, Makbule Leman was overshadowed by Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman (Uğurcan, 1991).

An attempt to account for Great Women's reputation based on personal circumstances and arguing that they made it almost without any difficulty is wrong, because the unique opportunities the Great Women had at their disposal did not easily unlock the doors of the Ottoman intellectual world for them. Indeed, they ran up against a set of religious and cultural obstacles, unlike the men of their era. Despite their fathers' support, their gender did not allow them full access to

knowledge; they somehow had to tackle the stigma of femaleness to enter intellectual circles. Fatma Aliye, for example, had to quit learning French from her male tutor İlyas Matar Efendi when she turned 15 years old. It was time for her to wear the Islamic veil. Later she was to sign her first work, the translation of George Ohnet's *Volonte*, as "A Woman", because women were not thought to be intellectually capable of producing literary works:

Are you paying attention? All of these lazy objections are either directly or indirectly due to your translation of *Volonte*. They are just jealous. They just cannot stand a woman's victorious achievements in the intellectual field where they are themselves incapable...In other societies when a woman incorrectly puts some information together, the appreciative men get tired of applauding her. We see our women who are superior to us, and in order not to look inferior to them, we make a lot of effort to discourage those holy women using all our power. May God give us what we are due (Fatma Aliye. 19890-1912, Ahmed Midhat to Fatma Aliye, April 4, 1890)! (Appendix A,1 for original quotations. Translations are my own.)

When she got married at the age of 19, her husband Faik Efendi, a senior captain (*kolağası*), disapproved of her novel-reading and did not allow her to keep writing. Likewise, Nigar was to collect her poems, and wait 12 years before she could get them published: "The social and cultural atmosphere of the period was not appropriate for women to publish their writing" comments Nigar referring to the 1870s when she actually started to write her poems (Bekiroğlu, 1998, p. 234). Halide Edib (1930) admits that she did not know the male figures of the day in person although she had started to write in the leading newspaper *Tanin*. The reason, she writes in her memoirs, was the fact that she was not "emancipated enough to go to the head quarters" (Edib, 2004, p. 272). Muhiddin was also confronted with severe difficulties particularly in the early Republican Era when the Women's Union was

closed down and she faced a number of charges such as corruption and falsification in 1927.

The presence of women who could not gain as much reputation as the Great Women and the difficult intellectual journey the Great Women went through do not allow us to argue for reputation-making based on merely personal circumstances such as familial and educational background (see Table 2). These factors do not alone account for everything the Great Women achieved, and such accounts remain unsatisfactory.

Table 2. The Relationship between Personal Circumstances and Reputation

Woman Intellectual	Personal Circumstances			Reputation (based on rep. criteria)
	Education	Father's status and support	Writing Career (publication)	
Fatma Aliye	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emine Semiye	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nigar bint-i Osman	Y	Y	Y	Y
Halide Edib	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nezihe Muhiddin	Y	Y	Y	Y
Makbule Leman	N	Y	Y	N
Fatma Fahrünnisa	Y	Y	Y	N

(Y: Yes, N: No)

2.2 Ideological congruence

A quick examination of the Great Women's reputational trajectories gives the impression that they could acquire their reputations so long as they defended the values and norms of the existing ideology and remained loyal to it. It is indeed true that the acceptance of the prevailing ideology of a particular period does play an important role in making reputations. Those whose art can be made to serve a broader cause, such as defining an emerging identity or dramatising new aspirations, are more likely to be granted a prominent place (Lang and Lang, 1988, p. 100).

In this study, I do not deny the importance of ideological congruence, and I accept the fact that it may well have eased the process of reputation making. However, I do not treat it as the predominant factor which enabled the Great Women to establish their reputations because it reduces their complex relationship with those in power to either pure acceptance or refusal of an ideology. It also does not always hold true, for some moments in reputational trajectories falsify the argument of ideological congruence (see Table 3). Besides, the split with an ideology does not necessarily take place once after the regime officially changes. For example, Emine Semiye's alliance with the Committee of Union and Progress, the party that came to power after the 1908 Revolution, starts in 1904 (not in 1908) as she writes in *Hürriyet Kokuları*, a manuscript written by Emine Semiye. Likewise, Halide Edib's break with the Kemalist regime did not take place once after the Republic was established in 1923. It has its roots as early as 1919 when she started to question Mustafa Kemal's authority during the Independence War (see Edib, 1930, 2004).

Table 3. The Relationship between Ideological Congruence and Reputation

Woman Intellectual	Hamidian Era	Reputation	Constit. Era	Reputation	Republican Era	Reputation
Fatma Aliye	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Emine Semiye	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Nigar bint-i Osman	N	Y	N	N	NA	
Halide Edib	NA		Y/N	Y/Y	Y	N
Nezihe Muhiddin	NA		Y	Y	Y	N
Makbule Leman	Y	N	NA		NA	
Fatma Fahrünnisa	Y	N	NA		NA	

(Y: Yes, N: No, NA: Not applicable)

Ideological congruence in the table refers to explicitly defending the values of the regime through their pens and an explicit attachment to those in power, and reputation is evaluated based on five criteria. See Chapter 1.

The Great Women lived through three regimes and with each regime new ideologies emerged to legitimise and support new forms of state power. The prevailing ideology of the Hamidian Era when the first generation of the Great Women started their careers was Ottoman nationalism along with Islamism. During this period, intellectual men, in line with the official discourse, inscribed themselves in a modernist Islamist understanding and strongly defended the unity of the Empire. A staunch defender of Islam and a harsh critic of Western feminism, Fatma Aliye in 1892 wrote an influential text entitled *Nisvan-ı İslam* (Women of Islam) in which she argued against the plight of Muslim women in Ottoman society by using Islamic precepts. Giving examples from the history of Islam, she exonerated it as oppressor of women. Moreover, she tried to rectify European misconceptions on issues such as arranged marriages, polygyny and divorce. As a result of *Nisvan-ı İslam*, Aliye did not only gain national recognition but she also enjoyed an international readership. *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete* served as an important venue for Fatma Aliye, where she frequently praised the Sultan and defended his policies. In her first article, she praised Sultan Abdul Hamid II, and expressed her gratitude for women's better life conditions. Thus, an attempt to account for Aliye's high reputation through her attachment to the Hamidian regime and its values seems true at the outset. Her fall from grace during the Second Constitutional Era when she was dissatisfied with the new regime and her sister Emine Semiye's ability to preserve her recognition during the early constitutional era via her alliance with the Young Turks represents further evidence for ideological congruence. However, this argument does not always hold true, as was the case with Nigar.

Nigar bint-i Osman did not have a direct opposition to the Hamidian regime. Neither did she have an agenda to defend Hamidian values such as Islamism and nationalism in her works. She, just like Fatma Aliye, established very close ties with Sultan Hamid II but her lifestyle represented a stark contrast to that of Fatma Aliye. Nigar lived in Nişantaşı, described by Yahya Kemal, an intellectual of the era, as a district without the call of prayer hence dry and colourless. Bekiroğlu (1998) draws attention to Nigar's house: "a stone mansion in Nişantaşı" explaining that most non-Muslims resided in stone houses at the time. Nigar held the first mixed literary salons as early as 1899, where she hosted intellectuals of the era and they discussed literature. What did it mean for a Muslim woman to organise mixed literary salons during the Hamidian Era when the ideology of Islamism was at its peak? This is the same period when Aliye had to stop learning French from her male tutor because she had become an adult, and she could contact Ahmed Midhat only through letters for years because it was not appropriate for mature women to meet men in person. On the other hand, Nigar's father, Osman Pasha, saw no harm in his daughter's meeting his male friends, and therefore he introduced Nigar to a number of leading intellectuals such as Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem. The men Nigar was introduced to often appreciated her, and helped her write in various journals of the time in the following years. In these mixed meetings, they often drank wine and played music. Neither Nigar's Western lifestyle nor her writings specifically address an Islamist agenda. Nonetheless, Nigar made a great start on her career with her first book *Efsus* in 1899. Nigar admits in her diaries that there was a discrepancy between the norms of social life and her personal life. Full ideological congruence is not the only way of gaining legitimacy to enter the intellectual world and one does not need to be a staunch defender of the existing ideology, as Nigar's case shows.

The ideology of Islamism was gradually replaced with nationalism after the first years of the Constitutional regime. In this period, the statement that women intellectuals who tied women's causes to the nationalistic project saw their celebrity rise also does not hold true, and remains as a simplification of women's trajectories. Nezihe Muhiddin and Halide Edib indeed had nationalist agendas and often acted in line with them: they defended the new regime while vilifying the previous one, and delivered inspirational speeches during the Balkan Wars in 1912-3 and WW1. Their patriotic efforts provided them with mobility and legitimacy, despite their gender. However, confining their trajectories to their nationalist tendencies is a simplification of their careers. Their relationship to the regime was not one of full acceptance but one full of ups and downs.

Halide Edib had her first arguments with the Young Turks on the issue of Armenians. Her ideas diverged from those of the regime, and her speech supporting Armenians in the Turkish Hearth (Türk Ocağı), the cultural institution of the period, in 1913 was not at all well received. This, however, did not bring about a significant loss in her reputation, for she was able to keep publishing books in the following years. Even when the Great Women developed a critical stance against the regime, they could find other ways of protecting and furthering their reputation. Similarly, Emine Semiye, despite being a staunch defender of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), was dissatisfied with the regime soon and started to support the party in opposition the Ottoman Democrat Party.

The Republican period represents a counter-example in terms of ideological congruence and reputation for the Great Women. The Republican period rejected the Ottoman past, and imposed its own values on all intellectuals as well as the members

of the new nation. In this period, an acceptance of the Republican ideology and its values did not suffice to make it to the intellectual milieus for the Great Women, because the new regime started its own project of raising intellectuals under the new reforms of the Republic. Nezihe Muhiddin employed an imperial tone after the foundation of the Republic, and her writings in “Kadın Yurdu” display a racist tendency, particularly against Armenians and Kurds (see *Kadın Yurdu* 1926). In the preface to her book *Türk Kadını* published in 1931, Muhiddin glorifies Mustafa Kemal as the sole leader of the new nation and celebrates the republican regime. Despite her attempt to embrace the new regime, Nezihe Muhiddin became a target of a slander campaign and consequently lost all of her reputation. She was pushed into silence by the Kemalist regime afterwards. Şukufe Nihal, a contemporary of Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin, represents an exception, for she was able to become one of the daughters of the Republic by successfully becoming involved in the Republican project. She worked with Nezihe Muhiddin in the Women’s Union in 1924, and celebrated the new regime as Muhiddin did. However, their reputational trajectories significantly diverged. Muhiddin was confronted with a number of charges such as falsification and embezzlement and taken to court whereas Şukufe Nihal continued her reputational trajectory as a Republican intellectual woman.

2.3 Seeking women’s agency in the world of men of letters

There is a large body of literature on women intellectuals, and a review may convince the reader that their trajectories were enabled by men: they could acquire reputations so long as they fitted men’s political, cultural and social agendas. It was their fathers, other male intellectuals, the Ottoman sultan and those in power who

solely made their careers possible (see Appendix B for information on intellectuals mentioned here).

In the Hamidian Era, for example, the leading male intellectuals started to debate the woman question for two reasons: (i) to enhance their own freedom for they were also annoyed with the centuries-old patriarchal structures, (ii) to help society as a whole heal through the changes in women's conditions (Kandiyoti 1991, Durakbaşa 1998). Similarly, during the Second Constitutional Era, it was clearly agreed that the salvage of the nation was possible only through changes in women's conditions. This meant more educational and social reforms for women, but they were supposed to remain mothers and wives. The words of the intellectuals show this mentality: Celal Nuri writes as follows: "Now we do not need any female politicians and technicians. First and foremost we need mothers, wives, teachers and women who will raise future generations. The issue is all about this" (p. 120). Mehmed Asaf, the editor in chief of *Hanımlar Alemi*, also stressed the real function of education for women: "Women were denied education, but it is a must for the harmony of the family and the nation" (Kurnaz, 1997, p. 166). Selahaddin Asım (1910) claimed that the corruption of women might lead to the erosion of the society and civilization, and hence demanded that women be raised as "intellectual mothers". Likewise, the women were given the right to vote as early as the 1930s, because the Kemalist regime wanted to escape any claims of fascist tendencies, as was the case in Italy or Germany (Kandiyoti, 1991).

2.4 Towards an account

As the examples above show, women seem to have been treated as mere objects of social change and reform. However, in this study, I aim to show women's

individualities rather than displaying them as objects of change to be used by men for the nation's favour. Such explanations reinforce patriarchal relations and give men and the structural factors a lot more importance than they should have. I believe women preserved their uniqueness as they went through conflicts while establishing their reputations, and thus I suggest a revision of women's reputational trajectories by paying attention to their individualities. I do not deny any of the factors I have discussed in the first part of this section, but an attempt to understand their reputational trajectories requires the inclusion of their subjectivities. This is the main concern of this study.

Agency is an act of temporalization where the subject transcends the immediacy of the present through actions that have an inherently anticipatory structure (McNay, 1999, p. 104). To find out women's agency, I have examined the strategies they employed by combining them with patriarchal bargains. While doing this, I also evaluated what resources women acquired as a result of changing historical and political conditions and in what ways they made use of their resources. Going beyond a mere dichotomy of dominance and resistance, I aim to show the Great Women's negotiations against the set of constraints they were confronted with. Given that personal circumstances and ideological congruence do not explain women's reputational trajectories, a different approach is in order. Considering Bourdieu's notion of strategy along with Kandiyoti's bargaining with patriarchy provides fruitful insights to better make sense of the women's intellectual trajectories.

When the Great Women's intellectual trajectories have been examined, four strategies emerge. I refer to them as collaboration, acquiescence, subversion and

defiance (see Table 4). The strategy of collaboration is explicitly supporting the image of women imposed by the state and also improving the image of the empire in the Western world regarding women's plight. Acquiescence is defined as consent without raising any objection and agreeing with the field rules, whereas subversion is undermining some of those rules in an indirect manner while at the same time upholding others. Defiance, on the other hand, is refusing to obey the rules and explicitly challenging them. Table 5 shows women's actions in each strategy.

Table 4. Strategies of the Great Women over Three Regimes

Intellectual	Hamidian Era	2nd Constit. Era	Republican Era
Fatma Aliye	Subversion	Subversion	No strategy
Emine Semiye	Collaboration	Defiance	No strategy
Nigar bint-i Osman	Acquiescence	Acquiescence	NA
Halide Edib	NA	Collaboration & Acquiescence	Defiance
Nezihe Muhiddin	NA	Collaboration	No particular strategy

Women's strategies have been documented in various settings against different forms of patriarchal oppression. Among these, some scholars have suggested acquiescence of women to their position while still negotiating for some gain (Hoodfar, 1996; MacLeod, 1996). Also, Gerami and Lehnerer (2001) describe how Iranian women negotiate with state fundamentalism through developing strategies of collaboration and acquiescence, among others. However, the way I discuss collaboration and acquiescence in Great Women's negotiations with patriarchal demands of intellectual milieus is not entirely the same as these scholars have done. I do not treat these strategies as forms of submission to the pressures of state, but instead offer a discussion of women's agency. Finally, subversion is also discussed as a strategy to point out that women's bargaining is not always unequal and indeed they do bring

resources (Ebaugh, 1993). I also present different forms of subversion from women intellectuals' careers.

Table 5. List of the Strategies and Women's Actions

Strategy	Women's Action	Women
Collaboration	Enforcing	Emine Semiye, N. Muhiddin, Halide Edib
Acquiescence	Agreeing	Nigar, Emine Semiye
Subversion	Undermining	Fatma Aliye
Defiance	Challenging	Emine Semiye, Halide Edib

The next chapter provides a theoretical background as to how I will address the Great Women's intellectual trajectories, and I further discuss the agency problem.

Women's strategies and bargains are expounded in the fourth chapter.

CHAPTER 3

STRATEGIES AND PATRIARCHAL BARGAINS

3.1 An overview of strategies and bargains

In a comparative analysis of how women tackle different forms of patriarchy, Kandiyoti (1988) introduces the term “patriarchal bargain”, that is, a “set of rules and scripts regulating gender relations to which both genders accommodate and acquiesce, yet which may nonetheless be contested, redefined and renegotiated” (p.286). However, “the notion of “bargaining with patriarchy” suggests that both men and women possess resources with which they negotiate to maximize power and options within a patriarchal structure” (Kibria 1990, p. 9), yet women, in bargaining with patriarchy, “as a rule bargain from a weaker position”, which indicates an asymmetrical exchange (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 286). However, their bargaining power is not always unequal (see Ebaugh, 1993). These bargains influence the potential for and specific forms of women’s active and passive resistance in the face of their oppression.

The notion of patriarchal bargain goes beyond the abstract notion of patriarchy which evokes an overly monolithic conception of male dominance, and aims to better understand the specific forms patriarchy takes under different cultural, political and economic conditions. It is based on the fulfilment of both men and women’s expectations, and thus the nature of patriarchal bargains varies across societies and even within societies depending on class, caste and ethnicity (Kandiyoti, 1988). In addition, patriarchal bargains are not timeless or immutable entities because social transformations often entail important shifts in the nature and scope of resources

available to women and men (Kibria, 1990, p. 10), and thus the initial bargains may break down, and new bargains are struck through renegotiations of the previous bargains, namely, once culturally and historically determined relations between genders. For instance, new market forces, capital penetration in rural areas, migration or new legislations are some of the factors leading to a breakdown of existing bargains. It is also important to note that the term “bargain” does not always refer to the rational choices of the parties involved, and “a cold-blooded negotiation for the resources” (Büyükokutan, 2011, p. 635) does not have to take place every time, for bargains are susceptible to cultural and historical transformations (see Büyükokutan, 2011; Kandiyoti, 1988), and thus may occur unconsciously or semi-consciously (Bourdieu, 1990; Chen, 1999).

The literature is rife with examples of women’s bargaining with male authority. There have been studies on women’s resistance to unfavourable labour relations in the household (Conti, 1979; Dey, 1981; Hanger and Moris, 1973), women’s resistance to disadvantageous marriage forms and inheritance rules (Mann, 1985; Munachonga, 1982), the negotiation of male hierarchies, fundamentalism and unequal distribution of opportunities in various religious orders (Ebaugh, 1993; Gerami and Lehnerer, 2001; Hutson, 2001), immigrant women’s resistance to male authority in the family and expatriate women’s coping strategies (Kibria, 1990; Arieli, 2013). However, women’s resistance to and negotiation of patriarchal authority in the intellectual field is yet to be examined. This study aims to fill in this void in the literature.

I aim to combine Kandiyoti’s insights with Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, which I believe complement one another. Bourdieu, in his ethnographic research on

the Kabyle and Béarnais, has contended that each matrimonial transaction is to be understood as the outcome of a *strategy*, and therefore he speaks of matrimonial strategies and social uses of kinship rather than rules of kinship. He rejects strategy as synonymous with choice, a conscious and individual choice guided by rational calculation or ethical or affective motivations (Bourdieu, 1990). According to Bourdieu, the notion of strategy makes a break with the objectivist point of view and with the agentless action that structuralism assumes possible.

Strategy is the product of a practical sense, of a particular social game, which is acquired at the beginning of childhood through participation in social activities (Lamaison, 1986, p. 112). The good player is continually doing what needs to be done, what the game demands and requires. This presupposes a constant invention, an improvisation that is absolutely necessary in order for one to adapt to situations that are infinitely varied. This cannot be achieved by mechanical obedience to explicit, codified rules (Lamaison, 1986, p. 113). For example, matrimonial strategies, as Bourdieu shows in his Béarne and Kabylia cases, are the product not of compliance with rules but of a sense of the game that leads one to choose the best possible match.

The key term that plays the most significant role in the process of constant invention and improvisation is *habitus*. It is a product of history, and produces individual and collective practices in accordance with the schemes generated by history. It ensures “the active presence of the past experience...which tends to guarantee the correctness of practices and their constancy over time” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 54). The habitus is a spontaneity without consciousness or will, opposed to the mechanical necessity of things without history in mechanistic theories (Bourdieu,

1990, p. 56). As an acquired system of generative schemes, the habitus makes the free production of all the thoughts, perceptions and actions inherent in the particular conditions of its production. Habitus as the social inscribed in the body of the biological individual makes it possible to produce the infinite acts that are inscribed in the game in the form of possibilities and objective requirements. Anyone who wishes to win at this game, to claim the stakes, to catch the ball has to have a sense of the game (Lamaison, 1986, p. 114).

3.2 Problems with Kandiyoti and Bourdieu: A reconciliation

I find Kandiyoti's contextualisation of patriarchy through the concept of patriarchal bargain very valuable. In addition, the concept of "patriarchal bargains" refute the view of women as passive victims in patriarchal systems by allowing them to craft their agency, and aims to show how women gain access to resources even in the face of strictly restricted opportunities. Bourdieu's conceptual toolkit and theoretical framework also have the potential to offer multi-layered analyses in gender studies. Thus, in this study, I suggest considering Kandiyoti and Bourdieu together due to reasons on which I shall elaborate.

I argue that each bargain is at the same time a Bourdieusian strategy, for both concepts share a similar reasoning. They refer to creative processes in which individuals try to maximise their power and options by employing or deploying if necessary their resources they have gathered. Both concepts are influenced by historical, cultural and political circumstances. In addition, neither Bourdieu's notion of strategy nor Kandiyoti's conceptualization of bargain regards choices of the agents as mere projects or calculations of consciousness and opens room for more multi-layered analyses.

However, Kandiyoti's conceptualization lacks a theoretical and conceptual framework, whereas Bourdieu's sociological enterprise is in need of more empirical data in gender studies. I believe they can be used to complement each other, and therefore I propose a combination of the two in which Bourdieu's metaprinciples (Swartz 2013) such as habitus, capital, and fields will fill in the theoretical and conceptual lacuna in women's bargaining with male authority while the literature on women's bargaining provides empirical data for the nascent Bourdieusian gender studies. I believe considering them together will lead to theoretically and empirically enriched analyses.

3.2.1 Problems with patriarchal bargains

The literature on patriarchal bargains needs conceptual clarification and theoretical strength. In striking a bargain, women possess resources which become available to them. Bourdieu refers to these resources as different forms of capital. Strategies are a product of a practical sense called habitus by Bourdieu, and the conditions of each bargain are determined by "class, caste and ethnicity". So drawing on Kandiyoti, I argue that habitus plays an important role in the process of bargaining. Constant improvisation and adaptation to new situations are very important. The logic of bargaining exhibits the same logic with developing strategies. For example, by not making full use of their resources, women may perpetuate the patriarchal authority thinking of future gains they might acquire (see Kandiyoti, 1988, Kibria, 1990). Therefore, neither in bargaining nor in strategizing can we talk about wealth-maximising. So what happens at the end is that during the process of striking a bargain, the individual with the sense of the game (habitus) evaluates the resources

(capital) that have become available to her, and makes the best decision to maximise her options against a set of concrete constraints.

The studies on patriarchal bargains make use of the terms strategy and to strategize, but they are not clearly defined and supported. Another concept that needs further elaboration is “power”. Despite its extensive use in the articles, its source and the forms it takes have not been extensively discussed.

3.3 Problems with Bourdieu: The habitus/agency problem

At first sight, Bourdieu’s notion of habitus seems not to be a dynamic and open-ended process. Indeed, Bourdieu, due to his conceptualization, has been charged with determinism (Alexander, 1994, p. 136; Butler, 1990, 1993; Garnham and Williams, 1980, p. 222). These criticisms claim that the concept of habitus suggests an overdetermined view of subjectivity in which subjective dispositions are too tightly tied to the social practices in which they were forged (Lovell, 2000), and thus it does not leave any space for agency, fluidity and instability of subject positioning.

These charges of determinism have been addressed by Bourdieu in his writings. Accordingly, habitus is not to be conceived as a principle of determination but as a generative structure. Within certain objective limits (field), it engenders a potentially infinite number of patterns of behaviour, thought and expression that are both relatively unpredictable but also limited in their diversity (McNay, 1999, p. 100). Habitus provides the social agent with relative autonomy vis-a-vis social structures but it also ensures that it is objectively adapted to its outcomes (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 55). Another advantage of the notion of habitus is that it introduces a temporal dimension to understanding the body. Habitus is the incorporation of

temporal structures or the regularities and tendencies of the world into the body, and it cannot be considered independent of existing social practices. This temporal dimension of habitus brings along dynamism and mutability as well. McNay (1999) argues that many accounts of gender lack a notion of temporality, and gender is construed as an atemporal system of dominant norms (p. 102). The integration of the term habitus, therefore, contributes to gender studies.

Habitus stresses the importance of social experiences; the resulting closure is never absolute because the habitus is an historical structure that is only ever realised in reference to specific situations. Thus while an agent might be predisposed to act in certain ways, the potentiality for innovation or creative action is never foreclosed: habitus is an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly subjected to experiences, and thus constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 133).

I believe Kandiyoti's concept of "patriarchal bargains" has to tackle the criticism Bourdieu has received. The charge of determinism is also closely relevant to Kandiyoti's conceptualization of patriarchal bargains because of the affinity it shares with strategies which are highly shaped by the agent's habitus as discussed earlier. Kandiyoti's concept seems as if it addresses the agency problem directly, and thus goes over the structural accounts in explaining women's behaviour. However, one's resources play a major role in the nature of the bargain, and the resources vary according to class, caste and ethnicity in a society. In other words, the determiners of the terms and conditions of the bargain to be struck at a particular moment are one's resources shaped by one's position in society. In this case, it may be argued that

bargains are also overdetermined by social conditions, and looking at one's position in society, her bargain can be more or less predicted. At this point, considering the concept of habitus in the process of bargaining helps refute such criticisms, and together they offer better analyses.

3.3 Bourdieu and gender studies

Bourdieu himself does not present a fully theorised argumentation regarding the place of gender. Nonetheless, his theoretical relevance for feminist and gender studies has the potential to offer highly complex yet quite concrete and specific analyses (see e.g. Hipsky, 2000; Le Hir, 2000; Moi, 1991, 2008). Throughout this thesis, I seek to utilise this potential by combining it with the concepts of patriarchal bargains.

So how does a Bourdieusian perspective specifically contribute to gender studies? Bourdieu's relevance and originality, as Moi (1991, p. 1019) argues, lie in his development of what one might call a microtheory of social power. Going beyond the generalities, it engages with specific social institutions and practices and how these factors influence the choices and the strategies of the intellectual. It allows us to incorporate the most mundane details of everyday life into our analyses (Moi, 1991, 1019). In *Masculine Domination*, Bourdieu (2001) analyses the social relations between men and women in exactly the same terms as any other set of social relations between a dominant class and a dominated class. It is possible to link the mundane details of everyday life to a more general social analysis of social power. Bourdieu's way of thinking shows that much of what patriarchal minds like to trivialise as gossip, for example, is in fact socially significant (Moi, 1991). Thus,

questions of patriarchal power and the social construction of gender seem to be acknowledged as central issues for Bourdieu's sociological enterprise.

3.4 A discussion of fields and women intellectuals

In his analysis of the French literary and artistic fields, Bourdieu highlights the importance of meso-level social structures in explaining intellectual trajectories. Rejecting both individual analyses of intellectuals in an isolated manner and macro-level analyses based primarily on class, Bourdieu (1996) situates intellectuals within various fields of cultural production. For instance, he argues that "to understand any writer, major or minor, is first of all to understand what the status of writer consists of at the moment considered" (p. 163). To understand this status, Bourdieu indicates an entirely special social universe, namely the concept of "field".

Bourdieu (1996) defines field as "a veritable social universe where, in accordance with its particular laws, there accumulates a particular form of capital and where relations of force of a particular type are exerted" (p. 163). Capital denotes the different goods, resources and values around which power relations in a particular field crystallise. The central characteristics of a field are as follows: A field is a game with its own rules of evaluation and its own instituted rewards, and bears "a certain number of fundamental interests" expressing and sustaining this game (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 73). These interests cannot be reduced to those of other fields, giving the field itself autonomy. Each field has a specific capital, and a struggle over the distribution of this capital takes place among the agents or institutions engaged in the field. In this struggle, the dominant actors take up conservation strategies, whereas the dominated take up subversion strategies. Finally, the newcomers have to

pay an entry fee consisting of the recognition of the values of the field to be involved in the game.

Bourdieu uses two methods to decide whether a social practice constitutes a field: the statistical method of correspondence analysis (Greenacre, 1984; Weller and Romney, 1990) and historical ethnography. Of these two methods, I applied historical ethnography because the small number of actors this study examines does not lend itself to correspondence analysis, whereas the written work available was sufficient for ethnography. Thus, through historical ethnography, I determined that it would be wrong to distinguish between an Ottoman intellectual field or a literary field in the late nineteenth century because there was not much differentiation between them. So, if there were a Bourdieusian field, it would be Ottoman field of cultural production in its broadest sense. However, the Ottoman field of cultural production does not display the full characteristics of a Bourdieusian field although it does show some important features.

Centralised in the capital of the empire, Istanbul (Tanpınar, 1973, p. 59), late nineteenth century Ottoman intellectual life seems to possess some rules of its own that are not fully reducible to any one principle associated with other fields, giving the field relative autonomy with regard to other fields. However, the intellectual practice in the field is largely determined by intellectuals' positions in the field of power, which assigns them an ambivalent relationship with the dominant class. In this sense, the field did not have strong autonomy from the state. The constant literary revolutions within the field, sometimes embedded in ideological disputes as well, confirm the struggles over the field's specific capital. Among the central disputes are "rhyme to the ear or to the eye", "the classics question", "the content of

literary works” and “the form of the language” (Tanpınar, 1997). These disputes take place among the leading intellectuals such as Namık Kemal, Ahmed Midhat, Ziya Paşa, Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem, Tevfik Fikret, Mehmet Akif and Ömer Seyfettin, and they pave the way for new literary movements born out of either conservation or subversion strategies.

The struggle over classification occurring in the field shows us two poles: social art and art for art’s sake. In line with the modernization project of the Tanzimat Period starting in 1876, a new literary tradition in terms of genres and content emerged among some of the intellectuals who represent the “social art” pole (Tanpınar, 1973). Their purpose was to educate the public through literature and for this, they argued, the language of Divan Literature had to be simplified. The leading intellectual of realism Namık Kemal (1895), for instance, underlines the mission of social art: “There is nothing as absurd as writing for the elite.”⁴ Ahmed Midhat, Ziya Paşa and Şinasi are other prominent figures representing social art.

At the opposite pole of the field lies the position of “art for art’s sake,” born as a reaction to social art. Among the important representatives of this opposite pole are Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem, Abdülhak Hamid and Samipaşazade Sezai, and they only argued against the simplification of the language and the wide treatment of social themes in poetry. Due to the heavy censorship of the Hamidian Era, the position of art for art’s sake was officially established with the initiatives of Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem around the literary journal called *Servet-i Fünun* (Mutluay, 1973). Tevfik Fikret was the editor-in-chief of the journal, and among the prominent writers were Cenab Şehabettin, Hüseyin Cahit and Hüseyin Rahmi. Unaware of the realities of the

⁴ “Havas için kitap yazmaktan daha abes bir şey yoktur.”

country and away from the community, the intellectuals occupying the art for art's sake position tried to make a living in non-literary ways and did not get involved in any political conflicts (Mutluay, 1973, p. 49).

It is not my purpose in this study to analyse the Ottoman field of cultural production and fully document the dynamics of the field. My focus is on women intellectuals and since I cover a long time period which includes three political regimes, it is beyond the scope of this study to offer analyses of the making of the Ottoman intellectual field and the changes the field underwent. Nonetheless, I try to offer a preliminary analysis and wish to employ the concept of field in its broadest sense while analysing the intellectual trajectories of women intellectuals.

Women intellectuals were a part of the field of cultural production, although they were not allowed to get close the centre of the Ottoman field of cultural production. By using different forms and the volumes of capital they gathered, they could make it to intellectual milieus, and their position-takings and strategies determined how far they could make in the field. I argue that to the extent that they understood the field rules, their reputational trajectories improved.

CHAPTER 4

STRATEGIES OF REPUTATION MAKING AND BARGAINING WITH PATRIARCHY

The Ottoman society went through a major social transformation starting with the Tanzimat Period in 1839 until the early twentieth century. This period represents a turbulent time in the history of the Empire, entailing multiple regimes, social and cultural change, several wars and upheaval. A feeling of political, economic and cultural defeat against the Western world was prevalent within the Empire. In this period, a major transformation of society via extensive reforms in various fields from administration to legislation and education took place. The Ottoman intellectual just like society was going through a mental transformation as well. For the first time in Ottoman history the woman question became a pressing issue on the political and social agenda. It was agreed that the road to civilization was possible via educating women who made up half of the population, and even more importantly, they were to raise the next generations as mothers. The reforms, therefore, also touched upon women's conditions in various forms such as schooling and clothing. Women were recognised as a social entity, and they were to be educated so that the nation could have educated wives and mothers. Women seem to have been treated as objects of a nationalist project, but it is, as I will argue, precisely these specific conditions through which they were able to manage to open some space for themselves on the way to becoming an intellectual. Although their recognition was limited to the extent that they remained wives and mothers, they developed strategies of accommodation

and resistance, and struck bargains against the ever-changing patriarchal authority thresholds.

The bargains women struck were not merely against the new standards of the Westernizing elites, i.e. first the Young Ottomans, then the Young Turks and then the Kemalist cadre), because there were also traditionalists who strictly adhered to long-standing traditions, and thus resisted the process of modernization. During the process of negotiations between these parties and women, gender rules underwent dramatic changes when compared to the early nineteenth century and before.

The women intellectuals in this study lived through the regimes of monarchy, the constitutional monarchy, and the republic. With each regime the boundaries of women's social, economic and, more importantly, intellectual experiences shifted through new resources and opportunities. Three members of the Great Women started their careers during the Hamidian Era (1876-1908), whereas the intellectual careers of the other two began after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908.⁵ For this reason, in this chapter, I first focus on these two periods and explain how the Great Women were able to go beyond the sexism of the intellectual field and establish their reputations. Then I explain the Great Women's diverging reputational trajectories in the early Republican Era. In all periods, I explicate what strategies the Great Women used in acquiring their reputations and what resources they employed against the patriarchal codes. Not all members of the Great Women acquired the same amount of reputation throughout their careers. Therefore, I also try to explain the reasons

⁵ Halide Edib had articles in *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*'s 134th and 142nd issues published in 1899, but her intellectual trajectory started after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908 through her articles in *Tanin*.

behind the reputational divergence among the Great Women and other contemporary woman writers.

4.1 The making of women intellectuals in the Hamidian era

As the society went through a major transformation in the nineteenth century, the intellectuals' mindset was also changing. This change showed itself in their stance on the woman question. The Young Ottomans were the new class of intellectuals. The first arguments on women's emancipation were made by these intellectuals through their writings. They frequently argued against the practices of forced marriages, polygamy and concubinage. They argued that the true Islam based on the Quran and the Hadith (sayings of the Prophet Mohamad) had not been implemented for centuries, and the religion in practice was heavily blended with tradition, patriarchy and superstitions. Women's plight in Ottoman society, therefore, had nothing to do with Islam per se. The true Islam, the intellectuals frequently argued, required an absolute protection of women's rights, and moreover, urged women to get education. Şinasi, for instance, criticised arranged marriages in his satirical play *Şair Evlenmesi* written in 1859. Similarly, Ahmet Midhat in his novels strongly advocated women's rights, and demanded a change in women's overall position in society.

The examples showing men's changing mindset on the woman question may give the impression that the centuries-old patriarchal authority in Ottoman society was starting to crumble for the first time. However, the arguments of the prominent male intellectuals were motivated by their desire to enhance their own autonomy and also to help society as a whole to heal through changes in women's conditions (Kandiyoti, 1991). Patriarchal institutions that reinforced strict hierarchies among men and practices that segregated public place based on gender put pressure on the

new generation of young male intellectuals (Durakbaşa, 1988). Feeling alienated from the centuries-old “stultifying and archaic structures” (Kandiyoti, 1991) and social conventions of Ottoman society, the intellectuals involved women in their arguments. The restiveness of the Young Ottomans was to be solved with a new power domain where they could be protectors of women and also gain access to new possibilities of interaction with them (Durakbaşa, 1988). It was this new domain that provided women with legitimacy to enter intellectual milieus by getting their writings published in the periodicals of the time.

Despite the changing mindset, the masculine domination in the intellectual field assumed a natural and self-evident status through its inscription in the objective structure of the social world which was incorporated into the habitus of intellectuals. Accordingly, a set of binaries based on masculinity and femininity were built. These binaries were lived and reinvoked in the everyday life of intellectual production and exchanges, strongly influencing the structuring of the field and drawing the boundaries of women’s mobility in contrast to men’s relatively free circulation. There were, for example, a set of themes such as education, bringing up children, and social etiquette that women intellectuals were expected to cover and thus contribute to the education of society, particularly of other women, and they could do this only through engagement in certain genres. Moreover, they were expected to avoid any polemics with male writers. Bekiroğlu (1994) argues that women were promised an ivory tower away from criticism and attack (p. 36), so they were confined to an artificial press environment by Ahmed Midhat. Midhat’s own words in a letter written to Fatma Aliye confirm the ivory tower metaphor:

Are you going to say “it is none of your business”? How do you mean? Is each one of you not the flowers of the garden of development desire that

I have grown in my dream? The effort of protecting each of you from weeds and the attacks of caterpillars and insects is of utmost importance to me (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 18, 1896).⁶

In order to gain visibility, recognition and renown as intellectuals, women had to strategise by taking these rules into consideration. They refused to stay in the ivory tower they were promised and showed either active or passive resistance. To do this, Nigar chose the strategy of acquiescence (which took the forms of self-exclusion and self censorship) by confining herself to the realm of poetry, which brought her immense fame throughout her career, whereas Aliye, despite Midhat's discouragement and criticism, was successful in the strategy of subversion by pursuing her interests in the banned area of philosophy as well. Emine Semiye, on the other hand, employed the strategy of collaboration in this period. These strategies were informed by the women's family background, amount of educational and cultural capital and networks (or social capital).

When the intellectual trajectories of the Great Women during the Hamidian Era have been examined, I identify three strategies that I refer to as collaboration, acquiescence and subversion emerge (see Table 6). The strategy of collaboration is explicitly supporting the image of woman imposed by the state and also improving the image of the empire in the Western world regarding women's plight. Acquiescence is defined as consent without raising any objection and agreeing with the field rules, whereas subversion is undermining those rules. Moreover, the strategies of collaboration and subversion require important resources which could easily be converted into reputation. This is relevant knowledge and appropriate use

⁶ "Sana ne?" mi diyeceksiniz? Nasıl bana ne? Sizin her biriniz hayalim bağçesinde yetiştirdiğim arzu-yı terakki bostanının çiçekleri değil misiniz? Sizin her birinizi sümüklü böceklerin, tırtılların, flokselerin ta'arruzatından muhafaza gayreti benim için cibillidir.

of that knowledge. In the former strategy, one explicitly uses the relevant knowledge to serve the regime’s agenda (and without any presence of external demand) and maximises her options this way, whereas in the latter strategy, one deliberately makes use of her cultural capital to undermine some of the rules while upholding others. Fatma Aliye’s strategy is an example. Acquiescence, on the other hand, is a strategy employed by the person when she does not have easily convertible resources and some negative capital such as inappropriate lifestyle, and agreeing becomes the best strategy here to benefit most from the existing conditions. Here one does not have a strong bargaining power. The content of Nigar’s writings and her engagement in poetry, not a desirable genre given the instrumental use of the press to educate people, made her choose the strategy of acquiescence.

Although I have mentioned three strategies, these are the primary strategies women implemented. In addition, women’s intellectual trajectories do not always fit neatly into one and only one strategy. Indeed, they changed strategies throughout their careers.

Table 6. Three Strategies for Dealing with the Male Bias Pervading the Ottoman Intellectual Circles in the Hamidian Era (1895-1908)

Strategy	Women’s Action	Women
Collaboration	Enforcing	Emine Semiye
Acquiescence	Agreeing	Nigar bint-i Osman
Subversion	Undermining	Fatma Aliye

4.1.1. Gendered habitus of the Ottoman intellectual field

I discuss here the gendered practices of the Ottoman intellectual field to better understand women’s strategies and to show the background shaping women’s strategies. Based on this, I will also argue that women were aware of these rules in

striking bargains against patriarchal practices. These rules show that women were expected to engage in certain genres and write on certain subjects. For example, in 1896, Ali Kemal, known as Paris Muhbiri, appreciated Aliye's writings on women of Islam in his letters published in *İkdam* on the grounds that Aliye's arguments helped him during a discussion with a female university student abroad. However, in the same article, he criticised one of Nigar's poems finding it strange (*garib*). His purpose was to give an example of Muslim Ottoman women, but he got disappointed when he saw Nigar's poem. His criticism was that women were supposed to write about more serious subjects serving a purpose. Similarly, the frequent publication of Nigar's poems in the newspapers was criticised in a letter signed as Ebürrefi (1887) published in *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*. Despite finding Nigar more successful than many male writers, he asked for the publication of Ahmed Midhat's novels instead of the wide coverage of Nigar's poems (Bekiroğlu, 1998, p. 277). Ahmed Midhat, the founder of *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, seems to have agreed with Ebürrefi. In a letter to Fatma Aliye, he admits that he destroyed Nigar's first poetry book *Efsus* because he did not like it:

Speaking of Nigar, I just remembered something. They put her booklet among the books I took to Stockholm with me. The men in charge of taking care of the books asked for my help while classifying the books. When I noticed this book, which I had not seen until that moment, I did not like it. It was such that Europe would not like it either! What did I do? I secretly stole the booklet and destroyed it. It is better for an Ottoman lady not to write anything than writing such poems (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Dec 31, 1890). (Appendix A,2)

Although Fatma Aliye was appreciated for her writings on the women of Islam and it is mostly such writings that gained her reputation, the content of her articles was shaped by external factors. For instance, her two articles on Fatma bint-i Abbas as an

example of a woman of Islam were written after several complaints by her colleagues:

When I stated in my article entitled “Let Us Take Warnings from Blue Stockings” that I would write the biography of Madam Montagu as well, I received a lot of direct and indirect warnings from many friends and colleagues that I should write the life history of one of the famous women of Islam, too (Fatma Aliye, 1895).⁷

Likewise, *Nisvan-ı İslam*, Aliye’s pioneering work that brought her both national and international reputation was not an independent initiative taken by Aliye herself. It was written as a response to Ahmed Midhat’s request:

By saying that you intend to produce another work after the completion of *Meram*, you are increasing my happiness. Please consider Ahmed Midhat as your associate in services that will be a source of prestige for our glorious Ottoman Empire. Let me also tell you that I decided to send a number of works produced by competent Ottoman intellectuals I like to the next meeting of the Congress of Orientalists. I also urged my other adoptive daughter, Lady Makbule Leman, to write a booklet on the women of the East. Can I not give you such an encouragement as well (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, No Date, Nr: 14-114)? (Appendix A,3)

In another letter:

I can guess that Lady Makbule Leman has started to write the book I asked her about: the Women of Islam....There is no harm in your writing such a book: on the contrary, there is even an advantage. In particular, your account will be based on your conversations with European ladies...But I humbly warn you that, in the book, there ought not to be any comparisons of women of Islam with the women of Christianity and especially Europeans. The purpose is to gain their courtesy. Not to provoke their anger (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, April 1, 1890)! (Appendix A,4)

⁷Bablülerden İbret Alalım sernameli makalede Madam Montagu'nün tercüme-i halini de yazacağımı da söylediğim zaman meşahir-i nisvanı İslam'dan bir kadının da tercüme-i halini yazmaklığımın dair birçok ehibbadan gerek bizzat ve gerek bilvasıta birçok ihtarlar aldım.

The same Aliye, however, was to be criticised by Ahmed Midhat when she engaged in poetry, particularly love poems:

Now it is time for you: You have a great command of poetry! How fluently and eloquently you write! Indeed! This is the best form of poetry. But what are you saying? You have a lover in your imagination. He deems it proper to come together with others but leaves you in sorrow. So he is a rascal! He wishes everyone would be blessed with richness, but at the same time makes you an addict of sorrow. And you are begging God with your heart on fire and eyes in tears. Oh my God! Can you possibly say such things in prose? Can you write such a literary (!) article? What gives you such daring? Poetry? Isn't this right? I condemn that poetry (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Dec 31, 1890)! (Appendix A,5)

In the same letter, he adds that Aliye does not need such poems, because it is Nigar's business:

Why do you have to say such things, my daughter? To show your great morals and virtues? Even though I am your father and admire your virtues, I would not publish this poem of yours in *Tercüman* if you wanted me to! I would deny it if I saw it published in another paper. If people who attributed it to you did not take their words back- if our law allowed as well- I would challenge them all to a duel. Because my virtuous daughter does not need poetry and particularly this kind of poetry to display her virtues. These are Lady Nigar's business Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Dec 31, 1890). (Appendix A,6)

One week later, Ahmed Mithat congratulates Fatma Aliye on her decision not to engage in poetry anymore:

My dearest daughter, whom I hold in high esteem! Your letter about the refusal of poetry, I swear to you, brought me to tears! Oh, you want to be forgiven! I offer you my apologies instead. Please have mercy on me and be kind enough to accept it. You are, not just in my opinion, but according to all Ottomans, such a holy and precious person that all Ottomans try to protect you from problems that blow to you lighter than a zephyr...This poetry issue has become a thing of the past. Let us not talk about it ever again. I burned the letter so that it will not be among your documents (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 6, 1891). (Appendix A,7)

In a letter six years later, Midhat writes that if women engage in poetry, particularly love poems, they have to face the consequences. In a way, by presenting Nigar as a counterexample, Ahmed Midhat shows Fatma Aliye what could have happened to her if she had continued in poetry:

In ferries, some important men are uttering filthy words changing the line “Our Sheiks’ miracle is self-proclaimed” to “Nigar’s chastity, too, is self-proclaimed”. Upon hearing such words, it is tearing my heart out although I have no relation to this woman. Through lines from *Efsus* and other books of Nigar, they justify *İkdam*’s Paris Muhbiri. What merciless men! While Fitnat, Leyla and Şeref’s affection (?) is apparent, they are directing their insulting language at Nigar. But this is, of course, the consequence of women’s engagement in poetry, and especially this kind of poetry (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 20, 1896). (Appendix A,8)

Midhat clearly stated that he expected Aliye not to engage in philosophy just like poetry: “You do not forget that I have forbidden you to engage in philosophy. No time spent in philosophy has ever proved useful” (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 18, 1896).⁸ In another letter: “In any case, I regard women’s engagement in poetry and philosophy dangerous. I kindly ask you to act very carefully, at least on this matter” (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 20, 1896).⁹

Just like the ban on poetry and philosophy, polemics with male writers were not desirable either, because even among male intellectuals polemics were problematic. Nigar was to find this out through her response to Ali Kemal. When Nigar (1896) responded to Ali Kemal’s criticism of her poem in an article published in *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, Ahmed Midhat felt very worried about this polemic

⁸ Unutmazsınız ki ben sizi feylesofi ile iştigalden men etmiş idim. Feylesofiyede haklı haksız hiçbir vakit katiyen tahakkuk ve ta’ayyün etmemiştir.

⁹ Herhalde ben kadınların şiir ve feylesofi ile iştigallerini tehlikeli görüyorum. Hiç olmaz ise bu hususta pek ihtirazlı davranmanızı rica ederim.

between a woman writer and a male intellectual. He wrote in his letters that he was very upset, for a woman was made to defend herself: “So when the situation among men is like this, you can imagine how sad I am because of Lady Nigar’s pell-mell entering to the battlefield by adjusting her moustache” (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A. Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 18, 1896).¹⁰

He also expressed his sadness to *İkdam*’s owner and editor-in-chief Cevdet Efendi because he had published Ali Kemal’s article in the first place, and thus put Nigar, *a woman*, in a difficult position.

In today’s *Hanımlar*, I have seen your precious article written as a response to Paris Muhbiri [Ali Kemal]. Although you have every right to defend yourself, I felt bad about your comment. I had already expressed my sadness to the editor-in-chief of the paper, Cevdet Efendi, for publishing that [Ali Kemal’s] article. Even though I had thought about writing a response myself so that I would save you the trouble, I did not eventually realize my idea. Because I considered that it would be more appropriate and fair to ignore it through silence. However, when I saw your response I felt sad, for a woman had to defend herself while no man had undertaken such a duty (A. Midhat to Nigar bint-i Osman, Jan 16, 1896 Aşyan Museum). (Appendix A,9)

In the same letter, Ahmed Midhat sounds determined to prevent a possible polemic between Nigar and Ali Kemal: “I am sure that if Paris Muhbiri responds to your latest article, it will not be published because Cevdet Efendi will definitely be gently admonished not to do so”.¹¹ Not being able to see any further pieces written by either side, Bekiroğlu (1998) concludes that the first comprehensive polemic between a man and a woman could have taken place as early as 1897 earlier than Aliye and

¹⁰ İşte erkekler arasında hal böyle iken Nigar Hanım’ın baldırlarını sığayıp, bıyıklarını bürerek ulu orta mübareze meydanına girivermesinden ne kadar müte’essir olduğumu tahmin buyurmalısınız.

¹¹ Vakıa Cevdet Efendi’ye suret-i kat’iyede tenbih edileceğinden Paris Muhbiri tarafından müdafaa-i ulyalarına şayet mukabele edilecek olursa gazeteye derc edilmeyeceğinden emniyetim ber-kemal ise de sülukunuzla tezyin buyurmuş olduğunuz....

Mahmut Esad's polemic on polygamy in 1899 but it was prevented by Ahmed Midhat.

4.1.2. Nigar bint-i Osman vs Fatma Aliye: Contrasting negotiating strategies

Despite having a broad literary interest, Nigar confined herself to the realm of poetry, and did not engage in other forms of literature such as plays or novels. Nor did she pursue a career in other fields such as philosophy and history. Nigar's focus on poetry, an area where women had gained access as earlier as the fifteenth century, was a result of her proper assessment of the field rules. Nigar's choice shows her internalization of the objective social structures, or the habitus of the intellectual field. This strategy of self-exclusion is manifest in her interest in writing plays.

Pointing to her literary archive, Bekiroğlu (1998, p. 301-2) explains that Nigar was enthusiastic about writing plays. Among her poems there are pieces written in dialogues that resemble or are a preparation for plays (Bekiroğlu, 1998, p. 303). Her unpublished play entitled *Tesir-i Aşk*, which was written by Nigar in 1883, is another example of her self-exclusion and self-censorship, because it was not published during Nigar's life, whereas her other works in the forms of poems, prose and letters were published in *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*. The reason was that Nigar knew that women's engagement in theatre was not welcomed in her period. Murat Uraz (1941) evaluates the days of the Hamidian period as follows: "the narrow minded people of the era expressed common opinions about theatre from a negative perspective by looking at the forms theatre stages took in our period and afterwards (p. 423). A criticism of theatre published in HMG with the sign of Nazmiye was as follows: "Lady, humanity does not expect from you this [any engagement in theatre], it

expects a body that has become a real human being.” Women writers had to wait until the Second Constitutional Period in order to get their plays published.

Nigar’s strategy of self-censorship may also be the reason why she did not engage in the fields of philosophy and history, because there is no evidence showing her interest or attempt in writing in these fields. Poetry was not a desirable genre for women in this period, given the fact that women were expected to educate other women through their writings. The field of poetry, however, was historically a legitimate area for women, given that there were famous female Divan poets as early as the fifteenth century (see e.g. Havlioğlu, 2007, 2010). Nigar may have tried to justify her engagement in poetry based on this historical legitimacy (her poems display Divan poetry characteristics), and she fulfilled the content expectations through her poems. She wrote on a range of themes from motherhood to patriotism. Thus, she could avoid the symbolic violence in the form of loss of recognition and renown and even exclusion from the field she might have possibly faced in an attempt to go beyond the legitimate zone. She maximised her reputation by staying in the realm of poetry and meeting the content requirements. A similar example is given by Moi (2008, p. 55) in explaining Simone de Beauvoir’s choice between literature and philosophy. According to her, literature was an easier, more feminine, option. Beauvoir, as is argued, did this as a result of her understanding of the rules of the French intellectual field.

As Nigar’s case shows, there were certain positions (un)available to women intellectuals in the field, and these available positions were not even close to the centre dominated by men. However, Fatma Aliye’s case offers a stark contrast. If the available positions to women intellectuals did not entail philosophy, for example,

how does one explain Fatma Aliye's extensive engagement in philosophy along with literature? She wrote two philosophy books, *Teracim-i Ahval-i Felasife* (1900) and *Tedkik-i Ecsam* (1901). In his letters to Fatma Aliye, Midhat asked her not to engage in philosophy because it was not appropriate for women.

Why do you preoccupy your great mind with these futile things? Engage in history; what an enjoyable and instructive scholarship it is. Make it your purpose. If you are going to engage in philosophy, just be satisfied with the translations of philosophy. This gives you a rest, and the greatest faith lies in them (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Feb 27, 1893). (Appendix A,10)

Aliye, however, convinces Midhat at the end:

Before everything, let us talk about the layout of your book: I propose to you a plan. Please first write to me what you think about it. What can I do? Much as I wanted to prevent you from engaging in philosophy, you did not accept it. So I offer my guidance...

If I see your opinions about this plan and observations, I offer my other comments based on that. I will inform you about the kind of books that will be useful to you in what you are going to write, but I say one more time that it is not yet time to write philosophy in our society. I could not dare to do so if they asked me to write philosophy books. Bear this in mind, and think about it accordingly. I kindly request that you not attempt to do anything on your own in this dangerous path (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Nov 26, 1893). (Appendix A,11)

Given her two works on philosophy and Midhat's later praise of Aliye on these works, Aliye seems to have subverted the patriarchal authority. The question here is how did she do this? Fatma Aliye engaged in a bargain with Ahmed Midhat, who clearly wanted to make use of Fatma Aliye's talent to serve the Empire likening her mind to fertile soil:

Because subject matters about classics are awaiting extension and progress from you. We liken your minds to a fertile soil. If we lay the

necessary knowledge there, we think that we will receive very good products (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, June 29, 1897).¹²

Fatma Aliye, using herself as an example, implies that Ahmed Midhat and others have to keep opening space for women so that they could defend the Empire in the eyes of the Western world, and thus she shows that women represented an important party in the bargain:

The attention that the great readers have shown to my humble works and the appreciation bestowed upon me falsify the wrong ideas of the Europeans that women of Islam are not regarded as humans, and they are oppressed and treated as slaves by men. Thus, this attention and appreciation prove that the nation of Islam is many times more valuable. And accordingly, they [the readers that showed appreciation] serve their nation and state in a very important way (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, F. Aliye to A. Midhat, No date, Nr: 21-110). (Appendix A,12)

Much as Aliye seems to acquiesce to what was expected from a woman willing to start her career by responding to Ahmed Midhat's requests, I argue that she was able to subvert the male authority by striking a better bargain in which she wisely made use of her resources, and in the end she appropriated Midhat's patronage. Upon reading Fatma Aliye's writings, Midhat seems very much impressed by Aliye's prowess:

You turned out to be much greater than I had expected my Wise daughter! Your intellect is getting greater and greater. Your greatness is similar to a soaring firework that as soon as you show the first spark of your knowledge, it goes up in the sky so quickly that those who wish to follow you to compare their knowledge with yours cannot catch up with you (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Oct 31, 1891). (Appendix A,13)

You are drawing my attention to the general classification in İbn Haldun's *Mukaddime*, and you are doing this to show that my words

¹² Zira asar-ı atikiyeye dair mebahisin tevsî ve terakkisini sizden bekliyor. Biz sizin zihinlerinizi bir münbit araziye teşbih ediyoruz. Malumat-ı lazıme-yi oraya zer eder isek bilahare pek güzel mahsüller alacağımızı düşünürüz.

about difference between knowledge and wisdom, and scholar and judge does not match with İbn Haldun's description. Isn't it your knowledge that even Ottoman intellectual men could not achieve and your intelligence that can properly use the knowledge that fascinate and urge me to say such words (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, No date, Nr: 11-114)? (Appendix A,14)

Despite Midhat's patronage, Aliye was able to craft her agency. For example, Ahmed Mithat asks Aliye not to send an article directly to *Hanımlar*.¹³ Aliye, however, takes the initiative and sends an article. This article was published with the caption "doğrudan doğruya" (directly), implying that Aliye sent it herself. In a letter on 29 October 1898, Ahmed Midhat clearly recognizes Aliye's agency:

He could not realise his dreams when he learnt from Ahmed Midhat that Lady Fatma Aliye is not directly connected to any newspaper, even *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, and whichever paper she likes, she gets her works published there...Ahmet Midhat is your adviser, consultant, and everything, but I cannot be your tyrant and pester you. You are a lady who acts as she wishes (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Oct 29, 1898). (Appendix A,15)

Even earlier than this incident, Midhat's words show Aliye's freedom of choice: "All papers and we are grateful to you. Whichever paper you like, you get your writings published there (9 Jan 1897)."¹⁴

If you ask my opinion, I would prevent not only you, but also Lady Nigar and Makbule from an attempt to send literary works from İstanbul to Salonica, which could be interpreted in various ways. Ugh! What a horrible man I am, isn't this true? Always oppressing and pestering! I am just telling you what I think. The choice is yours (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 9, 1897)! (Appendix A,16)

¹³ I cannot still dare to directly send an article in your case.(Hanımlara doğrudan yollamanıza yine cesaret edemem.) 9 Jan 1897.

¹⁴ ...Siz hiçbir gazetenin hiçbir kimsenin minnetdarı değilsiniz. Her gazete ve cümlemiz size minnetdarız. Mübarek hatırınız hangi gazeteden hoşlanır ise atıfediniz o tarafa teveccüh eder.

Aliye made use of her cultural capital, which provided her with more bargaining power compared to Nigar. This is not to say that Nigar did not have much capital. Indeed, she had because of her education but she could not strike as strong a bargain as Aliye did. Given the cultural and ideological atmosphere of the era, Aliye seems to have been able to strike a better bargain thanks to her resources, particularly her cultural capital. For example, it was the knowledge of Islamic law that enabled her to engage in a polemic with one of the leading members of ulema. She had acquired this knowledge from her father, Cevdet Pasha, during the preparation of the Mecelle, the civil code of the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Similarly, her philosophical writings were a result of the lessons with her father. Ahmed Mithat's initial criticism turned into praise once he read Aliye's works:

How sweetly you have written. How capable and knowledgeable! At some point you say a sentence that "there is no need to be a philosopher for this" and thus you are implying that you are not a philosopher. However, I can only feel proud to admit that I have rarely seen philosophers who have as much inclusive knowledge and broad ideas as you do. In this case, I am ashamed to say "Well done" (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Dec 2, 1893)! (Appendix A,17)

In addition, her specific agenda on the defence of Islam and criticism of Western feminism ran parallel to that of the period. No other woman writer specifically addressed these issues as fervently as Fatma Aliye. These pieces were the ones that brought her immense fame. *Nisvan-ı Islam* published in 1892 is a great example, where, using Islamic precepts, she argued against the plight of Muslim women in Ottoman society. Giving examples from the history of Islam, she exonerated it as an oppressor of women. As a result of this publication, Aliye did not only receive

national attention and appreciation but also she enjoyed an international readership.¹⁵ Such works helped the Empire combat Orientalist stereotypes abundant in the Western world. She also wrote *Namdaran-ı Zenan-ı İslam*, published in *Malumat* between 1899 and 1901. Such efforts were appreciated and brought Fatma Aliye even further recognition: “Ottoman society will be proud of you... You are one of the pre-eminent Ottomans whom Ahmed Midhat will have to respect and honour. The future generations must recognise you like this, and no doubt they will do so” Fatma ALiye, 1890-1912, A. Midhat to F. Aliye, April 4, 1890).¹⁶

Nigar, however, did not have such a specific agenda to defend the women of Islam. On the contrary, she was the target of severe criticism because of her lifestyle.¹⁷ Nigar herself admits that her lifestyle was at odds with the Ottoman lifestyle. In her diaries early in 1889, Nigar hosted her fellows on Tuesdays, which she calls *journée de réception* (day of reception) in their mansion in Nişantaşı, a cosmopolitan area where most of the non-Muslims resided. Moreover, a Turkish-Crimean intellectual, Fatih Kerimi, expressed his surprise to see a completely European woman when he visited Nigar in 1912. Nigar was dressed up in Western style with no headscarf. He explained that he kissed her hand. Aliye’s meeting with Kerimi, however, takes place in a completely different environment. Kerimi was able to reach Aliye through some intellectuals Fatma Aliye knew and trusted, and only then could the meeting take place. Aliye explained why she accepted the male

¹⁵ *Nisvan-ı İslam* was translated into Arabic and serialized in the Beirut periodical *Themeretü-l Fünun*, and was translated into French in 1895 by Nicolos Nicolaides (Marvel, 2011, p. 38).

¹⁶ Osmanlılık sizlerle iftihar edecektir....Sizler Ahmed Midhat’lerin ta’zim ve tebcile mecbur olacakları fuzala-yı Osmaniyedensiniz. İstikbal ve ahlak size böyle tanımalıdır ve bila şübhe böyle tanıyacaktırlar.

¹⁷ Nigar’s poems and lifestyle were belittled in an article by Ali Kemal, an intellectual in exile in Paris (Bekiroğlu 1994:35).

visitors as follows: “I see you as my brothers, that’s why I accepted you, I don’t meet men that I don’t know and don’t accept male journalists” (Kerimi, 2001, p. 262).

Nigar’s contrasting positioning vis-a-vis her contemporary, Fatma Aliye, as the ideal Ottoman woman seems to be one of the reasons why Nigar acquiesced to what was expected from a woman writer while Aliye subverted the male authority by using her family background and educational capital wisely.¹⁸ How could Nigar then maintain her reputation without serving for the ideological agenda of the Empire while leading her nonconventional life?

Nigar’s extensive social networks as a result of her origin provided her with an important source of bargaining power (see Appendix C for Nigar’s networks). Social capital is defined as “the power and advantages one gains from having a network of contacts as well as a series of other more personal and intimate relations” (Moi, 1991, p. 1038). It helps its possessor to develop and increase other forms of capital and may greatly enhance his or her chances of achieving legitimacy in a given field. Nigar had an extended family in Hungary through whom she could extend her reputation beyond the Empire. In addition to her large family, she was acquainted with the leading male intellectuals of the time such as Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem and Süleyman Nazif. She was introduced to these people by her father, Osman Pasha. These prominent intellectuals helped Nigar get published in various journals.

¹⁸ It is important to note that there was not any dispute between Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman. On the contrary, they both supported each other in making intellectual careers. Fatma Aliye wrote as follows: “A nightingale was inviting the people in the neighbourhood to the light of the morning and the Sun. It was Nigar. These three people [Makbule Leman, too], how we loved each other! Such an affection we had that neither rivalry nor jealousy could penetrate it (Quoted in Zihnioğlu, 203, p. 44). (Bir bülbül terane-i latifi o muhit halkını sabahın nurlarına, şemsin ziyalarına da’vet ediyordu. Bu da Nigar idi. Bu üç kişi birbirimizi ne kadar sevdik! Öyle bir muhabbet idi ki, ne hased ne rekabet, ne kıskançlık ona nüfuz edemezdi.)

Nigar's self-exclusion strategy was accompanied by a set of small tactics. For example, her reaction to criticism was very tolerant. In her response to Ali Kemal, she wrote that she was not the kind of poet who appreciated her poems but rather she admitted their insignificance. When Nigar's first poetry book *Efsus* was criticised by Ebürrefi because the poems were replete with flaws of prosody, Nigar herself agreed with Ebürrefi, and accepted her errors. Moreover, Fuad Köprülü (1924, p. 297) distinguished Nigar from a number of other women poets in that she was the sole one who understood what sincerity was and her poems, although replete with mistakes, deserved appreciation. Apparently, modesty was a part of the gendered habitus of the field. The same attitude can be seen in Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye. Fatma Aliye wrote that she did not believe she was capable of writing in Ottoman Turkish and asked her father to correct her first novel (Esen, 2000). Her father Cevdet Pasha said the writing did not need even a slight correction. Similarly, Emine Semiye explained that the reason why she used a pen name in her first article in HMG was her timidity and lack of confidence (Semiye, 1896).

Nigar's strategy of acquiescence gained her an unusual free environment in the Hamidian Era, which was to be referred to as the Era of Despotism. She benefitted from this strategy very much in her bargain against patriarchal practices. In other words, through this strategy she was able to carry on with her lifestyle, which she admitted was against the social conventions of the Ottoman society. Moreover, she could engage in poetry, a field where she wanted to pursue her intellectual aspirations, despite its unpopularity as a genre.

4.1.3 Strategy of collaboration

Emine Semiye's earlier career displays characteristics of the strategy of collaboration. In this strategy, she explicitly and without any external demand supported the image of women imposed by the Hamidian regime: educated mothers and wives. She did not start her intellectual trajectory to become a writer, and clearly stated that her purpose to write was to benefit of society. This was precisely what women intellectuals had to do to gain recognition. "It is a well-known fact that the purpose of writing is for society's benefit. Therefore, we need to write what we write from the perspective of usefulness" (Semiye, 1897).¹⁹ Along these lines, she covered the themes of education, improvement of society, womanhood and child raising (Gökpınar, 2008). She produced a series of articles under the titles of "Advice to Mothers" (*Validelere Nasihat*) and "Lessons of Wisdom for Ladies" (*Hanımlara Dürus-ı Hikmet*). Before her first article, HMG (1895) published an article introducing her as the daughter of late Cevdet Pasha in which it was stated that HMG was honoured because such a talented woman would be writing in the following issues:

It is a great honour for *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete* to have the skillful woman writer who has dedicated her precious time to writing about social ethics, extending knowledge and science, and improving the girls and the women of Islam in the right path of knowledge and also helping them blossom like a flower while at the same time by completely isolating the eloquent writing of hers from useless things like romance. (Appendix A,18)

Her stance on the woman question was the same as that of the leading male intellectuals of the time and she followed the literary tradition of Ahmed Midhat in

¹⁹ Yazmaktan maksat umumun istifadesi olduğu malumdur. Bunun için yazdıklarımızı faide nokta-i nazarından yazmamız icab eder.

that her main purpose was to educate people. As a result of her first pieces in HMG, she received much praise from the male writers (Kaymaz, 2009, p. 74). At the outset of her career, as someone who joined the intellectual circles later than her sister Fatma Aliye and Nigar, the strategy of collaboration provided Emine Semiye a safe passage. Her knowledge, which she put to use in the articles, and her family background provided her with great bargaining power.

Emine Semiye's diverging career with Selma Rıza, another intellectual woman, shows the importance of these familial ties. Emine Semiye was the daughter of the prominent bureaucrat Cevdet Pasha, the secretary of education (*maarif müdürü*) Reshid Pasha's wife and she was also the younger sister of the first Ottoman woman writer (as introduced by Ahmed Mithat in 1892) Fatma Aliye. Despite her later alliance with the Young Turks, Emine Semiye's trajectory diverges from Selma Rıza's, the sister of Ahmed Rıza, one of the founders of the Committee of Union and Progress. Ahmed Midhat explains why Selma Rıza was forgotten as a woman intellectual.

I, just like you, liked what Lady Selma has written. Although she mentions her lack of reputation, she is one of the knowledgeable women who in the past honoured the *Tercüman* with her articles. If her elder brother, whom she says is a member of a positivist association in Paris, were a real positivist and an earnest man, our Selma would be an effective woman writer. However, you can learn her brother's status from Mr. Faik and understand why he can help neither himself nor his sister. For this reason, the knowledgeable Selma could not escape being totally forgotten (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, May 10, 1892). (Appendix A,19)

In contrast to Selma Rıza's vague intellectual trajectory, Emine Semiye was rewarded for the success of her novel *Sefalet* (1897). It was published in *Mütalaa*, and then translated into Serbian by a Serbian woman. Due to the success of the book in public, Semiye was awarded the Saint Sava Medal by the Serbian government

(HMG 9 Feb, 1899). Before receiving this award, Semiye was also awarded the medal of the Hamidian period given to successful ladies called “Şefkat Nişan-ı Hümayunu” for her services and literary efforts (30 Jan 1899).

Semiye moved to Salonica due to her husband’s, Reshid Pasha’s, appointment as *maarif müdürü* (secretary of education). After she moved to Salonica, she became the editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Mütalaa* and continued her articles in HMG until 1903. Censorship in Salonica was not as severe as it was in Istanbul and political articles were being published. In 1897, Ahmed Midhat, in a letter to Aliye, mentions Semiye’s activities in Salonica as editor-in-chief of *Mütalaa* and her husband Reshid Pasha. He warns Aliye that sending articles to *Mütalaa* would not be welcomed, and Midhat himself would not allow her and other women writers to do so:

While trying to please your brother-in-law and sister, I am afraid; you may get both yourself and them caught up in various plots. If you ask my opinion, I would prevent not only you but also Lady Nigar and Makbule from an attempt to send literary works from İstanbul to Salonica, which could be interpreted in various ways (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 9, 1897). (Appendix A,20)

Although it was speculated that Emine Semiye, who was away from Istanbul during the establishment of the CUP, helped organise the Salonica branch of the organization and escaped Hamidian censorship, her activities took place right before the Second Constitutional Period (Kaymaz, 2009, p. 51). Karaca (2010) argues that Emine Semiye started her political activities in 1904 looking at her manuscript entitled *Hürriyet Kokuları* in which Semiye wrote on the day of the revolution that she had been crying for freedom for 3,5 years.

What is interesting here is Ahmed Mithat's warning as early as 1897, 11 years before the revolution. Moreover, in another letter written two months later, Ahmed Midhat condemns the Young Turks, and expresses his loyalty to the Sultan Abdul Hamid. He adds that he was ready to die on this path. He concludes the letter by forcing Aliye to make a choice between the Young Turks and himself. The Committee of Union and Progress²⁰ attempted two coups, one in 1896 and another in 1897, but both were discovered. Salonica was one of the centres of the Union.

I assure you, my daughter, that your literary father is loyal to his Sultan. He has submitted to the Sultan with the promise of loyalty and genuine allegiance. Just like people submitted to Ali (who ruled the Islamic Caliphate from 656-661). But it turns out that there are a lot of difficulties in our time. These difficulties cannot discourage the loyal people from obeying the Sultan. I accept death on this path of loyalty. I would be very happy particularly if this happens through the sharp dagger of the traitors of the state of religion like them [the Young Turks]. This would be a great end to my life. So keep this in mind, and accordingly decide whether you are going to be with Ahmed Midhat or the Young Turks (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A.Midhat to F. Aliye, Mar 16, 1897). (Appendix A,21)

Among the hundreds of letters Midhat sent Fatma Aliye between 1895 and 1912, the name of Emine Semiye does not occur even once. She is mentioned a few times as Aliye's sister without her name. On the other hand, the names of a number of women intellectuals often occur in the letters among which are Makbule Leman, Nigar bint-i Osman, Gülnar Hanım, Nakiye Hanım, Selma Rıza and Zafer Hanım. Given that Midhat encouraged women to read and write and he sometimes acted like a father, Midhat might not have welcomed Semiye's ideas (Kaymaz, 2009, p. 75).

²⁰ Some opponents of the Hamidian regime convened the Committee of Union and Progress in 1889 in Paris, its name was İttihad-i Osmani and became CUP in 1895 (Akşin, 1987, p. 23).

In this period, Emine Semiye's networks with other women writers such as Nigar, Makbule Leman and Fatma Fahrünnisa stand out. Nigar bint-i Osman in particular was a close friend, and their letters were published in HMG. In many articles and letters published in HMG, they praise one another. Emine Semiye's collaboration strategy was to change direction towards the end of the Hamidian regime, and she was to start collaborating with the CUP. Therefore, unlike Nigar and Fatma Aliye, her reputational trajectory would further flourish during the Constitutional rule.

4.1.4. Explaining the divergence

The kind and volume of capital women intellectuals amassed helps explain why some of the contemporary women could not achieve the level of repute as the Great Women did. Makbule Leman's intellectual trajectory offers an example. Uğurcan (1991) explains Leman's being overshadowed by the Great Women owing to her lack of Western cultural capital as well as her short life. In an era when the Empire was going through a series of reforms under the modernization project, the lack of such capital meant exclusion from wider intellectual circles. In other words, one could have pieces in newspapers or even become the editor-in-chief of periodicals as was the case with Makbule Leman, but recognition at a wider level was problematic. The members of the new class of intellectuals were knowledgeable about Western classics and the influence of these works was, to a certain extent, evident in their own writings. In addition, they could speak and read in a number of foreign languages.

Makbule Leman, according to Ahmed Midhat, was confined to the boundaries of Ottoman intellectual tradition, and thus her source of inspiration was lacking (Uğurcan, 1991, p. 403). "Much as Makbule Leman says some words and idioms in

French, I presume she does not know French. If only she did! Her intelligence and feelings are brilliant” (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A. Midhat to F. Aliye, April 4, 1890).²¹

The members of the Great Women, on the other hand, had gathered large amounts of Western capital due to their education. Nigar was familiar with the Western culture because of her origins – her father, Osman Pasha, was a Hungarian convert, and she had attended a French primary school as a child. She knew the foreign writers and poets such as Pierre Loti, Paul Bourget, and Carmen Sylva in person. She represented the Westernist yet Muslim women who spoke eight languages and could read the original Western texts. Likewise, Fatma Aliye had an unusually good command of the French language and she was to accompany foreign female visitors. In a letter to Aliye, Ahmed Midhat emphasises the importance of Aliye’s knowledge of French as follows: “Due to your command of the French language, you can be successful in all areas” (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A. Midhat to F. Aliye, No Date, Nr: 14-114).²²

The importance of Western capital had also to do with the Orientalist ideas abundant in the Western world, and the discourse of Orientalism was a sign of cultural defeat against the West. The Empire sought to fight such a discourse in every way. The cultural actors, both men and women intellectuals, became important in this project. The Empire, for example, desired to participate in world fairs not as objects but as subjects (İnceoğlu, 2008, p. 117), and intellectuals, through their works and knowledge, helped the Empire combat Orientalist ideas. Women with their

²¹ Makbule Leman her ne kadar Fransızca bazı kelimeler, bazı ıstılahlar irad eder ise de pek zannederim ki Fransızca bilmez. Keşke bilse idi! Zekası, hisleri pek fevkaladedir.

²² Fransızca’ya vukufunuz hasebiyle siz her vadiye sevk-i semend-i iktidar edebilirsiniz.

Western knowledge such as languages and culture helped improve the image of the Muslim, woman which was very poor in the Western world.

In addition, Makbule Leman's lack of such capital may have prevented her from extending her networks. She was not a legitimate interlocutor in literary discussions where mostly Western works were being recited and discussed. She lacked an important resource, so her bargaining power was more limited.

Apart from having the right kind of capital, having the necessary volume of cultural capital seems to be important as well. Ahmed Midhat expresses his disappointment with Madam Gülnar (Olga de Lebedeva) because she was not a promising woman writer: "She is not a good scholar. Nor is she a brilliant philosopher. Besides, she does not have a good command of politics. She is a pretty mediocre woman" (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, A. Midhat to F. Aliye, Jan 2, 1893).²³

4.2 The making of women intellectuals in the Second Constitutional era

*The women of a nation are the sign of the degree of its progress.*²⁴

Abdülhak Hamid

This period, unlike the Hamidian Era, was turbulent in terms of historical and political conditions. A group of intellectuals who were in opposition to the autocratic regime of Abdul Hamid established the Committee of Union and Progress in Paris, and came to be known as the Young Turks. Among them were Abdullah Cevdet, Ahmed Rıza and Yusuf Akçura. The Young Turks were successful in mobilizing a growing base of disillusioned civil and military elites, and in 1908 they staged a

²³ Pek mükemmel alime olmadığı, pek mükemmel feylesof olmadığı gibi siyasiyat iktidarı hiç de yoktur. İyice *mediocre* kadıncağızdır.

²⁴ Bir milletin nisvanı, derece-i terakkisinin mizanıdır.

revolution (Marvel, 2011, p. 20). This marked the overthrow of Abdulhamid's regime, and the constitution was reinstated.

After the Young Turks came to power, the Empire experienced huge territorial losses between 1908-1912: The independence of Bulgaria, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, the loss of Crete to Greece, the occupation of Tripoli by Italy and a major defeat in the Balkans in 1912. Two years later in 1914, World War I broke out and ended in 1918 with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. It did not, however, mark the end of the war period, because a year later in 1919, the War of Independence started and continued until 1922.

The above quotation was published in *Mehasin*, one of women's journals, on top of an article about women, and brilliantly summarises the male perspective of the era regarding women's conditions. The male intellectuals often argued that unless women's conditions were improved, the nation was to be confronted with more obstacles. The instrumental framework behind the Hamidian reforms was still prevalent and even more apparent in the Second Constitutional Era. Celal Nuri, a pioneering intellectual, establishes an explicit link between the advancement of society and education of women in the preface of his book *Kadınlarımız* (1913) (Our Women), and explains the logic behind the reforms:

Not only the salvation of Muslims and Turks but all kinds of elevation depend on the level of women. There is no society in the world where the men are advanced and the women remain behind. A real civilization can only be possible with both parties. If we want to elevate Turks and Muslims in general, we should not start the operation with only the army or navy. It is not correct to start progress from schools. Before everything, we need to educate our women so that they can educate children, and children can improve the society and the state. While building an apartment, you do not start from the roof. First, the foundation of the building is laid. Women are the foundation of society. (Appendix A,22)

In line with this agenda, a series of reforms was promulgated. Schooling for women became more widespread. The number of schools for girls almost doubled in the early years of the new regime (Kurnaz, 1996, p. 79). Various vocational courses were offered to young women. A number of laws on property rights, marriage and family were enacted. The press flourished and the number of periodicals rose to two thousand, although some were short-lived (Kurnaz, 1996, p. 192). The intellectuals of the era encouraged and supported women financially to form women's associations. The reforms were so widespread that an English intellectual woman visiting the Empire exclaimed as follows: "A Turkish Feminist Government: To Western Europe this sounds strange" (Ellison, 1915, p. 81).

Given the pragmatic character of the reforms, women represented an important entity in society, and they struck explicit bargains against the new patriarchal codes. Through these bargains they pursued their intellectual aspirations and demanded rights for women often radically, but they made sure that they prioritised the importance of the nation and the roles of motherhood and wifehood. They stressed that the improvements in their conditions would be for the benefit of society. This emphasis can be frequently seen in the articles addressing men. Nigar bint-i Osman (1908), for example, in her article in *Kadın* demands justice and equality and points to men as the actual beneficiaries:

You right minded men! It is justice and equality that will be presented to us by you. Your help to improve our position will be the greatest gift to us in this time of fortunate freedom when you will not regard us, the poor Turkish women, as household goods. Besides, isn't it each one of you who will pick up the fruits of our success if we can achieve it? (Appendix A,23)

Their bargains were inspired by the previous generation of Great Women, and the women who started their careers in this period enjoyed the advantage of those previous bargains. Başçı (2003, p. 149), for example, states that Halide Edib's predecessors, particularly Fatma Aliye unburdened her from the responsibility of being a trail-blazer as a woman writer. In the early twentieth century women were no longer regarded as incapable of producing literary works.

4.2.1. Great Women's diverging reputational trajectories and new beginnings

The overthrow of the old regime had hurt those who had earned a living or enjoyed status as members of the Hamidian apparatus (Zürcher, 1994, p. 102). The favouritism of the old regime ended. So the reputational trajectories of the Great Women who saw their celebrity rise during the Hamidian period changed as well. Fatma Aliye had an explicit commitment to the Hamidian regime and seems to have chosen the side of Sultan Hamid against the Young Turks given her non-attendance after Emine Semiye got her invited to deliver a speech by sending two letters to the headquarters of the CUP. Nigar bint-i Osman, the successful poet of the Hamidian era, described the new regime as "the nightmare of Constitution" in her diary, and constantly put the blame on the Young Turks, the group in power, for the unpleasant conditions the Empire was to encounter in the following years, such as the Balkan Wars and WW I (Bekiroğlu, 1998). She even went as far as destroying the parts of her diary where she wrote about the first years of the CUP (Bekiroğlu, 1998).

The new regime, however, meant freedom and happiness for Nezihe Muhiddin and Halide Edib while they described the old regime as tyranny and oppression. Emine Semiye, too, was to join the second generation of the Great Women in celebrating the new regime. She was to be the first person to celebrate the

new regime on Independence Square with a flag and shouting out loud “Long live the fatherland, nation and liberty” (Coşar, 1974, p. 59). This denunciation of the previous regime and the celebration of the new seem to be a pre-requisite either to making a career or to improving one’s existing reputation in the Second Constitutional Period.

The Great Women’s strategies in this period diverged as well. Halide Edib employed the strategy of collaboration and acquiescence later in her career while Muhiddin collaborated, although she denied any affiliation with the political parties. The first generation of the Great Women who had started their careers continued their existing strategies, except for Emine Semiye, who resorted to the strategy of defiance (see Table 7). Before I elaborate on them, I shall briefly explain the changing parameters of the intellectual field in the Second Constitutional period in order to provide a background for women’s strategies.

Table 7. Four Strategies for Dealing with the Male Bias Pervading the Ottoman Intellectual Circles in the Second Constitutional Era

Strategy	Women’s Action	Women
Collaboration	Enforcing	Nezihe Muhiddin, Halide Edib
Acquiescence	Agreeing	Nigar bint-i Osman, Halide Edib
Subversion	Undermining	Fatma Aliye
Defiance	Refusing to obey	Emine Semiye

4.2.2. The changing parameters of the intellectual field: More boundaries

Although women were encouraged to participate in social life through reforms, the boundaries of their visibility and mobility were even more clearly drawn in the Second Constitutional Period. This meant more and more rules for women, and these

rules were presented in a detailed way in articles published in both men's and women's magazines. In these articles, binaries based on femininity and masculinity were created. For example, one article signed by Zehra (1908) addresses women writers and criticizes women covering the so called "masculine" subject matters:

To our women writers: Women must write with heart while men with their ideas...Wisdoms as deep as women cannot grasp, broad information, and great use of jargon cannot be accepted in women's articles...In my opinion, just as it is inappropriate for a man to write an article without ideas, it is also inappropriate for a woman to write an article without emotions...Women must choose the subjects they will cover in an appropriate way for a woman. For instance, a woman should not examine the political programme of the parliament or the outcome of the boycott of foreign goods. It would be ridiculous. I see such articles with the sign of women, therefore I am clarifying it...There is a saying in Turkish: "She is trying to do a man's job with dough on her hands". Women should not give others the chance to say this. (Appendix A,24)

Apart from content limitations, there were also genre expectations: Literature seems to be a designated area for women just like in the Hamidian era, and philosophy and mathematics were simply inappropriate for women:

No matter what feminists and their opponents say, I regard women who are as knowledgeable as a member of an institution as a failure of nature...A woman's level of knowledge should not go as high as calculating the distance between stars through arithmetic. High level of scholarship which cannot even be grasped by men is dry and harsh for women...It is not women's business to be absorbed in the realm of deep philosophy (Zehra, 1909). (Appendix A,25)

Women seem to be aware of these expectations and they seem to have known that they had to comply with these rules as long as they wanted to continue their intellectual practices. Fatma Aliye, for example, preferred to write in another language when she wanted to go against content expectations, whereas Halide Edib mostly followed the rules to establish her reputation. She started her career through writing literary columns, whereas her husband Salih Zeki wrote scientific columns in

Tanin. Apart from literary columns and educational articles, Halide Edib wrote novels as well, and they were appreciated by the leading intellectuals. For example, Mehmet Nafiz²⁵ (1910) commented on Edib's novel *Seviye Talip* (1910) in his article in *Tanin* as follows:

I owe many thanks to Lady Halide Salih who has given me the opportunity to begin my first article with praise, because her latest novel, *Seviye Talip* is, without any exaggeration, a really exceptional literary work. Our literature today has got richer in all its aspects with this unique work. And I should admit that I have not read any book so far that has impressed me to this extent. It must be admitted that this work produced by a lady in a period when literature has been left unguarded and weak by intellectuals for different reasons is a great art workAnd I assure you that the writer suddenly takes a big step with this work and reaches to the level of our greatest literary people and to the brightest position of our day. (Appendix A,26)

Even when Halide Edib (1909) wanted to discuss the expectations from women, she emphasised women's roles as mothers, wives and sisters while prioritizing the interests of the nation. Thus she could open some space for herself in the intellectual circles:

Women are neither stars nor flowers... nor are they important subject matters for literature. Women are your real friends who will help you in our hard and long struggle for the nation. They will accompany you on the road we built as your mothers, sisters and wives...Do not only write poems for them, establish partnerships with them in knowledge, and make knowledge accessible for them. (Appendix A,27)

²⁵ Mehmet Rauf's pen name in *Tanin*.

4.2.3. Halide Edib: From collaboration to acquiescence

Halide Edib's intellectual trajectory starts in 1908 after the Young Turk Revolution through her articles in the Unionist newspaper *Tanin*/The Voice²⁶, and continues until after the foundation of the Republic in 1923. It is not possible to describe her efforts to pass as a woman intellectual with only one strategy, for she had several turning points throughout her career. She collaborated with the regime in the early months by referring to the Hamidian era as "a dark reign of tyranny and despotism, a system of terror and espionage" (2004, p. 250) and she thought "the years 1913-15 of the Unionist regime deserved to be appreciated for the sincere and hard struggle put forth for constructive change in the country" (2004, p. 345). Following her dissent with the Unionists in 1916, she turned to the strategy of acquiescence and negotiated for some gain while mostly following the patriarchal rules of the intellectual milieu.

It was her husband Salih Zeki's networks that brought Edib in contact with literary circles at the outset of her career. Halide Edib's articles in *Tanin* brought her quick reputation due to *Tanin*'s wide circulation. The traces of Edib's collaboration strategy can be seen in her resistance when she received anonymous letters threatening her not to write in the Unionist *Tanin* during the counterrevolution of 1909 staged by the opponents of the Young Turks. She noted in her diary as follows: "I was only twenty four, and this was the price of the literary fame I had acquired in a few months" (p. 274). She did not, however, give up on her career and continued writing. In a short time, she had proved her talent. In 1909, she was asked to contribute to seven newspapers, start teaching in a new school and establish a women's association and participate in men's associations as an honorary member

²⁶ The newspaper *Tanin* began to be published in 1908. Tevfik Fikret and Hüseyin Cahit edited it together, and they had a staff composed of the best known writers of the day.

(Jenkins, 2008, p. 152). Accordingly, she established the first women's association called Teali-i Nisvan Cemiyeti (*The Society for the Advancement of Women*). She explained that "as a whole the association kept within the bounds of usefulness and philanthropy, and we tried to maintain a quite tone, avoiding propaganda" (Edib, 2004 [1926], p. 335).

Her reputational trajectory continued to thrive through her attendance at the Turkish Hearth in 1912, where she established more networks with the leading intellectuals of the era such as Yusuf Akçura, Hamdullah Suphi and Ziya Gökalp. Thanks to such networks, she also started to write in the journal of the Turkish Hearths *Türk Turdu*. In her first article, Edib (1912) presented a mother who devoted herself to her nation. Ziya Gökalp was to be the primary influence on her novel *Yeni Turan* in 1912, which brought her immense reputation both at the national and international level. In this novel, she explicitly narrates her Turanist ideology, the ideal of bringing together all Ural-Altaic or Turkish speaking people, including those outside the Ottoman Empire. The novel is also regarded as the first political and ideological novel in Turkish literature (Önertoy, 1973). Up until this point, the primary strategy in Halide Edib's career seems to have been collaboration. Through propagating the ideals of the constitutional regime and prioritising the nation and underlining women's role as mothers and wives, she gained a lot of reputation and became a well-known writer.

The year 1915, however, represents a turning point in Edib's intellectual trajectory, when she delivered a speech to 700 people at the Turkish Hearth on the Armenian question. In the speech, she addressed the government for the killings of Armenians. Soon after, her reputation at the Ocak was tarnished and the number of

intellectuals visiting her gradually decreased in the following weeks. Talat Pasha addressed Halide Edib regarding her speech:

Look here, Halide Hanum [sic]. I have a heart as good as yours, and it keeps me awake at night to think of the human suffering. But that is a personal thing, and I am here on this earth to think of my people and not of my sensibilities. If a Macedonian or Armenian leader gets the chance and the excuse he never neglects it. There was an equal number of Turks and Moslems massacred during the Balkan war, yet the world kept a criminal silence (Edib, 2004, p. 387).

Ziya Gökalp wanted to send Edib away from the Ocak, but Talat Pasha, who criticised her, also rejected this proposition arguing that “Edib serves her country in the way she believes” (Edib, 2004, p. 388). During these days, Cemal Pasha invited Edib and Nakiye Hanım to Syria to work for the planning of the new schools. Halide Edib agreed to leave Istanbul after she became a target in the intellectual circles. When she came back from Syria two years later, she was still defending the rights of the Armenians and arguing for the establishment of a commission to defend the rights of Armenians (Edib, 1918). She was, however, severely criticized by some of the intellectuals, among whom was Ahmet Haşim (1918):

If only your voice had been heard just like today when all the voices kept silent and the last red rivers flowing from the throat of people reached the soil in order to disappear! But you were gone to view another slaughterhouse. Your Pasha had invited you to Syria with his shiny automobiles to watch a Neron entertainment. (Appendix A,28)

After such criticism, Halide Edib’s tone gradually starts to change. Her radical stance on the Armenian issue seems to have changed by 1919, when she wrote a letter to Americans. In the letter she sought to prevent American mandate of Armenians and complained that Armenians killed about a million Muslim Turks and Kurds (Çalışlar, 2010). Moreover, in the *Turkish Ordeal*, she mentioned that Muslim Turkish children

brought in large numbers from the orphanages of Anatolia were being Armenianized daily in the Armenian church in Kumkapı right after the WW1 (1928, p. 17-18). In 1926, when she wrote her memoirs her ideas, clearly seem to have changed: “I saw the Armenian question quite differently from the way I see it today. I did not know about the Armenian crimes, and I had not realized that in similar cases others could be a hundred times worse than the Turks.”

Halide Edib’s moderate stance also shows itself in her decision not to engage in politics when she did actually have a chance. In the elections of 1919, when she also received votes, she explained that she did not want a career in politics:

I was profoundly touched to hear that the electors of Bey Bazaar (a town near Konia) had given me twelve out of their twenty votes. Kiresund [sic] gave me eight votes and Erzerum[sic] three. As women do not have political rights in Turkey, and as I essentially dislike the idea of a political career, I have never made a sign which would have given them any cause to think that such an act on their part would please me...Had I asked a majority of votes in those days, I believe I could have had it without difficulty, though the Turkish senate would have been called upon to interpret the clause (Edib, 1928, p. 48).

Given her outcry after the foundation of the Republic about women’s political suffrage, she may have thought that politics was not yet a legitimate area for women. A year later when Halide Edib mistakenly appeared on the first page of the *New York Times* as the minister of education, the reactions showed that women were not indeed welcome in the realm of politics. The then-minister of education, Rıza Nur, was annoyed with such news and blamed Halide Edib in his memoirs: “Halide herself said she was the minister of education, and the American newspapers wrote it. Mustafa Kemal got really angry. This speculation was so deep-seated that I still see foreigners saying Halide is the minister of education” (1992, own translation). Halide

Edib was given a place in the world of men as a journalist at most. Even though she agreed to stay behind the men in areas such as politics, she could not escape being the target of rumours as a married woman with two children who went to the battlefield:

[Halide] was appointed as Corporal by Mustafa Kemal. It is ridiculous. Both Mustafa Kemal and Halide are after fantasy and [...]. Halide enters from one tent to another in the army. She is always after S. Everybody is talking about this in Ankara. The members of the parliament are talking about this, too....Some say she is Adnan's wife, whereas others say she is not. If she were to be his wife, she would not have her father's name like Halide Edib. Just like she was named Halide Salih in her previous marriage, she would be called Halide Adnan now. They say Halide is his [Adnan's] mistress (Rıza Nur, 1992, p. 214). (Appendix A,29)

Halide Edib's request to go to the battlefield during the Independence War was criticised because of her political ideas regarding Armenians. In addition, her letter to Mustafa Kemal in 1919, which brought her the label of traitor, damaged her reputation. *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, for example, criticised her: "Halide Edib, who was once working for the American mandate, cannot say anything on Independence. While she is writing articles in her mansion in Anatolia, the young people of Istanbul are dying in Sakarya" (Sarıhan, 1993, Vol 4, p. 50).²⁷

Halide Edib's cultural capital was very important in making her career, although she started it through her husband's networks. Her social capital expanded by her participating in intellectual institutions such as the Ocak and also through her foreign networks. As Lowry (1994) explains, the political visitors to Ankara who spoke English first met Edib. She preferred to use such resources in the strategy of

²⁷ Bir zamanlar Amerikan mandası lehine çalışan H. Edib, istiklal namına söz söyleyemez. Bugün kendisi Anadolu'daki köşkünde makale yazarken, İstanbul gençleri Sakarya'da can veriyor.

collaboration and stopped directly challenging the regime after she received much criticism in 1916.

4.2.4. Nezihe Muhiddin: An unintentional collaboration

The last member of the generation of the Great Women (Zihnioglu, 2003, p. 35), Nezihe Muhiddin started her intellectual trajectory as a science teacher in 1909 and continued her career as a writer, journalist and activist until 1930. Brought up during the Hamidian Era in an environment where intellectual, social and political problems and the plight of women were discussed by women, Muhiddin celebrated the new regime in 1908. Although she prioritised the ideals of womanhood throughout her life and tried to stay away from party politics, her writings and activities during the first years of the constitutional regime show that she actually collaborated with the regime.

While striking a bargain against the new authority thresholds, Muhiddin paid attention to the terms of the bargain, emphasising women's roles as mothers who would raise the next generations: "When this issue is considered for us, women, this country needs first and foremost mothers who will raise the next generations and also serious institutions of education to educate those mothers" (1912a).²⁸ Moreover, in a story entitled "Ceng Ninnisi" (1912b) Muhiddin portrayed a mother who, without any hesitation, sends her son to fight for the nation. She also prioritised the interests of the nation while supporting women's educational and economic activities outside home. She constantly stressed the benefits to be accrued by the nation in her writings. Whatever women succeeded in would be for the benefit of the nation: "Our

²⁸ Bizim için yani kadınlar için bu mesele düşünülürse bu memleket her şeyden evvel nesl-i atiyi ihzar edecek hakiki validelere ve o valideleri yetiştirecek ciddi müessesatı irfaniyyeye muhtaçdır.

strong claim is that women must have a place wherever there is a need and the situation leads us to. For this, the principle we have is as follows: To be useful for the country in every kind of work a woman is capable of” (Muhiddin, 1931, p.11).²⁹

In the early years of the regime, Muhiddin criticised the Western feminism and and the Christian West. She supported the official ideology of Ottoman nationalism until the Balkan Wars, and in the following months she turned to the growing ideology of Turkish nationalism. Although she wrote articles for the *Sabah*, *İkdam* and *Peyam-ı Sabah* about pedagogy, psychology and literature between 1909 and 1912 (Hoyi, 1941), Muhiddin’s reputational trajectory started in 1912 after she delivered a speech in a conference organised by the Committee of Union and Progress. In her speech entitled “Hitabe”, she addressed Ottoman Muslim women. Muhiddin was referred to by *Kadınlar Dünyası* in 1913 as *edibe-i şehire* (famous woman writer) and *Türklerin büyük kadını* (the Great Women of Turks) (Muhteşem Neffel, 1914) afterwards. In this speech, the traces of her Ottoman nationalism, which stressed the solidarity of all Ottoman-Muslims, are manifest:

Our vile enemies Serbia, Greece, Montenegro, and Bulgaria saved their necks from old agreements with the help of friendship Christianity provided them with. Even the Bulgarians who got by on the income of service until recently...

You! The daughters of a great past of six-hundred years and the noble generation! I address you! Please do not turn these soils each part of which has the noble and heroic blood of your glorious ancestors. This great society of Turks who back in the past dominated the universe with power. (Nezihe Muhiddin 1912a). (Appendix A,30)

You, the young women of the Great Ottomans who frightened the universe in the skirts of Vienna, in Indian sea, on Spanish coasts and in Hungarian fields... (Nezihe Muhiddin, 1913).³⁰

²⁹ Bizim kuvvetli iddiamız, ihtiyacat ve icabat-ı hazıra bizi nerelere sevk ediyorsa kadının behemehal orada bir mevki olmasıdır. Bunun için vaz edeceğimiz düstur da şundan ibarettir: Kadının muvaffak olabileceği her işte memlekete mufid olmak.

Muhiddin became an ardent supporter of the CUP-initiated “Muslim Boycott” (Toprak, 1995, p. 107-11), which encouraged the consumption only of domestic goods. Muhiddin also delivered speeches to raise awareness about the national economy and asked women not to buy goods from the shops of minorities.

Have we found in ourselves the right to oppose and object while our Christian citizens have been working on their prosperity and happiness? Obviously, it is impossible not to respect rights. There is no doubt that our righteous citizens will appreciate our reasonable attempt... Here I say again. First comes our own identity! The development of our own community! There is no other vehicle that will save us... This strength will increase by worshipping our race and nation (Nezihe Muhlis (Muhiddin) 1913). (Appendix A,31)

Muhiddin also actively worked in women’s associations Esirgeme Derneği and founded women’s branch of Donanma Derneği³¹ (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 59-61). Her activities in these associations contributed to women’s visibility in social life. When Muhiddin channelled the activities of the Esirgeme Derneği to support the regime’s schools for girls (Industrial Girls School), she was criticised by her colleagues in articles in *Kadınlar Dünyası*. In a letter to the editor-in-chief of *Kadınlar Dünyası*, she sharply responded to the speculations that she was affiliated with the CUP, and denied the claim that the association she founded for the protection of women was working with the CUP. She argued that she fought for the ideals of womanhood rather than establishing alliances with political parties: “The certificates of appreciation awarded by the centre of the Committee of Union and Progress as a

³⁰ Ey Viyana önlerinde, Hint denizlerinde, İspanya sahillerinde Macaristan ovalarında cihana muhatap dehşet veren büyük Osmanlı kızları...

³¹ Established in 1909. Full name: The Ottoman Navy National Resistance Society.

result of my articles published in the Young Turks' newspaper have been a sign of my sacrifice I have made for my ideals" (N. Muhiddin, 1931, p. 42).³²

Muhiddin criticised the Committee of Union and Progress' policies towards the 1920s and accused the government for the hard political and economic situation the country faced, but at the beginning of her career she, albeit unintentionally, collaborated with the regime because her ideals overlapped with those of the regime.

4.2.5. Diverging reputational trajectories: Fatma Aliye continues subversion

During this period, Fatma Aliye continued her strategy of subversion in the early years of the new regime, and she was still able to get published. However, she had to change her strategy because she had lost most of her networks: Ahmed Midhat's death was particularly crucial. Moreover, with the overthrow of the Hamidian regime, she had become a potential target because of her father, who was against the Constitutional regime, and an ardent supporter of the Hamidian regime (Karaca, 2010, p. 15). In contrast to her attitude, Emine Semiye, who welcomed the new regime, mentions in a letter to Aliye that she was upset about her father's political alliance: "When our late father, whose name we have to honour, is opposed by the defenders of liberty due to some of his actions buried in the blackness of the past, I get very sad mourning for him in the depths of my heart (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, Emine Semiye to F. Aliye, 16/3, August 24, 1908).³³

³² Jön Türk gazetesinde intişar eden makalelerle İttihat ve Terakki merkezinden aldığım takdir ve teşekkürnameler sırf kendi mefkurem uğruna yaptığım fedakarlığımın birer kadirşinaslık nişaneleri oldu.

³³ Nâminı tebcil ile yâda mecbur olduğumuz pederimiz merhumun, mazinin siyahlıklarına gömülmüş bazı harekâtı ki ara sıra hürriyet-perveranın enzar-ı itirazına battıkça bu âcize de, onun acısını kalbimin en derin noktasında hissederek mustarip olmuştum.

Nonetheless, Aliye tried the strategy of subversion first, but changing politics and her familial troubles made her stop writing. Her subversion strategy is manifest in her insistence on writing and getting published in the earlier years of the regime, but in another language. She told Turkish-Russian intellectual Fatih Kerimi during his visit that she was writing a book about women's rights and duties in Islam, and added that she wanted to publish it in French in Europe. Upon Kerimi's suggestion that she publish it in Turkish so that people in the Ottoman society could benefit, Aliye strongly rejected this:

When published in Turkish no matter where, everyone with/out expertise will have access to it, and they will make a big issue out of it. The intellectual level of our male intellectuals on women and family is unfortunately quite low. They would attack me. I have already received various threats, anonymous letters and insults for some of my articles (Kerimi, 2001, p. 265).

By deliberately not writing in her native language, Aliye aimed to avoid criticism. She wisely made use of her cultural capital by being able to write in French and seems to have aimed for international reputation without further damaging her existing reputation at home. Aliye here, just like in the Hamidian period, sought to undermine the rules by using her cultural capital. Although she had lost most of her social capital, she tried to compensate for this through attending the Türk Ocağı, where she and Halide Edib gave lectures to raise awareness for the salvage of the nation (Adivar, 1930, p. 183). More interestingly, Emine Semiye expressed her appreciation of Fatma Aliye's articles in the Unionist newspaper *Şura-yı Ümmet*:

I went through the copies of *Tercümanı Hakikat* one by one yesterday. Akil Pasha's sister-in-law sent the copies of *Şuray-ı Ümmet*. Your articles are extremely good... It is beyond the capacity of anybody to challenge your knowledge in history and the precision of expression in

your writing (Fatma Aliye, 1890-1912, E. Semiye to F. Aliye, 16/4-a, Oct 29, 1908).³⁴

In the Hamidian Era, Fatma Aliye kept a certain distance from the CUP (which was then Committee of Ottoman Union) and their media outlets. It is important to note Ahmed Midhat's influence on this decision. However, here in the new regime Aliye seems to have collaborated with the new regime, although partially instead of entirely rejecting the institutions of the new regime and its official newspaper. She might have acted this way in order to be able to strike a better bargain, given her strong alliance with the Hamidian regime. Such a move enabled her to maintain her existing reputation in the earlier years of the new regime. She was still active and she founded women's associations, where she helped the poor and contributed to women's education. Her last book, *Cevdet Paşa ve Zamanı* (Cevdet Pasha and His Era), published in 1914, marked Aliye's fall from grace due to its content. In the book, Aliye's presentation of her father and the Hamidian Era contrasted with the official historiography of the CUP. Aliye's subversion strategy may have enabled the publication of this book as well, but soon after she had to submit. The number of her publications in this period decreased significantly (See Table 8). Kızıltan (1993, p. 29) also draws attention to Aliye's health problems and her daughter Zübeyde İsmet's conversion to Christianity in explaining Aliye's withdrawal from intellectual circles.

³⁴ Dün tek mil Tercüman-ı Hakikat'leri birer birer gözden geçirdim. Şura-yı Ümmet'leri de Akil Paşa'nın gelini hanımefendi gönderdi. Sizin makaleler fevkalade güzel....Tarihe olan vukufunuza, vuzuh-ı ifadenize çıkışabilmek herkesin haddi değildir.

Table 8. Distribution of Fatma Aliye’s Publications during Two Regimes

Number of	Hamidian Era (1889-1908)	Second Constitutional Era (1908-1922)
Books	9	3 (1910, 1913,1914)
Articles	36	5
Translations	6	None
Aliye’s translated works	4	None

4.2.6. Nigar bint-i Osman: The strategy of acquiescence

The Second Constitutional Era brings along a visible change in Nigar bint-i Osman’s reputational trajectory, just like Aliye’s. Her career seems to have benefitted from the atmosphere of freedom the new regime brought to Ottoman intellectual and social circles. Although Nigar mentions the social gathering earlier in 1889, Abdülhak Şinasi, who lived next door to Nigar, explains that the weekly mixed gatherings at her mansion started with the Second Constitutional Era, when she hosted men and women, Turks and foreigners together. It is also important to note that the early years of the new regime witnessed such literary salons. The Kıbrıslı Residence was filled with intellectuals just like the literary salons in Paris (Belge, 1994, p. 249). But in the following years of the new regime, Nigar’s intellectual career did not turn out to be as sumptuous as it was in these salons.

Apart from her financial resources, Nigar’s networks diminished significantly due to changing life conditions such as wars. She could not afford the tea parties she organized weekly. The Constitutional regime cut half of her income, and she described people in power as self-interested. In her diaries, she often writes on her loneliness: “What a sorrowful summer...I cannot stop crying every day” (13 Sept

1916).³⁵ “Time does not pass at all...No one knocks on my door today...Now, there really is nobody” (19 Sep 1916).³⁶

Nigar tried to continue her career by writing articles and poems for the periodicals during the early years of the regime. In her articles and poems, she surprisingly supported the binaries of men and women and often drew the portrait of the ideal woman as someone whose main duty is to establish a family and look after children. According to her, women must regard housework as one of the greatest pleasures (see her poem Sa’y and Amel). Moreover, despite being against the regime, she did not explicitly express her opposition, and instead employed a moderate tone:

The good intentions and help of our men is manifest in their sincerity and understanding in this newspaper. How is it possible not to appreciate the important duty of this beautiful sex that is the other half of humanity... The first feature that my heart deems appropriate for women is seriousness. The kindest and the most exceptional woman loses an important part of her womanhood unless she adorns this beauty with seriousness (Nigar bint-i Osman, 1908). (Appendix A,32)

The duty of women is holy
Much as she deserves it
A woman should not rebel
Her life is dedicated to seriousness
Because she is the source of her own sex
Indeed she is the mother! (Nigar bint-i Osman, 1909).³⁷

Nigar also extensively engages in the theme of patriotism. Her last poetry book *Elhan-ı Vatan*, published in 1916, was a compilation of Nigar’s poems with the theme of holy motherland. It was very much appreciated and brought Nigar much fame. Moreover, she actively worked in the women’s associations Hilal-i Ahmer and

³⁵ Ne hazin bir mevsim-i sayf...her gün ağlamak ihtiyacından kurtulamadım.

³⁶ Vakit geçmiyor...Kimseler açmaz bu gün bab-ı ikametgahımı...Şimdi işte şimdi hakikaten kimse yok.

³⁷ Muhteremdir vezâif-i nisvan./Ne kadar karı olsa mahviyet/Bir kadın etmemek gerek nisyan/ Ki bütün ömrü vakf-ı ciddiyet;/Çünkü hemcinsine odur masdar,/Çünkü mader, evet odur mader.

Cemiyet-i Hayriye.³⁸ She delivered speeches and recited poems in women's meetings: "Upon invitation I would go on the stage and address people. Sometimes I would see sincere ladies cry and thus console myself as I succeeded in passing some of my feelings of patriotism to others" (12 Dec 1913).³⁹

She was also among the speakers in women's meetings organised by Müdafı-ı Milliye Osmanlı Hanımlar Cemiyeti in 1913. After Halide Edib, she addressed women and recited two poems entitled "Koşalım Tehlikede Çünkü Vatan" and "Vatan". She also attended Türk Ocağı, the major cultural club of this era. Through covering social themes and activities in women's associations, Nigar acquiesced to the expectations from women in this period while trying to maintain her reputation in the Hamidian Era.

4.2.7. Emine Semiye: From collaboration to defiance

Emine Semiye's intellectual trajectory continued to flourish in this period. In the earlier months of the regime, her collaboration strategy was replaced with the strategy of defiance. Actively engaging in politics, she fought for women's rights through her articles, speeches and social activities. While negotiating women's rights, she employed by far the most radical language of the period. In her bargain, she often addressed men and argued that unless women were given rights immediately, men's efforts to salvage the nation will be futile. In the early months of the regime, she responded to Mehmed Cavid:

³⁸ Hilal-i Ahmer Cemiyeti was established during the Balkan Wars in 1913 with the support of Besim Omer Pasha and Cemiyet-i Hayriye was established in 1909.

³⁹ Davet olundukça kürsülere çıkıp irad-ı nutuk ediyor ve manzumeler inşad eyliyorum. Bazen samiinden olan hanımların ağladığını görüyor ve en samimi hissiyat-ı vatan-perveranemi ihsasa kısmen muvaffak olduğum için müteselli olmaya çalışıyorum.

Our righteous brother with whose intelligence and knowledge we are pleased with! Do not make us dizzy with many blows, us, the Ottoman ladies who have been oppressed till their souls although they have not yet claimed anything serious. It is a shame! This injustice is a great sin!... Whichever good you do for the nation, you will not be able to prevent the next generations from not thinking highly of you because of the oppositions caused by your latest nonchalant behaviours during women's oppression in a tragic point in the history of Islam (Emine Semiye, 1908). (Appendix A,33)

In the same article, Semiye praised Mehmet Cavid and distinguished Ottoman women from European women, who resorted to violent ways for their rights:

We, the women of Islam, are lucky that we have a brother as beautiful as your character...You, our righteous brother, you were caring for us at best, and promising nice things....

I regard it as an obligation to put an end to the severe attitude of our men towards us by saying that those who are supporters of feminism in our country (which once corresponded to all the noise) do not make the claims and demands of European women: We are not complaining about wearing headscarves. We remark that we would rather be surrounded with virtues and goodnesses rather than be surrounded with walls made of either stone or sand (Emine Semiye, 1908). (Appendix A,34)

Emine Semiye continued her collaboration strategy during the first months of the new regime. However, she was disappointed with its unwillingness to improve women's rights as promised. In a letter written to Şukufe Nihal published in *Mehasin*, Emine Semiye expressed her disappointment and frustration with the party in power:

Before liberty came, I had requested a little help for the women of Islam from a great person who served his country in many important ways. That person had strongly assured me... The reply I received from him is as follows: "We saved the liberty, but we could take only one step in erasing bigotry. You should wait; the time for the advancement of women will arrive. Such patriot women [like you] should not get hopeless and should keep working without losing their strength." As is obvious from this sentence, our advancement is left to us. We should

ourselves think of what our men does not want for us, and probably will want at the very last. So we should expect women's improvement from our women who understand that the next generation of women does not deserve to be deprived of justice of humanity (Emine Semiye, 1909). (Appendix A,35)

She explained that the government had guaranteed women's rights before they came to power, and now they asked women to wait. She was courageous enough to criticise the political party and organizations she sided with, and she could even go as far as seeking new alternatives by abandoning the old one. Later she joined the Ottoman Democrat Party founded by İbrahim Temo, who was also one of the founders of CUP, but he had dissented from it.

Emine Semiye's radical tone continued in her writings. While some male writers regarded women's participation in the workforce as the downfall of family life, Emine Semiye not only defended women's rights but also referred to women's visibility in the workforce as "kadın inkılabı" (women's reform), which was to inspire Nezihe Muhiddin in the early republican era to start the first women's political party.

It cannot be, under any circumstances, denied that women's reforms have started in our country despite the terrible war. Now, women have joined the workforce. The women with their sharp mind have understood the usefulness of working and earning money which has become a necessity. What all our intellectuals should do is to help women by sprinkling the path of reforms with flowers where women will walk past. The Turkish women are a central foundation of our nation that cannot be ignored (Emine Semiye, 1919). (Appendix A,36)

The idea of establishing families has significantly declined among our women. I see in women I contact a nonchalant attitude and deplorable and pitiful hatred about family... Today our women who have joined the workforce are mostly the narcissistic opponents of family. The women who make money are thinking of themselves only (M. Sırrı, 1918). (Appendix A,37)

In 1909, Emine Semiye described Selma Rıza as a fighter for women's rights: "The great fighter Lady Selma was working very hard for the improvement of the Girls' School before the disaster of 31 March...None of her friends will ever forget what she went through because of the violent attacks of the reactionaries".⁴⁰

4.3 Diverging reputational trajectories: The early Republican era

After the World War I, the Ottoman Empire was defeated. With the foundation of the Republic, "a systematic onslaught on Ottoman institutions" (Kandiyoti, 1991, p. 22) took place, and this affected intellectuals dramatically. There was a radical break with the Empire, and Islam was evacuated from the legislative sphere. Moreover, a set of reforms was promulgated to prevent any further Islamic identification. The compulsory romanisation of the alphabet, for example, made the works of the Great Women, such as Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman inaccessible to the new Turkish generation. In addition, a re-reading of Turkish history with a focus on pre-Islamic heritage also invalidated the efforts of those intellectuals who heavily drew on Islam such as Fatma Aliye.

The early Republican era rejected the memory of the Empire, regarding it as decadent, and instead forged a new sense of nationhood. In this vein, it created an image of "a new woman". This new concept of women did not include the Ottoman Turkish women intellectuals who had fought for women's rights for half a century (Parla, 1991). Most of the intellectual women who played an important role in the

⁴⁰ 31 Mart feciasından evvel İnasa Mahsus Sultaniyye'nin küşadı için mücadele-i şehiremiz Selma Hanımefendi pek çok ibraz-ı mesai eyliyordu.....irticaıyyunun savlet-i hun-aşamiyle neler çektiğini bütün muhibbeleri ebediyyen unutamayacaklardır.

Ottoman Women's Movement supported the new regime. Nonetheless, these women could not be among the Republic's "own" children (Toska, 1998, p. 77). The ideologues of the new regime were determined to create their own women intellectuals instead of allowing women intellectuals from the Ottoman Empire to represent the new woman.

The role of the new woman was to represent the ideals of the Republican ideology. The Republican woman produced by Kemalists abided by Atatürk's social project and she was totally obedient to political authority, and someone who gratefully appreciated the rights that the great saver had bestowed (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 187). Moreover, the culture of idolisation and glorification of Atatürk was established. The Great Women, despite appreciating the new regime and the founder Atatürk, had conflicts with the expectations of the authoritarian and the sexist regime. Some women, on the other hand, who were to be called the daughters of the Republic, could go beyond the new authority thresholds through their participation in this new culture, along with "the strategy of self-abasement and self trivialising" (Adak, 2007).

Sabiha Gökçen is an example of the new woman and she gained legitimacy through her commitment to the new regime. The title of her memoirs is quite instructive in terms of her devotion to the leader: *Atatürk'ün İzinde Bir Ömür* (A Life in the Path of Atatürk). Born in 1913, she was adopted by Atatürk in 1925. She became the first female pilot. The beginning and end of her narrative mark a life that had meaning only because it was lived according to the principles of Mustafa Kemal. The last sentence of the autobiography "only if I think of you, if I understand you, if

I love you, if I am in your path, I am” proclaims her *raison d’etre* (quoted in Adak, 2007, p. 34).

Şukufe Nihal, despite being an active intellectual woman during the Second Constitutional Era, managed to fit in the image of new woman of the Republic. She was also a member of the Women’s Union that was founded by Nezihe Muhiddin. Nihal’s writings are full of references to the new leader of the newly-founded Republic. Her article in the first issue of *Kadın Yolu* is a prime example: “Here [Çankaya Palace] this humble home belongs to a Western front commander who creates marvellous lightnings and thunder in solemn silence. . . Is this place the last point that transmits souls to God in the universe? The Great Veteran! The Great Hero (Şukufe Nihal, 1925)!⁴¹

The Great Women, however, challenged the glorification culture while demanding equality and participation in political and social life, and they did not easily succumb to the pressures of the Kemalist regime. Halide Edib, for example, refused to obey the new male authority through a self-imposed exile, and continued her intellectual practice abroad by challenging the regime at home. Nezihe Muhiddin lacked a consistent strategy and instead tried a number of actions while demanding political rights for women via establishing the first women’s political party in an era when the single-party regime was being established in Turkey (see Table 9). However, her financial resources and networks did not help her in her attempts unlike in Halide Edib’s case. Soon, therefore, she had to submit to the new regime and then she withdrew from the intellectual circles. Fatma Aliye shared Muhiddin’s

⁴¹ Burası (Çankaya Köşkü) bu mütevazı yuva, vakur bir sükunet içinde muazzam şimşekler, saikalar yaratan bir Garb cephesi kumandanına aittir. . . Burası kainatta ruhları uluhiyyete isal eden son merhale midir? Büyük Gazi! Büyük Kahraman

final fate because she was regarded as “antithetical to the goals of the Republic” (Marvel, 2011, p. 12), and she chose a “voluntary silence” with the emergence of the new regime (Kaymaz, 2009, p. 45). She had neither the financial resources nor the networks to strike a more advantageous bargain. Her familial issues may well have had an effect on her submission as well. Finally, Emine Semiye was not able to enjoy her previous reputation in the new regime either. Although she celebrated the Kemalist regime, she could not maintain her reputation and spent the rest of her life from 1923 to 1933 teaching literature at various high schools in Anatolia. In this part, I specifically focus on Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin, the second generation of the Great Women, and explain their strategies against the new authority thresholds of the Kemalist regime.

Table 9. The Strategies for Dealing with the Patriarchal Benevolence of the Kemalist Regime

Strategy	Women’s Action	Women
Defiance	Challenging	Halide Edib
No strategy	-	Nezihe Muhiddin

4.3.1. The field of politics and two diverging careers: Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin

Both Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin attempted to enter the political field in the early Republican era. Strongly believing that progress and reforms could not be achieved without women, Muhiddin founded the first women’s political party, the Women’s People’s Party (*Kadınlar Halk Fırkası*) in 1923, and Edib was chosen as a candidate for membership in the parliament by Turkish women’s organizations, but women were not yet granted political suffrage. According to Çalışlar (2010), Halide Edib was invited to the battlefield but not to the parliament (p. 308). When the war

was over, there was no more need for Halide Edib. Their attempt, however, was not welcomed at all and the consequences were different. Halide Edib made use of her networks abroad, which had been established during the Second Constitutional Era and she chose self-exile with her husband, Adnan Adıvar. She defied the regime through her writings abroad. Muhiddin was not as lucky as Halide Edib and due to the lack of a strategy, she faced a number of charges and had to submit to the pressures of the regime in the end. In one of her articles, she wrote as follows: “Those whose self esteem is damaged keep silent more easily” (Kadınlık Yüksektir, 1927).⁴² So she chose total silence, whereas Edib’s defiance strategy helped her maintain her reputation outside the country.

Halide Edib’s dispute with the leading cadre of the Kemalist regime had started earlier in the previous regime. Her attempt to enter the political field after the Independence War resulted in further problems. Women’s roles in the new regime were limited to motherhood and charity at most, and the political field was designated for men only. Edib rejected this notion and she thought it was time women had political rights. The result was to be a disappointment. Yusuf Ziya addressed Halide Edib as follows:

Now, finally the war is over, peace has come, some died and some survived, the motherland is saved and you have become unemployed... You wanted to become a member of the parliament? Or God forbid, something greater? What goodness is lying in your heart which has overflowed due to taking more than it could actually carry (quoted in Özer, 2001)!⁴³

⁴² İzzet-i nefsi kırılan insanlar daha kolaylıkla sükut ederler.

⁴³ Fakat nihayet harp bitti, sulh oldu, ölen öldü, kalan kaldı, vatan kurtuldu ve siz işsiz kaldınız. . . Mebusluk mu istiyordunuz, vekillik mi? Yoksa maazallah daha büyük bir şey mi?. . . İstiabisinden fazla yolcu almaktan tevessua uğrayan gönlünüzde kim bilir ne aslanlar yatıyordu!

Her husband, Adnan Adivar, was one of the founding members of the Progressive Republican People's Party, the opposition to Republican People's Party, and Edib was chosen as candidate to be a member in the parliament by Turkish women's organizations. Having been through disputes with the regime, Edib and Adivar left Turkey and went to England in 1925. Edib started to challenge the single party rule and the authoritarian Kemalist discourse afterwards. In 1926, she wrote the first volume of her biography *Memoirs*, and two years later the second volume *The Turkish Ordeal* was published. This second volume, Adak (2003) argues, was written as a response to the narration of [Atatürk's] self and the nation in *Nutuk* (The Speech), Mustafa Kemal's seminal speech delivered in 1927 in Ankara (p. 518).

Presenting a linear account of historical events starting in 1919, *Nutuk* described the heroic accounts of the Independence War of Turkey. After the delivery of *Nutuk*, a number of letters of defence and alternative autobiographies were written by some of Mustafa Kemal's political opponents, including Kazım Karabekir Pasha, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Dr. Rıza Nur and Halide Edib. After 1925, however, not only the political opposition but also its press was silenced, so these articles did not enjoy publicity in Turkey (Adak, 2003, p. 510). Taha Parla (1991) in his study on *Nutuk*, concludes that Atatürk's leadership was "paternalist and patriarchal" (p. 167).

Nutuk dismissed Edib's role in the Independence Struggle entirely and characterised her as *mandacı*-traitor based on a letter Edib sent Mustafa Kemal in 1919 vouching for the American mandate (Adak, 2003, p. 511). This marked Edib's transition from "the mother of the Turk" to a "traitor". As a response, Halide Edib in *The Turkish Ordeal*, gave a portrayal of both herself and Mustafa Kemal along with other leading people of the Independence Struggle. In her letter, Edib expresses her

loyalty to Mustafa Kemal several times. In addition, having recognised the problematic aspects the American mandate, she regarded it as “the lesser of two evils” (*ehven-i şer*) in given conditions rather than a willing suggestion (Kemal, 1984, p 64). In *Nutuk*, however, the issue of the American mandate was presented as a choice Halide Edib made over national independence.

Dear Sir,

...We regard the temporary American mandate covering the old and the new borders of Turkey as the lesser of two evils for us. Here are our reference points:

For these reasons, the American mandate that we must urgently ask for is not without any harm. We have to sacrifice our honour to a great extent (p. 66-7). (Appendix A,38)

Edib clearly challenged the narrative of *Nutuk* that depicted Mustafa Kemal “as the sole hero who had seen particular historical events while his political opponents and the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph were eradicated from the annals of Turkish history, regarded as “wrong and treacherous” (Adak, 2003, p. 518). Moreover, the interpretation of events by its narrator in *Nutuk* was taken as synonymous with historical facts. However, what Edib showed in *Turkish Ordeal* is that the Republic was founded by the leadership and strategic planning of Ali Fuat Pasha, Kazım Karabekir Pasha, Rauf Bey, and Colonel Refet rather than solely by Mustafa Kemal. *The Turkish Ordeal* underscores the fact that the nationalist movement in Anatolia began not with Mustafa Kemal but under the leadership of Kazım Karabekir in the east with the collaborative efforts of the Karakol organization, Kara Vasıf Bey and Major Cemaleddin (Adak, 2003).

Edib also presented the portrait of Mustafa Kemal after the opening of the Great Turkish Assembly in 1920 as follows:

He always considered every Turkish subject to have been brought into the world specially to serve his purpose: each was a member of the

collective mass of Turkish humanity which he meant to possess and command. And should a woman among them oppose him she would be given no chivalrous consideration, but would be ruthlessly dealt with by whatever horrid means he could devise (1928, p. 188-9).

He was by turns cynical, suspicious, unscrupulous, and satanically shrewd. He bullied, he indulged in cheap street-heroics. Possessing considerable thought quite undistinguished histrionic ability, one moment he could pass as the perfect demagogue-a second George Washington- and the next moment fall into some Napoleonic attitude. ...Of course, one knew all the time that there were men around him who were greatly his superior in intellect and moral backbone, and far above him in culture and education...Take any man from the street who is shrewd, selfish and utterly unscrupulous, give him the insistence and histrionics of a hysterical woman who is willing to employ any wile to satisfy her inexhaustible desires, then view him through the largest magnifying glass you can find- and you'll see Mustafa Kemal Pasha (1928, p. 185).

Due to her devotion to the Turkish nationalist movement, Edib often praised the people of Anatolia who fought for the nation. In *the Turkish Ordeal*, she exclaims as follows: “All through the ordeal for independence the Turkish people itself has been the supreme hero” (p.407). Edib was critical of the idolization and glorification culture in her own country:

My nation has earned her independence by an ordeal which will stand out as one of the hardest and noblest in the world's history. But she has another ordeal to pass through...it is called the Ordeal of Freedom. In the unending struggle for freedom, there can be no real individual symbol, no dictator. (1928, p. 407).

Although her reputation was slandered at home, Halide Edib showed resistance and chose to challenge the authoritarian policies of the new regime instead of participating in the idolization and the glorification culture. Her foreign networks, which were established during the Second Constitutional Era, and her her ability to write in the English language helped her maintain her reputation abroad. She was an important figure in the intellectual milieus in various countries such as the US,

England and India. She gave lectures at universities and kept writing about the regime in Turkey.

4.3.2. Nezihe Muhiddin: Lack of strategy and fall from grace

Nezihe Muhiddin, however, was to experience a different fate. Looking at her writings and activist stance, Muhiddin does not seem to have employed a particular strategy throughout her career in the early Republican era. At the outset, she sounded very determined to acquire political suffrage and initiated a women's political movement. When the political climate changed in 1925, her tone changed as well and got moderate. Having been through accusations by the regime in 1927, Muhiddin surprisingly praised the Kemalist regime again in 1931. Nonetheless, she could not maintain her reputation. I argue that this lack of strategy had a big impact on Muhiddin's fall from grace.

Muhiddin founded the first women's political party, the Women's People's Party (*Kadınlar Halk Fırkası*) in 1923, for she believed women were a central part of the new regime and they deserved full equality. Nezihe Muhiddin argued as follows: "In this period when there are efforts to recover and to improve the country, reforms are bound to be useless if women are ignored" (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 139). So, she was often radical in her speeches and sounded very determined to get political suffrage:

Even though they do not give them [rights] to us, we will get them. No doubt, justice is a result of effort and activism. Intellectual attempts and activities that our women have carried out for the last fifteen years have given us a right. The reality of our country orders that we fill in those positions (Nezihe Muhiddin, 1923). (Appendix A,39)

Why would women not benefit from political rights while men can do so? Are women in an inferior position in some aspects? What kind of

difference of right can we seek between Saka Mehmed Aga and Lady Fatma in terms of political rights (Türk Kadınları, Cumhuriyet, 1926)?⁴⁴

Representing a threat to the Kemalist ideology that assigned women the role of mere spectators to the reforms and as mothers raising children for the nation (Zihnioğlu, 2003), the first women's political party did not receive the approval of the government after waiting for eight months. Nezihe Muhiddin did not step back, and the party was turned into an association as the regime demanded. The change, however, also marked the removal of the second clause of the party programme, which demanded political rights for women. The (Turkish) Women's Union (*Kadınlar Birliği*) was established in 1924.

The intervention of the regime brought along a change in Nezihe Muhiddin's tone. According to Zihnioğlu (2003), she must have realized that she had to participate in the glorification culture, not to be seen as the enemy of the regime. She started a magazine entitled (*Türk Kadın Yolu*) in 1925, and until 1927 this magazine served as the media outlet of the Turkish Women's Union. The articles here often appreciated Mustafa Kemal and the new regime.

Now *Kadın Yolu* has joined the world of press taking advantage of the great tolerance of our position. Our purpose is not being meaningless and fanatic suffragettes....Let us glorify the republic that makes us understand the happy transformation and the President of the republic who is the great founder of the republic (Nezihe Muhiddin, 1925).⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Erkekler hukuki siyasiyyeden istifade ediyorlar da kadınlar niçin etmesinler? Ba'zı cihetlerde kadınlar erkeklerden daha mı dun bir mertebededir? Saka Mehmed Ağa ile çamaşırçı Fatma hanım arasında hukuk-ı siyasiyye nokta-i nazarından ne gibi bir hakk-ı rüchan aranmalıdır?

⁴⁵ İşte: Kadın Yolu vaz'iyetimizin şu fevka'l-'ade müsaadecarlığından istifade ederek meydan-ı intişara çıktı. Maksadımız, ma'nasız ve müfrit bir sufrajetlik değildir.....Bize bu mes'ud tahavvülü idrak ettiren Cumhuriyeti ve onun 'amil-i mübecceli olan dahi Re'is-i cumhurumuzu takdis edelim.

Muhiddin's moderate tone can also be seen in other newspapers. In an interview, for example, she recognized Mustafa Kemal's leadership, and explained that they were far from all kinds of ambitions:

None of us is thinking of being a member of the parliament. However, we want to be able to vote....The life of political parties led to the catastrophe of political ambitions. However we regard the People's Party that has come together around the principles of the founder of the new Turkey Mustafa Kemal Pasha as a strength which is savior and noble... We in the life of womanhood regard sectarianism in its extensive meaning. The first meaning we find in the word of party is carrying out activities in society. We are away from all kinds of ambitions (interview by T. N., 1923). (Appendix A,40)

Another example of Muhiddin's moderate tone:

All intellectuals along with the men of the government are supporters of Turkish women's acquisition of political rights, particularly the President Gazi Pasha wishes that women would become successful and advanced just like he has created all the regeneration in the country. Our civilized men are of the same opinion. Due to all this support, we are, beyond any doubt, away from making any noise. Our propaganda is positive and constructive (Kadınlık Aleminde, Cumhuriyet, 1925). (Appendix A,41)

Muhiddin's changing tone makes sense given the political climate of 1925. The Seyh Sait rebellion was suppressed, the Progressive Republican Party was shut down, and its leaders were put on trial. Newspapers of the Second Constitutional Era such as *Tanin*, *İstiklal* and *İleri* were closed down and the journalists, some of whom were friends of Muhiddin, were arrested. In order to pursue her initiatives in the Women's Union, Muhiddin seems to have deliberately made use of a moderate tone.

During such political incidents, the Turkish Women's Union nominated Nezihe Muhiddin and Halide Edib as candidates for an empty position in the parliament in 1925. This attempt was mostly criticised in various articles particularly in *Cumhuriyet*. The Union and Nezihe Muhiddin in particular quickly became targets of criticism:

We could not just nonchalantly watch our women's preoccupation with the propaganda of becoming members of parliament and related advertisements...So far most of the women who claim to participate in politics against us have not done anything serious apart from putting forward the adventures that either they have experienced or they wish they experienced as a story or novel. Are we going to give political rights to these women (Hanımlar Faaliyetde!, *Cumhuriyet*, 1925)? (Appendix A,42)

Apart from male writers, a woman, Muallim Nakiye (Elgün) also joined the chorus of the Union's criticism and argued that the women's movement was unnecessary (Zihnioğlu 2003:158). She was to be among the female members of parliament in March 1935, while Muhiddin was to be the target of a slander campaign by the regime in 1927.

Muhiddin regarded women's history as a continuity, and thus countered the myth of discontinuity in the national historiography. This attempt brought about a dispute with the Kemalist regime. The new woman of the Republic was one that was to be supported by Mustafa Kemal and who was to grow up with the reforms of the Republic. Muhiddin's political and cultural background as an intellectual woman is, according to Zihnioğlu (2003, p. 229), another reason why Muhiddin fell apart with the Kemalists. Rejecting the continuity of the reforms and the cultural and political heritage from the Ottoman era, Kemalists who sought to exert control over matters concerning women by discounting women's struggles in the past and present first ignored Muhiddin and the Women's Union (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 229). Recep Peker's words evince that the government denied that the campaign of Women's Union for suffrage in 1927 represented women: "The Women's Union is a committee that *pretends* to represent womanhood and its claims" (quoted in Zihnioğlu 1998, p. 10, emphasis mine).

By the year 1927, the Union had opened branches in other cities and had increasing numbers of members. They had also established links with international organizations such as the International Alliance for Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship and the League of Nations. When the Union voiced demands for political suffrage one more time in 1927, the government intervened. A court case against Muhiddin was opened. A number of charges were levelled against her for corruption, falsification and embezzlement (Zihniođlu, 1998, p. 190). During these days, Yunus Nadi (1927) in *Cumhuriyet* celebrated Muhiddin's banishment from the Union in an article entitled "Çok Şükür Kurtulduk" (Thank God, We're Saved!): Thank God, the persistent and obstinate responses of the Women's Union have come to an end. Whew, we're saved! We are free of the feeling of suffocation every day with the tendency of throwing up."⁴⁶ In 1929, she could finally escape these through a general amnesty proclaimed that year. She entered a period of silence afterwards. In her comparison of the Women's Union in Turkey with the Egyptian Feminists' Union, Aksu Bora (2008) notes that after Muhiddin's dismissal, the Women's Union was legitimised, and attained a set of rights primarily that of suffrage, whereas women in Egypt were given only limited rights within twenty years time (pp. 60-61). Moreover, in the local elections of 1930 and national elections of 1935, women who were nominated were mostly from the Women's Union (Çakır, 1994, p. 78).

When Latife Bekir, the new chair of Women's Union, was asked by a journalist whether the Union was going to engage in women's politics, she responded as follows: "No, we are not dreamers like Nezihe Hanım", and she added that they

⁴⁶Kadın Birliđi'nin anud ve iddiacı karşılıkları hamd olsun son bulmuştur....Oh, diyoruz aman kurtulduk! Artık her gün kusma eğilimi içinde bunalmaktan kurtulduk!"

would focus only on charity (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 258). Latife Bekir gave an opening speech during the International Women's Congress held in Istanbul in 1935. The Turkish delegates, without exception, referred to Atatürk "as our great leader" in their speeches, and expressed their gratitude to him for providing women with rights (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 257).

In 1931, Muhiddin joined the glorification culture in her last book. She dedicated it to Mustafa Kemal as follows: "To the Great Leader, the Great Savior, the Great Guide, Unique Brilliance, the Hero Great Mustafa Kemal Pasha's luminous trail".⁴⁷ She does not mention the work of the Women's Union in the book, which seems to be a result of self-censorship (Zihnioğlu, 2008, p. 249). Muhiddin's leader worship shows itself in the preface and the following chapters of her book *Türk Kadını*:

Gazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha...
The Great Guide, taking a small part from your bright torch which was created by unique brilliance...
As soon as the incomparable guide of the reform of republic saved the country from a hopeless and miserable agony, the Great saviour offered his hand to Turkish women.
With the inspiration, the Turkish woman got from her dear guide... (p. 1-3,58,113). (Appendix A,43)

4.4. Conclusion

The Ottoman field of cultural production throughout the three periods I examined was dominated by patriarchal rules, yet there were women who could enter the intellectual circles and make their reputations. The rules of the field were mostly directly gendered, in that there were explicit binaries as to what women should write,

⁴⁷ Büyük rehber Büyük kurtarıcı, Büyük Mürşid, misilsiz deha, kahraman, Büyük Gazi Mustafa Kemal Paşa Hazretlerinin ziyadar izine.

both in content and genre. Moreover, the space for women was motivated by instrumental reasons such as improving the conditions of the Empire through changes in women's conditions. Nonetheless, women struck bargains against such constraints, and developed strategies through which they pursued their intellectual aspirations by fighting the patriarchal rules.

Examining the Great Women's reputational trajectories in three periods, I offered four analytical categories regarding their strategies: collaboration, acquiescence, subversion and defiance. These are neither inclusive nor exhaustive and indeed, women changed strategies throughout their careers. Fatma Aliye, Emine Semiye and Nigar bint-i Osman started their intellectual trajectories in the Hamidian Era, and Nezihe Muhiddin and Halide Edib joined these women in the Second Constitutional Era that started with the Young Turk Revolution in 1908. The foundation of the Republic marked the fall of the Great Women, except for Halide Edib who was able to deal with the patriarchal benevolence of the Kemalist regime through the strategy of defiance. The regime changes meant changes in women's resources as well, and the success of their strategies was informed by their evaluation of these resources. As a result, their intellectual careers diverged at times.

In the next chapter, I offer an evaluation of the components of the Great Women's strategies, and argue that strategies were indeed decisive in making and also losing reputations. I close with a discussion of the concept of strategy through the careers of the woman intellectuals discussed here.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Evaluation of the Great Women's strategies

Instead of using simple accounts, i.e personal circumstances and ideological congruence, to explain women's reputational trajectories, I have argued that it was women's strategies which were informed by the field rules in each period that gained them reputation. As the trajectories of other contemporary writers show, the lack of a consistent strategy does not enable one to enter intellectual milieus at the outset or it tarnishes one's existing reputational trajectory, as Nezihe Muhiddin's fall from grace in the early Republican era exemplifies. However, although all members of the Great Women made use of various strategies in three different regimes, they acquired different amounts of reputation: some became outstanding writers, whereas some were overshadowed by others. So employing strategies alone is not sufficient to make reputations. Two questions arise here: To what extent is strategy decisive in fighting the patriarchal oppression in the intellectual field and making reputations, and how can we account for the reputational divergence among the Great Women? To answer these questions, I will discuss the strategies of the Great Women in a comparative fashion in three periods. Then I propose that we consider them with those women who could not establish their reputations and stayed far from the intellectual circles. I do not aim to offer a conclusive account regarding women's reputational trajectories and it is not my purpose to answer the general question of what brings women reputation. My analysis is based on five women, and I offer only suggestive evidence.

5.1.1 Comparative analysis of strategies in the Hamidian era

Fatma Aliye, Nigar bint-i Osman and Emine Semiye were the first generation of the Great Women, and started their careers during the Hamidian Era. Nigar bint-i Osman started her intellectual trajectory in 1887 with her poetry book *Efsus*, whereas Fatma Aliye began hers two years later with the translation of George Ohnet's *Volonte*. Emine Semiye joined the intellectual circle rather late in 1895 through her articles in the *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*. In Chapter 4, I have argued that Fatma Aliye employed the strategy of subversion, Nigar the strategy of acquiescence and Emine Semiye preferred to collaborate while negotiating the patriarchal codes of the Ottoman field of cultural production.

I shall now take a closer look at these strategies, and offer an evaluation based on four criteria (see Table 10). The first one is ideological congruence, and as discussed earlier it refers to explicitly defending the values of the regime along with showing loyalty and attachment to the regime and those in power. Social capital refers to one's networks, whereas cultural capital is having the right kind and the necessary level of knowledge in the field. Use of cultural capital, on the other hand, refers to the way one puts her knowledge into use. For example, if one supports women's education and emphasises the roles of motherhood and wifehood while staying neutral or even criticising the regime and the party in power, this denotes a good use of cultural capital. Use of cultural capital differs from ideological congruence in that one may not be a supporter of the regime while making good use of her cultural capital to open up space for herself. Nigar bint-i Osman in Hamidian Era and Halide Edib in the Second Constitutional Era exemplify this.

Table 10. Components of the Strategies in the Hamidian Era

Woman Intellectual	Ideolog. Cong.	Social Capital	Cultural Capital	Use of Cultural Capital	Reputation	Strategy
Fatma Aliye	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Subversion
Emine Semiye	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Collaboration
Nigar bint-i Osman	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Acquiescence

Fatma Aliye's successful subversion strategy shows that one needs serious resources to subvert the male authority. She needs to support the values of the prevailing ideology in a given period and has contact with the important and influential figures of the day. Moreover, she needs to be well educated and also must use this knowledge in an appropriate way to propagate the expectations from women. It is important to note here that in the subversion strategy one does not undermine all the rules; instead she upholds some rules while indirectly violating others for personal gain. The more resources one possesses, the more successful she becomes in the strategy of subversion as Fatma Aliye's intellectual trajectory as the first Ottoman woman writer proves.

Emine Semiye's collaboration strategy makes sense given that she did not have much social capital when she started her career, whereas other women had already established important networks. When compared to her sister Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman, she was a latecomer to the intellectual circles, so her best move was to collaborate with the patriarchy and establish networks first. She could have tried the strategy of subversion, but it would not have been as advantageous as collaboration due to her lack of social capital although she possessed all other resources in full. So collaboration seems the best strategy for someone who is a latecomer to the field. Emine Semiye's strategy changed in the second constitutional period as did her resources.

Nigar bint-i Osman's acquiescence shows that the fewer resources one has, the more she is likely to employ this strategy. Nigar did not have a specific agenda to defend the values of the regime; nor did she offer her cultural capital to be appropriated by the regime to serve its agenda through her works. Nonetheless, she was able to enter the intellectual milieus easily and make her reputation through her national and international networks. She did not choose to collaborate with the regime/or did not need to. Similarly, subversion would not be the best move for her given her lack of ideological congruence and genre choice. She simply preferred not to challenge the regime and agree with its expectations while at the same time acquiring reputation.

5.1.2 Comparative analysis of strategies in the Second Constitutional era

Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin started their intellectual trajectories in this period and joined the first generation of the Great Women. Halide Edib started her career through her articles in *Tanin*, whereas Muhiddin worked as a teacher first, and then became a public speaker and journalist. Table 11 displays the components of the strategies the Great Women employed in this period.

Table 11. Components of the Strategies in the Second Constitutional Era

Woman Intellectual	Ideolog. Cong.	Social Capital	Cultural Capital	Use of Cultural Capital	Reputation	Strategy
Fatma Aliye	N	Y	Y	N	N	Subversion
Emine Semiye	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Defiance
Nigar bint-i Osman	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Acquiescence
Halide Edib	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Collaboration
	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Acquiescence
Nezihe Muhiddin	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Collaboration

Fatma Aliye continued her subversion strategy in this period as well, but it did not help her maintain her reputation. As a result of the regime change, she lost some of her resources and she was not as advantageous as she was during the Hamidian Era in terms of resources. She did not support the new party, the Committee of Union and Progress, and she did not use her pen to propagate the ideal woman of the new regime in the long run. Instead, she preferred to write in another language to tackle the authority thresholds and criticised the party in power. She did not totally reject the institutions and media outlets of the regime and, at times, she even participated in them, but she soon lost her reputation. Considering the diminishing resources of Fatma Aliye, the best strategy for her would have been acquiescence, and thus she could have maintained not only her reputation but also improved it further.

The best strategy for Nigar bint-i Osman would have been subversion given that her resources seem to increase in this period. Although she did not side with the party in power, she addressed social themes such as nationalism and portrayed the ideal woman first and foremost as mother and wife in her works. She seems to uphold certain values, and this would have allowed her to subvert the male authority through her cultural and social capital. However, she continued her acquiescence strategy and lost most of her reputation.

Emine Semiye chose to defy the male authority instead of collaborating with it, as she had done in the Hamidian Era. Given her resources, she was able to subvert the gendered rules of the field by upholding at least some of its values through which she could enjoy her sister Fatma Aliye's huge success during the Hamidian period. However, she preferred the strategy of defiance and still maintained her reputation because she was rich in terms of resources.

It is interesting that Halide Edib collaborated with the male authority in the earlier years of her career. She supported the regime, was well educated and was writing for the Unionist newspaper *Tanin*. She could have tried to subvert the rules, but she was poor in terms of social capital, just like Emine Semiye at the beginning of her career. Halide Edib was also a latecomer to the field, compared to the first generation of the Great Women. The strategy of acquiescence which she employed later in her career seems the best choice to maintain her initial reputation after she fell apart with the Unionists because of her ideas on the Armenian issue.

Nezihe Muhiddin's choice of collaboration also displays the same patterns with Emine Semiye and Halide Edip at the outset of their careers: One is well educated, defends the values of the regime and emphasises the roles of women as mothers and clarifies the expectations from them, but lacks social capital. In this case collaboration becomes the best strategy, at least until one gets rich in terms of networks. Both Edib and Semiye changed their strategies later in their careers, but Muhiddin was not successful in employing another strategy in the next period, which actually marked her fall from grace.

5.1.3 Comparative analysis of strategies in the early Republican era

All members of the Great Women lived to see the Republican regime except Nigar bint-i Osman, who passed away in 1918. Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye did not continue their efforts to exist in the republican intellectual circles, mostly due to familial issues, and chose submission. Halide Edib and Nezihe Muhiddin, however, tried to continue their intellectual trajectory. The former employed the strategy of defiance, whereas the latter did not have a primary strategy from 1923 until 1931, when she wrote *Türk Kadını*. As a result, Halide Edib was able to maintain her

reputation, whereas Nezihe Muhiddin was pushed out of intellectual circles (for the analysis of their strategies, see Table 12).

Table 12. Components of the Strategies in the Early Republican Era

Woman Intellectual	Ideol. Cong.	Social capital	Cultural Capital	Use of Cultural C	Reputation	Strategy
Fatma Aliye	N	N	Y	N	N	No strategy
Emine Semiye	Y	N	Y	N	N	No strategy
Halide Edib	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Defiance
Nezihe Muhiddin	Y	Y	Y	Y-N	N	No particular strategy

Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye lost most of their resources and the necessary avenues to make use of them, and chose to submit instead of trying a strategy as they had done in the last two regimes. As someone with the least resources, the best strategy would be acquiescence, but it would also require either ideological congruence or social capital. They lacked both. Halide Edib's intellectual trajectory goes from collaboration to defiance here, as did Emine Semiye's in the Hamidian and Constitutional eras. She refused the roles the republican regime cast for women, and did not use her knowledge in the way the republican regime asked. She had already established social networks and chose to defy the patriarchal authority rather than acquiescing. She had far more resources for the strategy of acquiescence. As for Nezihe Muhiddin, subversion would be the best strategy because she was rich in resources, and indeed there were times she attempted to subvert the new rules, but she lacked consistency. Her efforts in this period display characteristics of acquiescence and collaboration at different times as I have shown in Chapter 4. The political climate of the period could be the reason why Nezihe Muhiddin was not able to employ a primary strategy in the new regime.

In order for the subversion strategy to be successful, one needs to have ideological congruence, as Fatma Aliye's reputational trajectory shows. Her attempt to subvert the male authority in the Hamidian Era when she defended the values of the regime brought her success, whereas in next regime, the same strategy failed because she was no longer attached to the values of the Constitutional regime (see Table 13). As Nigar's career shows, the strategy of acquiescence does not always bring success if one lacks ideological congruence. Indeed, it brought Nigar reputation early in her career, but her acquiescence strategy failed in the Second Constitutional era (see Table 14).

Table 13. The Strategies Employed in Case of Ideological Congruence and Reputation

Strategy	Who	When	Reputation
Subversion	F. Aliye	Hamidian Era	✓
Collaboration	E. Semiye	Hamidian Era	✓
Defiance	E. Semiye	Second Cons. Era	✓
Defiance	H. Edib	Early Rep. Era	✓

Table 14. The Strategies Employed in Case of Non-ideological Congruence and Reputation

Strategy	Who	When	Reputation
Subversion	F. Aliye	Second Cons. Era	X
Acquiescence	Nigar	Hamidian Era	✓
Acquiescence	Nigar	Second Cons. Era	X

5.1.4 The Great Women vs other women

I did not offer detailed analyses of the intellectual trajectories of other contemporary woman intellectuals with the Great Women. Nonetheless, three instances in which other contemporary woman writers failed to gain reputations appear. First, one of the reasons why Makbule Leman, a contemporary of the first generation of the Great Women, was not able to achieve as much reputation as the Great Women was her lack of Western cultural capital. Her initial cultural capital must have enabled her to work as the editor-in-chief of *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, but in a period when the Ottoman Empire was going through a modernization project, her lack of knowledge of Western works and languages prevented her from furthering her reputation and eventually from becoming one of the Great Women. Likewise, Olga de Lebedeva, known as Madam Gülnar, was not knowledgeable enough to make an intellectual career in the Ottoman field of cultural production, and was regarded as a “mediocre woman” by Ahmed Midhat. In her case, ethnicity may have been another factor in explaining her diverging career compared to other women in the period, which remains to be examined in further research.

Second, Selma Rıza’s diverging intellectual trajectory with that of the Great Women, particularly with Emine Semiye’s in the Hamidian era, shows the importance of social networks and ideological congruence in making reputations (see Table 15). Emine Semiye was the daughter of Cevdet Pasha, sister of Fatma Aliye, whereas Selma Rıza was the sister of Ahmed Rıza, one of the founders of the Committee of Union and Progress. Because of her family background, which was a threat to the Hamidian regime, Selma Rıza, despite having enough cultural capital was not able to make her reputation, and she could not establish networks with the

leading intellectuals of the period, either. This does not necessarily make ideological congruence the prerequisite for gathering social capital. It was Nigar bint-i Osman's social capital that brought her reputation in the absence of ideological congruence during the Hamidian Era. Eventually, Selma Rıza could not escape being a forgotten woman. She had to wait until after the Young Turk Revolution to start her career.

Table 15. The Factors behind Emine Semiye and Selma Rıza's Diverging Reputational Trajectories during the Hamidian Era

	Ideological Cong	Social Capital	Cultural Capital	Reputation
Emine Semiye	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Selma Rıza	No	No	Yes	No

The last instance of a diverging career emerges during the early republican era when Şukufe Nihal, despite having an Ottoman background, was actually able to maintain and even further her reputation during the Second Constitutional era (see Table 16). She did not challenge the republican regime at all, and collaborated with the Kemalist regime and used her pen to propagate the ideal of the new woman, which in turn provided her with safety in intellectual milieus when the Great Women were confronted with harsh conditions.

Table 16. The Factors behind Nezihe Muhiddin and Şukufe Nihal's Diverging Reputational Trajectories in the Early Republican Era

	Ideolog. Cong	Social Capital	Cultural Capital	Use of Cultural Capital	Reputation
N. Muhiddin	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Ş. Nihal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

5.2 Discussion

What is strategy? Bourdieu himself does not offer a full definition of the concept, but it often appears in his various analyses. According to Bourdieu (1993),

there is an ongoing struggle within a field among the agents over the distribution of specific capital, and the agents implement strategies to change their position within the field. He identifies two types of strategies which are shaped by an actor's positioning in the field: conservation and subversion strategies. The former is used by dominant actors with the purpose of preserving the hierarchies and the way capital is distributed within the field, while the latter is adopted by dominated actors who are often also the newcomers, and therefore generally the youngest (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 73). The purpose of a subversion strategy is to transform the system of authority within the field and the rules to one's own benefit. The findings of this study, however, go beyond this binary of conservation and subversion strategies, and shows that the subordinated actors are not always inclined to implement subversion strategies as Bourdieu argues.

The intellectual trajectories of eight women intellectuals who were indeed endowed with the least symbolic capital of the Ottoman field of cultural production and thus went through struggles to enter the field did employ three more strategies: collaboration, acquiescence and defiance. It is possible to think of these three strategies, along with subversion, on a continuum (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. Great Women's Strategies on a Continuum.

The ends of the continuum represent accommodation and resistance strategies, the first two being accommodation and the last two resistance. This means actors, at times, choose accommodation rather than resistance to the system of authority. The

reason for this has to do with the kind and volume of capital one possesses entering the field, as I have shown. In the case of women intellectuals, they did not always have enough resources to resist, so they waited until they were rich enough in terms of the necessary capital to adopt a resistance strategy. This is not to say that resistance strategies were ultimately better than the accommodation strategies, and the factors that determined the choice were both one's already existing capital and habitus.

Another interesting finding of this study was that actors did not always resort to covert strategies, and at times overt resistance or accommodation was more useful in challenging the authority, as well as bending the rules to their own benefit. Considering the overt and covert nature of the strategies along with the continuum above enriches the understanding of strategies and allows us to think of them in two dimensions (see Table 17).

Table 17. Evaluation of Strategies in Two Dimensions

	Overt	Covert
Accommodation	Collaboration	Acquiescence
Resistance	Defiance	Subversion

When women were involved in the field as agents, the picture seems more complicated than what Bourdieu has suggested. This multi-dimensional nature of the concept of strategy seems to be the result of addition of gender factor into the Bourdieusian analyses. I have argued earlier that Bourdieu's sociological enterprise is not fully developed on gender, and this study with its revision of strategies offers a contribution.

The evidence I presented regarding the intellectual trajectories of the Great Women, however, not only contributes to Bourdieusian studies, but it also brings along a number of questions with which I would like to close: In other fields where rules are gendered and when women are latecomers to the field, would women's strategies still be along these two dimensions, or could there be more levels? Kandiyoti (1988) shows that there are different forms of patriarchy in different geographical settings, and accordingly, different forms of relationship between men and women are established. Do these different forms of patriarchy bring about new strategies, or do they confirm the two dimensional results this study suggests?

What kind of strategies do male intellectuals implement while entering the field? Given that even obscure males have more advantages than women at the outset of their entrance to field, how would their strategies diverge from those of women? Would they, for example, still need to acquiesce when they lack resources? Would they prefer collaboration, and what would require them to employ the defiance strategy? Or would they resort to subversion strategies only, as Bourdieu argues? How would we evaluate the falls and rises in the prominent intellectual figure Ahmed Midhat's reputational trajectory? Did a lack of strategy lead him to fall from grace in the Second Constitutional era?

The strategies women intellectuals employed took place in authoritarian regimes where illiberal practices were widely applied (monarchy, constitutional monarchy and the early years of the Kemalist Republic). Would there be the same strategies when women's intellectual trajectories in liberal regimes where the basic rights have been protected by law were examined? Or would the different relationship to the regime bring along different strategies?

The Great Women's intellectual trajectories have proved that adding gender to analyses brings about a multilayered analysis of strategies of subordinated actors entering a field. When there are more factors involved such as ethnicity, race and religion, how do women's strategies change? Does research on subaltern groups' entrance to various fields display the same results?

APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL QUOTATIONS IN OTTOMAN TURKISH

[1] Dikkat buyuruyor musunuz? Bu miskinane muterizlerin kaffesi doğrudan doğruya veyahut dolayısından hep *Volonte*'yi tercümenizden dolayıdır. Çekemezler efendim çekemezler! Kendilerinin aciz kaldıkları muzafferiyat-ı kalemiyede bir kadının muvaffakiyat-ı galibanesini çekemezler....Akvam-i sairede bir kadın yalan yanlış dört lakırdıyı bir yere getirecek olsa kadirşinasan ricali alkışlaya alkışlaya avuçlarını kabartırlar. Biz ise kendimize faik nisvanımızı görürüz de güya onlardan aşağıda görünmemekliğimiz için şöyle bir celadet-i merdane ile o mukaddes kadınları yıldırımak hususunda olanca kuvve-i merdanemizi ibraz ederiz. Hay Allah layıkımızı versin!

[2] “Nigar” dedim de hatırıma geldi. İstokholm’e götürdüğüm kitaplar içine onun da ma’hud risale-i eş’arını koymuşlar. Hafız-ı kütübler kitapları sınıflara taksim için benim de muavenetime arz-ı ihtiyaç eylediler. O zamana kadar görmemiş olduğum bu esere dikkat edeyim ki sevmediğim bir yolda. Avrupa’nın da hiç beğenemeyeceği bir surette! Ne dersiniz? Risaleyi yavaşça çalıp mahvetmeyeyim mi? Bir Osmanlı hanımı böyle şiir yazacağına hiç yazmasın daha a’ladır.

[3] İkmal-i Meram’dan sonra bir risale telifi niyetinde bulunduğunuzu beyan buyurmakla bahtiyarlığımı tezyid eyliyorsunuz. Böyle şan-ı Osmanimizi i’laya medar olacak hizmetlerde Ahmed Midhat’ı daima kendinize yardımcı addediniz. Hatta size şunu da arz edeyim ki Müştşerikin Kongresi’nin gelecek içtimasına Osmanlı erbab-ı aklamından arzu eylediğim zevatın birçok asarını göndermeyi katiyen kararlaştırmış olduğum gibi diğer kerime-i maneviyem Makbule Lemana Hanımefendi’yi de nisvan-ı şarkıyeye dair bir risale kaleme almaya teşvik eyledim. Böyle bir teşviki zat-ı ulyanıza da edemez miyim?

[4] Nisvan-ı İslam hakkında te’lifini arzu eylediğim kitabı Makbule Lemana Hanımefendi’nin yazmaya başlamış olduğunu tahmin eyleyebilirim...Ma’a haza sizin de böyle bir kitap yazmanızda bir beis olmak şöyle dursun, bir de nef’-i azim vardır. Ba-husus ki siz Avrupalı madamlar ile gūzar eyleyen muhaveratınız üzerine bina-yı telif edeceksiniz...Ama min-gayri haddin size şunu ihtar edeceğim ki o kitapta Nisvan-ı İslamı nisvan-ı nasara ve ba-husus Avrupalılar ile mukayese için onların aleyhlerinde hiçbir muhakemeye girişilmeyecektir.Maksad onların teveccühlerini celb etmektir. Hiddetlerini tahrik değil!

[5] Şimdi gelelim size: Nazımda ne güzel iktidarınız var! Ne selis söylüyorsunuz! Nitekim! Şiirin en güzeli de budur. Lakin ne söylüyorsunuz? Sizin bir maşuk-ı hayaliniz var imiş. Vaslını ağyara reva görür imiş de sizi hicranda bırakır imiş. Yani rezilin birisi! Herkesi nail-i nimet-i visali eylediği halde yalnız sizi duçar-ı hicran eder imiş de siz de bunu bir dide-i giryanla bir kalb-i suzan ile makam-ı suziş u istirhama koyuyorsunuz! Aman ya Rabb! Şu sözleri nesren söyleyebilir misiniz? Böyle bir makale-i measure-i (edebiye!!) yazabilir misiniz? Ya size bu cür’eti veren nedir? Şiir! Öyle değil mi? Lanet o şiire!

[6] ...Bu yolda sözler söylemeye neden mecbursunuz kızım? İzhar-ı fazilet etmek için mi? Halbuki işte ben sizin pederane aşık-ı fazlınız olduğum halde bu şiirinizi *Tercüman*’la neşr sevdasında olsanız neşretmem! Başka bir yerde sizin namınıza neşrolunduğunu görsem inkar ederim. Onu size isnad edenler sözlerini geriye almayacak olurlar ise –kanunlarımızın da müsaadesi olsa- cümlesini düelloya davet ederim. Çünkü benim fazıl kızım izhar-ı fazl etmesi için şiire ve şiirin ba-husus bu türlüüne ihtiyacı yoktur. Bunlar Nigar Hanım’ın karıdır.

[7] Başımın tac-ı ba-ibtihacı kızım! Redd-i şairiyet yolundaki tezkireniz sizin mukaddes başınıza yemin ederim ki gözlerimden yaş götürdü! Afv istiyorsunuz ha! Ona bedel arz-ı itizar eylerim. Siz merhamet buyurunuz da onu kabule tenezzül gösteriniz. Siz yalnız bence değil bütün Osmanlılarca öyle mukaddes, mücteba bir zatsınız ki size nesimden daha hafif-vezan olan avarızdan muhafaza için bütün Osmanlılar namus-ı merdilerini sitare-i müdafaa ederler....Artık bu iş meda ma-meda (olan oldu) hükmüne girdi. Bir daha ondan bahsetmeyelim. Ben de o tezkire evrakınız içinde bulunmasın diye yaktım.

[8] Vapurlarda bazı mühimce adamlar “bizim şeyhin kerameti olur menkul kendinden” mısra’ı “Nigar’ın iffeti de bak olur menkul kendinden” suretinde tahvil ederek ne mürdar sözler söylüyorlar ki, şu kadına hiç ta’allukum olmadığı halde bile yüreğimi yakıyor. *Efsus* vesairenden beyitler iradıyla *İkdam*’ın Paris Muhbiri’ni haklı görüp gösterirler. Ne insafsız adamlar! Fitnat’ın, Leyla’nın, Şeref’in daha açık mahub dostluğu, zen dostluğu meydanda iken lisan-ı istihzayı Nigar’a dikiyorlar. Fakat ne çare kadın kısmı şi’ir ile ve ba-husus onun da bu türlü ile iştiğal eder ise elbette hal buna müncer olur.

[9] Bugünkü Hanımlar Gazetesi⁴⁸’nde Paris Muhbiri’ne cevaben münderic bulunan makale-i ulyalarını gördüm. Vakıa pek haklı bir suretde müdafaa göstermiş iseniz de ne çare ki muhlis-i bi-riyanız bu müşahadeden müteessir oldum. Zaten *İkdam*’a o makaleyi derc eylemiş olduklarından dolayı gazetenin sahibi Cevdet Efendi’ye müteessirane beyan-ı mütalaa dahi etmiş idim. Taraf-ı fazılanelerinden müdafaa meydan bırakmaksızın kendim bir müdafaa yazmayı düşünmüş idiysem de böyle şeylerin meskutün anh bırakılmalarını daha ziyade muvafık-ı hal ve maslahat görerek o tasavvurumu dahi icra etmemiş idim. Fakat müdafaa-i ismetanelerini görünce daha evvel bu vazifenin bir erkek kalemiyle ifa olunmayarak bir kadının meydan-ı müdafaa atılmağa mecbur edilmiş olmasından pek müteessir oldum.

[10] O mübarek dimağınızı neden bu beyhude şeylerle i’tab edesiniz? Efendim tarih-i tabii ile iştiğal buyurunuz. Ne eğlenceli ne instructif bir ilimdir! Hey’ete murad buyurunuz... Felsefe ile iştiğal edecekse iseniz yalnız felasifenin terceme-i hallerini iktifa buyurunuz. Bu sizi hem dinlendirir, hem de en büyük itikad bunlardandır.

[11] Bugün şu saatte bendenizde olan fikre göre biz evvel-be-evvel kitabınızın planı ile iştiğal edelim: İşte ben size bir plan teklif edeyim. Bana evvela onun hakkındaki mutalaanızı yazınız. Ne yapayım sizi feylesofiden men etmek istediğim halde kabul etmediğinizden bari refakatte bulunayım...

Bir kere şu plan ve şu mutalaat hakkındaki efkarınızı görür isem daha sair mutalaalarını dahi ona göre bast ederim. Hatta yazacağınız şeylerde size hangi kitaplar yarar ise onları da haber veririm. Lakin yine derim ki bizde henüz feylesofi yazacak zaman gelmemiştir. Bana “sen yaz” der iseler cesaret edemem. Bunu da bilerek ona göre düşününüz ve pek rica ederim ki şu tehlikeli yolda yalnız kendi hevesinize ittiba ederek başlı başınıza bir şey yapmayınız.

[12] Kariin-i kiram hazeratının asar-ı acizaneme gösterdikleri rağbet ve ihsan buyurdıkları takdirat şimdiye kadar İslam kadınlarının adeta insan yerine konulmayıp erkekler nezdinde makhur ve esir gibi bir halde buldukları zannında bulunan Avrupalıların bu yanlış zehabını ibtal ile millet-i İslamiye’nin de böyle değerinden kat kat takdir ile isbat eyliyor. Ve bu vechile devlet ve milletlerine büyük hizmet etmiş oluyorlar.

[13] Tahminimden daha büyük çıktın Fazıl kızım! Büyüdükçe büyüyorsun. Tealin bir hava-i fişengin suuduna benziyor ki ilk şerare-i fazl u irfanını gösterir göstermez a’layı iliyine doğru fırlayıp yükseliverdiğinden ulüvv-i rütbe-i fazl u irfanını mukayese için seni takip etmek isteyen fikr-i tahmin bile arkandan yetişemiyor.

⁴⁸ Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete

[14] İbn-i Haldun *Mukaddimesi* tercümesinde münderic bulunan tasnif-i ulumu ihtar buyuruyorsunuz. Bunu da ilm ile hikmet ve alim ile hakim arasındaki münasebata dair benim söylediğim sözler İbn-i Haldun'un suret-i tahririne uymadığını göstermek için irad eyliyorsunuz. İşte beni hayran eden, söz söylemeye teşvik eyleyen hep bu sizin maarif-i Osmaniyemize değme bir erkeklerin bile peyda edememiş oldukları vukufunuz ve o vukuf üzerine her sözü tamam yerli yerine tertib ettirecek mertebeye varan zekavetiniz değil midir?

[15] Fatma Aliye hanımefendi hazretlerinin hiçbir gazeteye, hatta *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*'e bile doğrudan doğruya merbut olamayacağını ve canı hangi gazeteyi ister ise asar-ı kalemiyesini ona derc ettireceğini Ahmed Midhat'dan suret-i katiyede öğrenince o emele nail olamıyor idi.Ahmet Mithat sizin müşaviriniz, müsteşarınız, kapuçukadarınız, bendeniz, her şeyiniz ise de yalnızca musallatınız, müstebidiniz olamaz. Siz faal-i li-mayürid (dilediğini yapan) bir seyyidesiniz.

[16] Bana kalır ise ben yalnız sizi değil Nigar ve Makbule hanımefendileri de böyle İstanbul'dan Selanik'e irsali asarını birçok manalar yakıştırılabilecek olan bir gayretten men' eyley idim. Of! Ne fena herifim değil mi? Daima mani, daima musallat! Ben hatırıma geleni söylüyorum. Kabul ve adem-i kabulü sizden!

[17] Ama ne kadar tatlı yazmışsınız. Ne kadar vakıfane, hakimane yazmışsınız. Bir yerde söz götürerek "bunun için feylesof olmak lazım gelmeyeceği gibi" diye güya kendinizin feylesof olmadığınızı dermeyan ediyorsunuz da ben sizin kadar malumat-ı şamile ve efkâr-ı vasıta ve muhita sahibi feylesofları pek az görmüş olmağımı itiraf ile iftihar ederim. "Aferin!" demeye haya ederim.

[18] Zira hame-i belîğü'l-beyanlarını asar-ı aşkane gibi faidesiz şeylerden külliyan tecrit ederek evkat-ı muazzezelerini hep mehasin-i ahlakiyyeye, ulum ve fûnunun tevsiiine hadimolan asar tahririne hasreden, ıksa-yı amal-i ismetpenahileri benat ve nisvan-ı İslamiye'nin şehrah-ı ulum ve fûnunda sık sık bi-hakkın müzehher terakki olmasına, böyle bir edibe-i maarifperverin ceridemizin muharire-i mahsusası olması Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete için büyük bir şereftir.

[19] Selma Hanımefendinin tebriknamesini ben de beğendim. Kendisi şöhretsizliğinden falandan bahsediyor ise de vaktiyle o da *Tercüman*'ı bazı asar-ı kalemiyesi ile i'zaz etmiş fazilat-ı nisvandandır. Paris'te positivist cemiyeti a'zalığında dediği karındaşı Rıza bey gerçekten positivist ve pose (ağırbaşlı) bir adam olsa idi Selma'mız pek nafi bir muharrire olur idi. Fakat ağabeyinin halini Faik Beyefendi oğlumuzdan öğrenirsiniz de hem kendisine hem hemşiresine neden hizmet edemediğini anlarsınız. O sebeple de Selma-yı fazıla el-yevm *nesyeyen mensiyen* hükmüne düşer olmuştur.

[20] İşte damadınızı, hemşirenizi memnun edeyim der iken korkarım ki hem onları hem kendinizi a'da entrikalarına düşer edersiniz. Bana kalır ise ben yalnız sizi değil Nigar ve Makbule Hanımefendileri de böyle İstanbul'dan Selanik'e irsal-i asarını birçok ma'nalar yakıştırılabilecek olan bir gayretten men' eyley idim.

[21] Evet kızım senin pederi manevin padişahına sadıktır. Sadakat vaadiyle ve bi'at-ı sahiha ile bi'at eylemiştir. Hazret-i Ali'ye bi'at olunduğu gibi. Ama zamanın birçok müşkilatı var imiş. Bu müşkilat erbab-ı sadakati yıldırıp da padişahına olan ita'at ve sadakatinden caydıramaz. Ben bu sadakat yolunda ölmeye razıyım. Bahusus onlar gibi din ü devlet hainlerinin hançer-i gadriyle olursa pek sevinirim. Tarihime bu da bir hatime-i nefis[e] olur. İşte bunu bil de Ahmed Mithat'ı mı yoksa Jön Türkleri mi seveceğine ona göre karar ver.

[22] İslamların ve Türklerin yalnız kurtulmaları değil, her türlü tealileri kadınların terfi-i seviyesine vayededir. Dünyada erkekleri ileri olup da kadınları geri bulunan hiç bir millet yoktur. Esaslı bir medeniyet ancak zülciheteyn olabilir. Türkleri ve alelumum İslamları isad

etmek istiyor isek ameliyata yalnız ordudan, donanmadan başlamamalıyız. Hatta terakkiyata mekteplerden bile beda' etmek doğru değildir. Her şeyden evvel kadınlarımızı ıslah etmeliyiz ki onlar da çocukları, çocuklar da büyüdüklerinde devlet ve millet ıslah etsinler. Bir bina yapılacağı vakit çatıdan başlanmaz. Evvela temel kazılır. Kadın mebnayı beşerin rükn-i rekinidir.

[23] Ey rical-i munsifa! Sizden bize ibraz olunacak adalet ve müsavattır. Biz, zavallı Türk kadınlarımızı artık eşya-yı beytiyyeden addetmeyeceğiniz şu vakt-i me'sud-i hürriyette hisse-i ma'arifemize edeceğiniz muavenet bizim için en büyük mükafat olacaktır; ve biz vayedarı irfan olur isek bunun semerat-ı nafiasını iktitaf edecek yine siz değil misiniz?

[24] Muharririmize: Kadın kalp ile erkek fikir ile yazmalıdır... Kadın yazılarında bir kadının bilemeyeceği kadar derin hikmetler büyük malumatfuruşluklar müthiş istilâhpervazlıklar kuvvetli mntıklar makbul olamaz...Bence bir erkeğin fikirsiz bir makale vücuda getirmesi ne kadar ayıp ise bir kadının hissis nezahatsiz bir eser yazması da o kadar ayıptır... Kadınlar intihab edecekleri mevzuda kadınca seçmelidir. Mesela bir kadın, Meclisi Mebusanın siyasi müzekaratını veya boykotajın netayicini tedkik etmemelidir. Gülünç olur. Kadın imzasıyla böyle yazılar görüyorum da onun için zikrediyorum...Türkçemizde bir darbı mesel vardır "elinin hamuruyla erkeğin işine karışıyor" derler. Bunu dedirtmemeli.

[25] Feministler ve muarızları ne derlerse desinler bir enstitü azası kadar alim olan kadınları galatı tabiat atfederim... Bir kadının seviye-i irfanı en uzak yıldızların birbirine mesafesini riyaziye ile ölçecek kadar yükselmemelidir. Pek çok erkeklerin bile akıl erdiremediği fününu aliye bir kadın için kuru ve serttir.... Yüksek riyaizyelerin derin felsefelerin haşin nazariyatına boğulmak kadınların karı değildir.

[26] İlk makaleme meth ile başlamak fırsatını bahşeden Halide Salih hanıma teşekkürle borçluyum. Çünkü son eseri olan bu roman, bu Seviye Talip hakikaten ve bila mübalağa emsalsiz, latif bir edeb-i eseridir. Bugün edebiyatımız, her manasıyla müstesna bir eserle zenginleşti ve itiraf ederim ki senelerden beri beni bu kadar ciddi bir surette cezp ve teshir etmiş bir eser okuyamamıştım...Edebiyatımızın üstatlarının her birinin bir başka sebeple ihtiyar-ı sükut edip öksüz bıraktıkları şu devr-i akamette bahusus bir hanım tarafından yazılmış bu eser, itiraf etmelidir ki büyük bir eser-i sanattır....ve temin ederim ki bu eseriyle muharriri birden gayet büyük bir hatve ile sıçrayarak, adeta bir pervaz-ı mehib ile üdebamızın en birinci takına ve bugünün en parlak mevki-i şerefine atlıyor.

[27] Kadınlar ne bir yıldız ne çiçek, ne de yalnız edebiyata mevzu olan mühim varlıklar değillerdir. Kadınlar vatan için deruhte edeceğimiz en müşkil, en uzun teşebbüslerimizde size yardım edecek tabii ve hakiki arkadaşlarımızdır. Onlar valideleriniz, kardaşlarınız, zevceleriniz sıfatıyla açtığımız yolda yol arkadaşımız olacaklardır. Onlara sadece şiir yazmayın, onları fikirlerinize ortak edin, ilim ve fenden yararlandırın...Vatanın hukuku kadınlık hukukundan büyük ve muhteremdir.

[28] Eğer bu sesiniz bütün seslerin sustuğu ve insan boğazlarından akan son kırmızı ırmakların kaybolmak üzere topraklara doğru koşup gittiği bugün gibi işitilmiş olsaydı!...Fakat siz o sırada başka bir mezbahayı seyre gitmiştiniz. Paşanız sizi dumanlı ve parıltılı otomobilleriyle bir Neron eğlencesini seyir için Suriye'ye davet etmişti.

[29] Mustafa Kemal'den onbaşılık almış. Gülünç şey. Mustafa Kemal de, Halide de fantezi ve [...] meşguller. Halide orduda o çadırdan o çadıra giriyor. Hele S'nin peşini hiç bırakmıyor. Bunlar Ankara'da herkesin ağzında. Mebuslar türlü türlü bundan bahsediyorlar....Kimi Adnan'ın zevcesi kimi değil diyor. Zevcesi olsa Halide Edib diye babasının adını taşımaz. Eski kocası zamanında nasıl Halide Salih adını taşımış ise şimdi de Halide Adnan olurdu. Metresidir, diyorlar.

[30] Leim düşmanlarımız Sırbistan, Yunan, Karadağ, Bulgaristan, Hristiyanlığın temin ettiği revabit-ı dostane ile, ahud-ı atikadan boyunlarını kurtardılar. Hatta pek yakın zamana kadar yanaşma ücretiyle temin-i iâşe eden Bulgarlar...

Ey altı yüz senelik bir mazi-i muhteşemin, necip bir neslin asil kızları! Size hitab ediyorum. Her zerre-i türabı o şanlı ecdadınızın asil ve kahraman kanlarıyla yoğurulmuş bu muhterem toprakları metruk bir şurezara döndürmeyin...Bir zamanlar ihtişam ve kudreti, besalet ve satvetiyle cihanı titreten Türklerin bu necip ve yüksek kavmin....

[31] Hristiyan vatandaşlarımız refah ve saadetleri için çalışırlarken biz kendimizde bir hakkı iğbirar, bir fikri itiraz bulduk mu? Çünkü hakka ser-fürü etmemek imkansızdır. Bizim bu haklı teşebbüsümüzü hak-şinas vatandaşlarımızın takdir edeceği şübhesizdir...İşte yine tekrar ediyorum. Evvela, kendi şahsiyetimiz! Kendi unsurumuzun tealisi! Bundan başka bizi halas edecek vasıta yoktur...İşte bu kuvvet, şahsiyyet-i ırkıyemize, hüviyet-i milliyemize tapmakla artacaktır.

[32] Ricalin hakkımızdaki hüsn-i niyet ve hayır-hahileri yine bu gazetede en celi muhalesat ve samimiyyetle bedidar...Beşeriyetin nısf-ı refik-i diğeri olan bu cins-i cemilin vezaif-i mühimme-i hayatiyyesini takdir etmemek nasıl olur?

Kalbimin kadına yakıştırdığı evsafın en birincisi ciddiyetdir. En zarif, rakik, müstesna bir kadın bütün bu mehasini ciddiyetle tezyin etmezse indirimde kıymet-i nisvaniyyesinin bir kısm-ı mühimini gaib etmiş olur.

[33] İşte, ey vicdanına ve kifayet-i akıl ve irfanına mutmain olduğumuz munsif biraderimiz bizleri, ruhlarına varınca ezilmiş, hırpalanmış Osmanlı kadınlarını (henüz ciddi hiçbir iddi'ada bulunmadıkları halde) fazla darbelerle sersemleştirmeyiniz. Yazıktır! Bu haksızlıklarınız (vicdani) büyük bir günahdır! ...Vatan ve millete ne kadar hizmet-i cansiperanede bulunursanız bulununuz; bu son zamanlarda kadınların makhuriyetleri esnasındaki tavr-ı lakaydenizden mütevellid muahezatı!- tarih-i İslamın en feci' bir yerinde, atıyyunun nazarı ta'yibi ile okuyamamasına mümkün değil bir çare bulamayacaksınız.

[34] Bizler “nisvan-ı İslam” yine bahtiyar imişiz ki zat-ı me'ali sıfatınız gibi bir dadere malikiz...Siz munsif biraderimiz, bizleri en ziyade düşünüyor ve güzel va'adlerde bulunuyordunuz.

Bizde feminizm gayretini güdenlerin (ki onca patırtıyı mucib olmuştu!) öyle Avrupa kadınlarının iddia ve talebine makis olmadığı buracıkda beyan ederek ricalimizin hakkımızdaki şiddetlerine perde-i itidal çekmeyi vecibeden add eylerim: Bizler mesturiyetimizden müşteki değiliz, yalnız haremle içinde, taş ve topraktan ma'mul duvarlarla kapanacağımıza, faziletle muhat olmamızıarzu ve mevzu'ı bahis eylemekdeyiz.

[35] Vatanına pek büyük hizmetler etmiş bir zat-ı ali ilanı hürriyetden evvel bir gün kendisinden nisvan-ı İslam için de bir hisse-i meşrua talep etmiştim. O zat bize pek kavi teminat vermişti...Bakınız o gayretperverden şu mealde cevab almıştım: Biz hürriyeti kurtardık, fakat kale-i taassubun henüz bir tasını kaldırabildik. Bekleyiniz, terakkiyat-ı nisvaniyenin zamanı da gelecektir. Sizin gibi erbab-ı hamiyet meyus olmaz ve fütür getirmeyerek çalışır.' Bu cümleden de anlıyorsunuz ya, bizim terakkimiz yine bizim himmetimize bırakılıyor. Ricalimizin bizi düşünmediklerini...ihtimal en son düşüneceklerini şimdiden bizler düşünelim de nisvan-ı atıyyemizin...kadınlığın insanlığın hukuk ve mezeyasının hiçbirinden mahrumiyetini icab etmediğini anlayan kadınlarımızdan bekleyelim.

[36] Her ne hal olsa da “harb-i hail” yüzünden bizde bir kadın inkılabı başladığı inkar olunamaz. Artık kadın çalışmak sahasına atılmıştır. İhtiyacın tevliid ettiği bu çalışıp

kazanmak faydasını kadın ince zekasıyla pek iyi anlamıştır. Bütün mütefekkirimize borç olan şey de kadının geçeceği inkılab geçitini fazilet çiçekleri serpererek...yardımcı olmaktır....Türk kadını milletimizin ihmal edilemeyecek bir mühim rüknüdür.

[37] Kadınlarımızda aile teşkili fikri fevka'l-'de hüzaile uğramıştır. Temada bulunduğum birçok hanımlarda a'ileye karşı bir lakayde, elim ve mü'essif bir nefret görüyorum...Bugün bi'l-hassa hayat-ı sa'ye atılan kadınlarımız ekseriyetle hod-pesend aile düşmanı kadınlardır. Maişetlerini şöyle böylr te'min eden kadınlar yalnızca nefislerini düşünüyorlar.

[38] Saygıdeğer Efendim,

....Biz İstanbul'da kendimiz için, bütün eski ve yeni Türkiye sınırlarını içine almak üzere geçici bir Amerikan mandasını "ehven-i şer" olarak görüyoruz. Dayandığımız noktalar şunlardır:...

Bu sebeplerden dolayı bir an önce istememiz gereken Amerikan mandası da elbette sakıncasız değildir. Haysiyetimizden epeyce fedakarlık etmek mecburiyetinde bulunuyoruz.

[39] Onları bize vermeseler bile biz, onları alacağız. Hiç şübhesiz hak, "azmin, fi'lin ve liyakatındandır. Kadınlarımızın, şu on beş seneden beri ibraz ettiği fikr-i teşebbüs ve fa'aliyyet o mevki'lere oturmak için bize bir hak bahş etmiştir. Memleketin ihtiyacat-ı hakikiyyesi de o mevki'lere bizim sahip olmaklığımızı emrediyor.

[40] Aramızda hiçbirimiz vekil ve ya sefir olmayı düşünmüyoruz. Fakat sahib-i rey olmayı... istiyoruz,..Fırka hayatı bizde da'ima ba'is-i felakatimiz olan ihtirasat-ı siyasiyyeye inkılab etmiştir. Halbuki yeni Türkiyenin banisi Mustafa Kemal Paşa'nın umdeleri etrafında toplanan Halk Fırkası'nı biz, bütün bunlardan münezze, alı ve kurtarıcı bir kuvvet olarak telakki ediyoruz....Kadınlık hayatında biz fırkacılığı daha şumüllü manasıyla anlıyoruz. Kadınlık hayatında fırka kelimesinde ilk bulduğumuz mana, içtima'i sahada fa'aliyyetdir. Biz her türlü ihtirasatdan uzak bulunuyoruz.

[41] Türk kadının hukuk-i siyasiyyesine na'il olmasına bütün rical-i hükümetle beraber münevverler tamamen taraftardır, bi'l-hassa Re'is-i Cumhuriyetimiz Gazi Paşa hazretleri memleketde bütün teceddüdatı yarattığı gibi, kadınlığın muvaffakiyyet ve terakkiyatını da ilk safda temenni etmektedirler. Rical-i hazıramız da aynı fikre sahibdirlere. Biz de bu kadar taraftarlığa karşı, şübhesiz patırtılar yapmaktan müstağniyiz. Propagandamız müsbet ve ilmidir

[42] Türkiye'nin hayatında çok mühim mes'eleler mevcut olduğu bir zamanda hanımlarımızın meb'usluk propagandası veya reklamı ile meşgul olmalarını la-kaydane seyredemezdik....Bize karşı siyasi hukuka iştirak iddi'asında bulunan hanımların ekserisi şimdiye kadar ancak başlarından geçen veyahud geçmesini tahayyül ettikleri ser-güzeşlerin roman ve hikaye diye ortaya atmış olmaktan başka ciddi bir iş görmüş değillerdir. Siyasi hukuku bu hanımlara mı vereceğiz?

[43] Gazi Mustafa Kemal Paşa Hazretleri...

Büyük Rehber, eşsiz dehanın yarattığı, senin parlak meşalenden bir zerre ziya alarak... Cumhuriyet inkılabının emsalsiz rehberi memleketi ümitsiz ve perişan bir ihtizardan kurtarıcı kurtarmaz, büyük kurtarıcı elini Türk kadınına uzattı. Türk kadını aziz rehberinden aldığı ilhamla...

APPENDIX B

GUIDE TO INTELLECTUALS MENTIONED

ABDÜLHAK HAMİD (TARHAN) (1851-1937): An influential playwright and poet of the early twentieth century, Tarhan was homeschooled by the leading tutors of the time. He became familiar with both Western and Eastern literature due to his stay in Tehran, Paris and London. He was one of the leading poets of the Turkish Romantic period, also the author of *Makber*, which is considered one of the greatest poems in Turkish literature. He is known as the Grand Poet (*Şair-i Azam*) and Grand Genius (*Dahi-i Azam*) in the Turkish literature.

(ABDÜLHAK) ADNAN ADIVAR (1882-1955): Writer, historian and medical doctor. In 1917, Adıvar married Halide Edib, one of the Great Women. He was close to the Young Turks, and later he was active in the Turkish War of Independence. In 1924, Adıvar founded the first opposition party, the Progressive Republican Party, with a small number of deputies. Upon the abolition of the party in 1925 based on allegations of his having supported an anti-state rebellion, Adıvar and his wife left Turkey and came back in 1939, a year after Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's death.

AHMED CEVDET PASHA (1822-1895): Ottoman intellectual, bureaucrat and historian. Father to two members of the Great Women: Fatma Aliye and Emine Semiye. Graduated from the *medrese* in İstanbul, where he studied not only Islamic sciences, but also mathematics, history, French and international law. Ahmed Cevdet Pasha was an important figure behind the Tanzimat reforms of 1839, and he was the head of *Mecelle* commission that produced the new Ottoman Civil, a modification of Islamic Law according to the needs of the time.

AHMED MIDHAT (1844-1912): Ottoman writer, translator, journalist and publisher. Ahmed Midhat was a prolific writer with more than 200 books. With the financial help of the Ottoman Palace, he started the newspaper *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* in 1878, and the publication continued until 1921, eventually becoming one of the longest publications in Ottoman history. He supported young writers, and encouraged female writers as well. His purpose in writing was to address the majority of people, and touch upon their problems and feelings. Therefore, he argued for the simplification of language. He withdrew from intellectual circles right after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 and died in 1912 due to heart failure.

AHMED RIZA (1859-1930): Having graduated from Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School), Ahmed Rıza went to France to continue his studies. He worked as the minister of education in Bursa, a position from which he resigned in 1887. He went to Paris in 1899 and stayed there. He started to oppose the reign of Abdülhamid II in his articles. In 1895, he became the head of the Paris branch of the Committee of Union and Progress. Then he began to publish the first official media outlet of the organization, *Meşveret*, and its supplement in the French language. Following the proclamation of the Constitutional regime, he came to İstanbul and was elected to the parliament.

AHMET HAŞİM (1884-1933): Writer and one of the leading poets of symbolism. He graduated from Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School), where he started to engage in literature and art. His first poem was published in 1901. His writing shows the influences of Muallim Naci, Abdülhak Hamid and Tevfik Fikret. He joined the literary movement called Fecr-i Ati, which argued for art for art's sake. He spent his life teaching mythology and French until he died in 1933.

ALİ KEMAL (1867-1922): Writer and journalist. Ali Kemal was named after the poet Namık Kemal. He was forced into exile, and went to Paris where he studied political sciences. At the same time he sent articles and translations to *İkdam*, based on his observations abroad. Upon his return to Istanbul, he became the editor-in-chief of the paper. He criticised the Committee of Union and Progress in his writings. He was killed in 1922.

CELAL NURİ (İLERİ) (1877-1938): Writer, journalist and intellectual. İleri was the owner of the newspaper *İleri*, and supported the War of Independence after the WWI. He first graduated from Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School), and then studied law and French. He started his career as a lawyer but soon became a journalist. His articles got published in newspapers such as *Le Courier d'Orient*, *Jeune Turc*, *Tanin*, *İkdam*, *İçtihad* and *Türk Yurdu*. He was elected to the parliament in 1919. He was among the intellectuals who were forced into exile by the British after the occupation of İstanbul in 1920. A year later, he returned to İstanbul and continued his political life until 1935.

FATİH KERİMİ (1870-1937): Writer and journalist. Born in Tatarstan, he was first homeschooled by his father, who was a mullah, and later he attended a Russian school. He came to İstanbul in 1890 to continue his education. With the help of Ahmed Midhat, he started Mekteb-i Mülkiye (Faculty of Political Sciences). He travelled in Europe and published a book about his observations. During the first Russian Revolution in 1905, he became an activist for the Tatar people. He worked as a journalist in İstanbul during the Balkan wars, and interviewed a number of Turkish intellectuals such as Ahmed Midhat, Yusuf Akçura, Halide Edib, Nigar binti Osman and Mahmud Esad.

HAMDULLAH SUPHÎ (TANRIÖVER) (1885-1966): Tanrıöver graduated from Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School). He was the nephew of writer Samipaşazade Sezai, and Tanrıöver's first poems got published in his uncle's Paris-based newspaper, *Şura-yı Ümmet*. He became the head of the Turkish Hearth (Türk Ocağı) in 1912. He taught French, literature, Turkish and Islamic art in various schools. In 1909, Tanrıöver joined the literary society of Fecr-i Ati, but two years later he left this group, and joined Ziya Gökalp and his friends around the literary journal of *Genç Kalemler*. As an influential public speaker, he delivered important speeches to the masses during İstanbul's occupation.

LATİFE BEKİR (ÇEYREKBAŞI) (1901-?): Born in İstanbul, Çeyrekbaşı worked as a Turkish language teacher in minority schools until 1923. Then she became the head of the Women's Union after Nezihe Muhiddin was dismissed. She helped organise the International Women's Congress in İstanbul. She was elected to the Grand National Assembly as a representative of İzmir in 1946.

MADAM GÜLNAR (Olga de Lebedeva) (1854-?): Russian writer. Madam Gülnar met Ahmed Midhat in 1889 in the 8th Congress of Orientalists in Stockholm, and they became friends. She came to Turkey in 1890 upon Midhat's invitation. She learnt Turkish, and her articles were published in Ottoman periodicals such as *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*. Some of her books written in Russian were translated into Turkish and were published in the periodicals as well. She became friends with women writers such as Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman.

MAHMUD ESAD EFENDİ (1856-1918): Jurist and writer. Born in İstanbul, he received medrese (religious school) education first, and then studied maths, physics and astronomy. He wrote various books on Islamic law, religion and economy. He

taught History of Law at the Faculty of Law, and International Law and Economy at the faculty of political sciences (Mekteb-i Müllkiye). Fatma Aliye engaged in a polemic with Mahmut Esad Efendi regarding the place of polygamy within Islamic law.

MAKBULE LEMAN (1865-1898): Woman poet and writer who lived in the same period as the Great Women. Born in İstanbul, Makbule Leman was homeschooled. She became the editor-in-chief of the Hamidian era's newspaper *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, and she was awarded a medal for her success by Abdulhamid II. She had close ties with Fatma Aliye and Nigar bint-i Osman. She died at the age of thirty-three due to health issues.

MEHMET RAUF (1875-1931): Playwright and writer. Born in İstanbul, Mehmet Rauf became interested in literature very early in his life. He was influenced by Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and the current of realism. He wrote in the literary journal *Servet-i Fünun*. He wrote novels, short stories and plays. Psychological analyses were an important part of his works. He was the author of the first psychological novel in Turkish literature, "Eylül".

NAMIK KEMAL (1840-1888): Writer, poet, journalist and bureaucrat. Namık Kemal was homeschooled, and he taught himself Arabic and Persian. He was the one of the leading figures of Turkish nationalism. He is famous for introducing the concepts of freedom, nation and patriotism into Turkish literature and intellectual life. He was a member of the Young Ottomans, and criticised the Hamidian regime in his articles. As a result, the newspaper *Tasvir-i Efkar* was closed down in 1867. Apart from poems, he wrote critiques, biographies, novels and articles on history. He died at the age of 48.

RECAİZADE MAHMUT EKREM (1847-1914): Ottoman poet and writer. He was born in İstanbul, the son of the minister of the official printing house (*takvimhane nazırı*). He worked as a teacher in Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School) and Mekteb-i Mülkiye (Faculty of Political Sciences). After meeting Namık Kemal, his first articles appeared in the newspaper *Tasvir-i Efkar*, published by Namık Kemal. He paved the way for a new literary movement called Edebiyat-ı Cedide through his discussions with Muallim Naci, who was in favour of preserving the existing literary traditions. Young poets and writers such as Tevfik Fikret followed his footsteps in their literary pursuits.

RIZA NUR (1879-1942): Writer, Turkologist, historian, politician and medical doctor. During the Constitutional era, he severely criticised the Unionists. He was sent to prison for three months for his persistent criticism. He was one of the closest people to Mustafa Kemal until 1925. He became the first minister of education of Turkey, and participated in the negotiations for the Treaty of Lausanne. During the political climate of 1925, Rıza Nur had disputes with Mustafa Kemal and went into self-imposed exile to Paris. In 1935, he sent his memoirs to the British Museum on condition that they would not be published until 1960.

SALİH ZEKİ (1864-1921): Mathematician. Salih Zeki was also interested in the philosophy of science, and translated the works of Henri Poincaré and Alexis Bertrand into Turkish. In 1901, he married his student Halide Edib. In 1910, he became the principal of Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School). After the Young Turk Revolution, he started to write articles in *Tanin*. He died in 1921.

SELMA RIZA (FERACELİ) (1872-1931): Female writer and journalist. Selma Rıza was the daughter of diplomat Ali Rıza Bey, and sister of Ahmed Rıza, one of the

leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress. She secretly went to Paris where her brother was living. There she studied at the University of Sorbonne. Later she became a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, and worked in the newspapers *Meşveret* and *Şuray-ı Ümmet*. In 1908, Selma Rıza returned to İstanbul, and actively worked in various associations.

SÜLEYMAN NAZİF (1870-1927): Major poet and writer. Süleyman Nazif was born in Diyarbakır. His father was a poet and historian. He mastered Persian, Arabic and French. He was one of the writers of the literary journal *Servet-i Fünun*. In 1897, he went to Paris and wrote articles against the Hamidian regime in Ahmed Rıza's newspaper *Meşveret*.

ŞİNASİ (1826-1871): Journalist, poet and playwright. Şinasi was one of the leading figures of Ottoman modernization, and the leader of the Young Ottomans. He learnt Arabic, Persian and French. Through a government grant, he went to Paris for his studies. One of his major contributions to literature was the use of simple language as a contrast to the language of Divan literature. He was also influential in journalism. He published the newspapers *Tasvir-i Efkar* and *Tercüman-ı Ahval*.

ŞÜKÜFE NİHAL (BAŞAR) (1896-1973): Woman writer, poet and activist. Şükufe Nihal was born in İstanbul. She received private lessons at home. She learnt Arabic, Persian and French. Later, she studied literature and geography. She was an active writer during the Second Constitutional period. During the occupation of İstanbul, she delivered public speeches. In the early republican era, she was among the founders of Turkish Women's Union. She worked as a teacher until 1953 in various schools.

TEVFİK FİKRET (1867-1915): An eminent poet, teacher and publisher. He was the leader of the literary society Edebiyat-ı Cedide (New Literature). In 1888, he graduated from Mekteb-i Sultani (Galatasaray High School) where he became the student of the pre-eminent intellectuals such as Rezaizade Mahmut Ekrem and Muallim Naci. During high school years, he started writing poems, and published in *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* with the encouragement of his teachers. Having worked at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a short time, he became a literature teacher in Mekteb-i Sultani after Muallim Naci's death. In 1909, he became the principal. He was also the editor-in-chief of the literary journal *Servet-i Fünun*.

YUNUS NADİ (ABALIOĞLU) (1879-1945): Turkish journalist, and founder of the newspaper *Cumhuriyet*. He graduated from Galatasaray High School, and then studied law at İstanbul University. His journalism career started in *Malumat* in the year 1909. After the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, he joined the newspapers *İkdam* and *Tasvir-i Efkar*. He resolutely supported Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's reforms during the early republican era.

YUSUF AKÇURA (1876-1935): Tatar writer and politician. He was born in Russia to a Tatar family. His 1904 work entitled *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* drew the attention of intellectuals. In this work, he compared the ideologies of Ottoman nationalism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism and argued that the last one is the best for Turkish people. After 1908, his ideas became very famous with the shift in the official ideology. He founded the journal *Türk Yurdu*, which became the platform for Turkish nationalism. His ideas, particularly moving away from Islamic values as well, were welcome during the early republican period, and he remained as a prominent intellectual in this period unlike many of his contemporaries.

YUSUF ZİYA (ORTAÇ) (1895-1967): Poet, writer, publisher and politician. Ortaç started writing poems during high school years. His first poem came out in 1914. After meeting Abdullah Cevdet, he started to publish in *İçtihat*. He gained recognition as a result of his poems in this journal. He met Ziya Gökalp and started write in syllabic meter afterwards. He was one the five poets called *Beş Hececiler* in Turkish literature. He worked as a teacher at Mekteb-i Sultani.

ZİYA GÖKALP (1876-1924): Sociologist, writer and poet. Gökalp was born in Diyarbakır, a city in eastern Turkey. He established the Diyarbakır branch of the Committee of Union and Progress after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908. He was influenced by the French sociologist Emile Durkheim. He was an advocate of Turkish nationalism, and argued for re-Turkification of the Ottoman Empire. In 1923, he published *The Principles of Turkism*, where he delineated his national ideology and emphasised the national-cultural rather than Islamic sources of morality.

APPENDIX C

NIGAR BINT-I OSMAN'S NETWORKS

Name	Who
Namık Kemal	Major writer
Abdülhak Hamid	Major writer
Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem	Major writer
Ahmed Midhat	Major writer
Ahmed Rasim	Major writer
Cenab Şehabettin	Major writer
Halid Ziya	Major writer
Faik Ali Ozansoy	Major poet
Süleyman Nazif	Major poet, writer and elder brother of Faik Ali Ozansoy
Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın	Writer, translator and journalist
Celal Nuri İleri	Major writer and journalist
Celal Sahir Erozan	Major poet and writer
Abdullah Cevdet	Poet and translator
Ercüment Ekrem Talu	Major writer and Rezaizade M. Ekrem's son
Rıza Tevfik Bölükbaşı	Major writer and philosopher
Selim Sırrı Tarcan	Teacher and writer
Tevfik Fikret	Major poet
Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar	Major writer
Carmen Sylva (Elizabeth of Wied)	Queen Consort of Romania and writer
Pierre Loti	French writer
Paul Bourget	French novelist and critic
Sully Prudhomme	French poet
Dr. İgnacz Kunoş	Hungarian Turkologist
Armenius Vambery	Hungarian Turkologist
The Nakkaşyans	Minority family
The Yakopyans	Minority family
The Evrenozzades	Minority family
Viktor Emmanuel	King of Italy
Gustav	King of Sweden
Kaiser Wilhelm II	King of Prussia and German Empire
Hegye	Musician
Maurice Trubert	French poet, painter and musician
Fausto Zonaro	Italian painter
Leyla Hanım	Major woman poet
Olga de Lebedeva (Madam Gülnar)	Woman writer
Fatma Aliye	Major woman writer
Emine Semiye	Major woman writer

Neyyir Hanım	Abdülhak Şinasi's mother
Fahriye Hanım	Mehmet Rauf's mother and poet
Bi-Piya Begum	Queen of Behobal
Mehmed V Reshad	Sultan of the Ottoman Empire
Hatice Sultan	Daughter of V. Murad, the Ottoman Sultan
Fehime Sultan	Daughter of V. Murad
Burhaneddin Efendi	Son of Abdul Hamid II
VI. Mehmed Vahideddin	The last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire
Naciye Sultan	Granddaughter of Abdulmecid and wife of Enver Pasha

REFERENCES

- Adak, H. (2003). National Myths and Self-Narrations: Mustafa Kemal's Nutuk and Halide Edib's Memoirs and The Turkish Ordeal. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102(2), 509-527.
- Adak, H. (2007). Suffragettes of the Empire, Daughters of the Republic: Women Auto/biographers Narrate National History (1918-1935). *New Perspectives on Turkey: Special Issue on Literature and the Nation*, (36), 27-51.
- Adivar, H. E. (1928). *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib*. New York; London: The Century Co.
- Adivar, H. E. (1930). *Turkey Faces West: A Turkish view of Recent Changes and Their Origin*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Adivar, H. E. (2004). *Memoirs of Halide Edib*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- Ahmed Midhat. (1892). *Fatma Aliye Hanım Yahud bir Muharrir-i Osmaniye'nin Neşeti*. İstanbul: Kırkambar.
- Ahmet Haşim. (1918, November 7). Halide Edib Hanımefendi'ye, *İçtihad*.
- Akşin, S. (1987). *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Alexander, J. (1994). *Fin de Siècle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction and the Problem of Reason*. London: Verso.
- Ali Kemal. (1895, December 20). Paris Musahabeleri. *İkdam*, 506.
- Arat, Y. (1999). Democracy and Women in Turkey: In Defence of Liberalism, Social Politics: *International Studies in Gender, State, and Society*, 6, 370-387.

- Arieli, D. (2013). The Task of Being Content: Expatriate Wives in Beijing, Emotional Work and Patriarchal Bargain. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 8(4), 18-31.
- Bartmanski, D. (2012). How to become an iconic social thinker the intellectual pursuits of Malinowski and Foucault. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15(4), 427–453. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1368431011423577>
- Başçı, P. (2003). Love, Marriage, and Motherhood: Changing Expectations of Women in Late Ottoman Istanbul. *Turkish Studies*, 4, 145-177.
- Becker, H. S. (1982). *Art Worlds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bekiroğlu, N. (1994). Ahmed Midhat'ın Nigar Hanım'a Mektupları. *Türk Edebiyatı*, 246, 31-37.
- Bekiroğlu, N. (1998). *Şair Nigar Hanım*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Belge, M. (1994). *İstanbul Gezi Rehberi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Bonnell, V., and Hunt, L. (Eds.) . (1999) . *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. California: University of California Press.
- Bora, A. (2008). Ortadoğu'da Kadın Hareketleri: Farklı Yollar, Farklı Stratejiler. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (39), 55-69.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The Rules of Art: Genesis and the Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Büyükokutan, B. (2011). Toward a Theory of Cultural Appropriation Buddhism, the Vietnam War, and the Field of US Poetry. *American Sociological Review*, 76(4), 620–639.
- Chen, A. (1999). Lives at the Center of the Periphery, Lives at the Periphery of the Center: Chinese American Masculinities and Bargaining with Hegemony, *Gender & Society* 13, 584-607.
- Collins, R. (1998). *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conti, A. (1979). Capitalist Organization of Production Through Non-capitalist Relations: Women's Role in a Pilot Resettlement Project in Upper Volta. *Review of African Political Economy*, 15-16, 75-91.
- Coşar, Ö. S. (1974). Türk Kadınının Hak ve Hürriyetleri Konusunda Tartışmalar. In *Atatürk Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 2, pp. 59-64). İstanbul: İstanbul Reklam.
- Çakır, S. (1991). Osmanlı Kadın Dernekleri. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 53, 139-159.
- Çakır, S. (1994). *Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi*. İstanbul: Metis.
- Çalışlar, İ. (2010). *Halide Edib: Biyografisine Sığmayan Kadın*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Demirdirek, A. (1993). *Osmanlı Kadınlarının Hayat Hakkı Arayışının Bir Hikayesi*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

- Dey, J. (1981). *Gambian Women: Unequal Partners in Rice Development Projects*. In N. Nelson (Ed.), *African Women in Development Process* (pp. 109-122). London: Frank Cass.
- Durakbaşı, A. (1998). Cumhuriyet Döneminde Modern Kadın ve Erkek Kimliklerinin Oluşumu: Kemalist Kadın Kimliği ve “Münevver Erkekler”. In A. B. Hacimirzaoğlu (Ed.), *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler/ Bilanço 98*, (pp. 29-50). İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Ebaugh, H. R. (1993). Patriarchal bargains and latent avenues of social mobility: Nuns in the Roman Catholic Church, *Gender & Society*, 7 (3), 400-414.
- Ebürrafi. (1887, December 15). Muharrir Efendi. *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*.
- Edib, H.(see Adıvar)
- Ellison, G. M. (1915). *An Englishwoman in a Turkish Harem*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Emel Aşa, (1989). 1928’e Kadar Türk Kadın Mecmuaları (Master’s Thesis), İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı.
- Emine Semiye, *Hürriyet Kokuları*, Milli Kütüphane, Yz. A 4664.
- Emine Semiye. (1897, March 11). Hanımlara Dürus-ı Hikmet, *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, pp. 6,7.
- Emine Semiye. (1908, December 21). Muhterem Biraderimiz Cavid Beyefendiye, *Mehasin*, 9, pp. 2,5.
- Emine Semiye. (1909, September). Terakkiyatı Nisvaniyyeyi Kimden Bekleyelim, *Mehasin*, 10, pp. 733,736.
- Emine Semiye. (1919, October 23). Hayatda Kadının Hisse-i İştiraki, *İleri*, 642, pp. 5,6.

- Esen, N. (2000). Bir Osmanlı Kadın Yazarın Doğuşu, *Journal of Turkish Studies - Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları*, Agah Sırrı Levend hatıra sayısı I, Vol. 24, Cambridge, MA.
- Fatma Aliye. (1890-1912). Correspondence. Taksim Atatürk Kitaplığı, Fatma Aliye Hanım Evrakı.
- Fatma Aliye. (1895, September 26). Meşahir-i Nisvan-ı İslamiyeden Biri: Fatma bint-i Abbas, *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, 8, pp. 3,4.
- Garnham, N., & Williams, R. (1980). Pierre Bourdieu and the Sociology of Culture: An Introduction. *Media, Culture & Society*, 2(3), 209-223.
- Gerami, S., & Lehnerer, M. (2001). Women's Agency and Household Diplomacy Negotiating Fundamentalism. *Gender & Society*, 15(4), 556-573.
- Gökpınar, B. (2009). The Role of Emine Semiye's Writings in the Ottoman Women's Movement (Graduation Thesis). Yeditepe University. Department of History.
- Göle, N. (1996). *The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Greenacre, M. J. (1984). *Theory and Applications of Correspondence Analysis*. London: Academic Press.
- Halide Edib. (1912, Feb). Allah'ın Nuru, *Türk Yurdu*.
- Halide Edib. (1918, October 22). Wilsonun Şartları Karşısında. *Vakit*.
- Halide Salih. (1909, Feb). Mehasin'i Okuyan Kardaşlarıma, *Mehasin*, 6, p.420.

- Hanger, J., and Moris, J. (1973). Women and the Household Economy. In R. Chambers and J. Moris (Eds.), *Mwea: An Irrigated Rice Settlement in Kenya* (pp. 209-244). Munich: Weltforum Verlag.
- Hanımlar Faaliyetde! Kadınlar Yalnız Meb'us Namzedi ile Kalmıyorlar Belediye İntihabatına da İştirak Edecekler, *Cumhuriyet*, 293, 28 Feb 1925.
- Havlioğlu, D. (2007). Osmanlı Şiirinde Kadının Sesi: Mihri Hatun'un Hatime-yi Risalesi ve Necati'ye bir naziresi. *Journal of Turkish Studies: In Memoriam Şinasi Tekin*, vol.31/II, Cambirdge, MA: Harvard University Press: (37-46).
- Havlioğlu, D. (2010). On the Margins and between the Lines: Ottoman Women Poets from the Fifteenth to the Twentieth Centuries, *Turkish Historical Review*, 25-54.
- Hipsky, M. (2000). Romancing Bourdieu: A Case Study in Gender Politics in the Literary Field. In N. Brown and I. Szeman (Eds.) , *Pierre Bourdieu: Fieldwork in Culture* (pp.186-206). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Little Field.
- Hoodfar, H. (1996). Survival Strategies and Political Economy of low Household Incomes in Cairo. In D. Singerman and H. Hoodfar (Eds.) , *Development, Change and Gender in Cairo* (pp. 1-27). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hoyi, İ. (1941). Kadın Romancılarımızla Mülakatlar: Nezihe Muhittin Yeni Eserlerini Neşretmeden Öleceğinden Korkuyor, *Son Posta*, 4027, 1-6.
- Hutson, A. S. (2001). Women, Men, and Patriarchal Bargaining in an Islamic Sufi Order: The Tijaniyya in Kano, Nigeria, 1937 to the Present. *Gender & Society*, 15(5), 734-753.
- İnceoğlu, F. S. (2008). İlk Muharremimiz Fatma Aliye'nin Gözünden Dönemi. In N. Şişman (Ed.) , *Harf Harf Kadınlar*, (pp. 115-35). İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.
- İnceoğlu, F. S., and Süslü Berktaş. Z. (2011). *Ahmed Midhat, Fazıl ve Feylesof Kızım Fatma Aliye'ye Mektuplar*. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.
- Jenkins, H. D. (2008). *Robert Kolej'in Kızları*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kadınlık Aleminde: Kadınlar Birliğinin Faideli Teşebbüsleri, *Cumhuriyet*, 518, 17 October 1925 p. 3.

Kadınlık Yüksekler, *Milliyet*, 378, 1 March 1927, p. 2.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2, 274-290.

Kandiyoti, D. (1991). Introduction. In D. Kandiyoti (Ed.), *Women Islam and the State* (pp. 1-21). Londra: Mcmillan.

Kandiyoti, D. (1998). Bargaining with Patriarchy, *Gender & Society*, 2, 274-290.

Karaca, Ş. (2010). Emine Semiye: Hayatı, Fikir Dünyası, Sanatı, Eserleri (Doctoral Dissertation). Kayseri Erciyes Üniversitesi. Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı Türk Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı.

Karakaya-Stump, A. (2003). Debating progress in a ‘serious newspaper for Muslim women’: The periodical Kadın of the post-revolutionary Salonica, 1908–1909. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* (November, 2003), 30(2), 155-181.

Kaymaz, K. (2009). *Gölgedeki Kalem Emine Semiye: Bir Osmanlı Kadın Yazarının Düşünce Dünyası*. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Kemal, Mustafa. (1984). *Nutuk*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.

Kerimi, F. (2001). *İstanbul Mektupları*. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları.

Keskin, T. (2003). Feminist/nationalist discourse in the first year of the Ottoman revolutionary press (1908-1909): Readings from the magazines of Demet, Mehasin And Kadın (Salonica) (Doctoral dissertation), Bilkent University.

Kızıltan, M. (1993). *Nisvan-ı İslam: Fatma Aliye Hanım*. İstanbul: Mutlu Yayıncılık.

- Kızıltan, M. (1990). Öncü Bir Kadın Yazar: Fatma Aliye Hanım. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 283-322.
- Kibria, N. (1999). Power, Patriarchy, and Gender Conflict in the Vietnamese Immigrant Community, *Gender & Society*, 4, 9-24.
- Köprülü, F. (1924). *Bugünkü Edebiyat*. İstanbul: İktbal Kütüphanesi.
- Kurnaz, Ş. (1996). *II. Meşrutiyet döneminde Türk kadını* (Vol. 8). M.E.B.
- Kurnaz, Ş. (1997). *Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Türk Kadını, 1839-1923*. İstanbul: M.E.B.
- Lamaison, P. (1986). From rules to strategies: An interview with Pierre Bourdieu. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(1), 110-120.
- Lamont, M. (1987). How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher: The Case of Jacques Derrida. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 584-622.
- Lang, G. Engel., and Lang, K. (1988). Recognition and Renown: The Survival of Artistic Reputation, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 79-109.
- Le Hir, M. P. (2000). Cultural Studies Bourdieu's Way: Women, Leadership, and Feminist Theory. In N. Brown and I. Szeman (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Fieldwork in Culture* (pp.123-145). Maryland: Rowman and Little Field.
- Lovell, T. (2000). Thinking feminism with and against Bourdieu. *Feminist Theory*, 1(1), 11-32.
- Lowry, H. (1994). Halide Edib Hanım in Ankara. April 2-1920- August 16, 1921. 1. Uluslararası Atatürk Sempozyumu Açılış Konuşmaları, Bildiriler, Ankara.
- M. Sırrı. (1918, March 4). Kadınlarımızda Aile Fikri, *Atı*, 63, p.2.
- MacLeod, A. E. (1996). Transforming Women's Identity.: The Intersection of Household and Workplace. In D. Singerman and H. Hoodfar (Eds.),

Development, Change and Gender in Cairo (pp. 27-51). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mann, K. (1985). *Marrying Well: Marriage, Status and Social Change Among the Educated Elite in Colonial Lagos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marvel, E. (2011). *Ottoman Feminism and Republican Reform: Fatma Aliye's Nisvân-ı İslâm* (MA Thesis). Ohio State University. History Department.

McDonald, T. (Ed.) . (1996). *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

McLaughlin, N. (1998). How to Become a Forgotten Intellectual: Intellectual Movements and the Rise and Fall of Erich Fromm. *Sociological Forum*, 13, 215-246

McMichael, P. (1990). Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 385-397.

McNay, L. (1999). Gender, Habitus and the Field Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16(1), 95-117.

Mehmet Nafiz (Mehmet Rauf). (1910, September 9). Seviye Talip Hakkında. *Tanin*, 740, pp. 5,6.

Moi, Toril. (1991). Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture. *New Literary History*, 22, 1017-1049.

Moi, Toril. (2008). *Simone de Beauvoir: Making of an Intellectual Woman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muhteşem Neffel. (1914, May 22). Kadınlar Cihanında Türklerin Büyük Kadını Nezihe Muhiddin Hanım'a, *Seyyale*, 1, pp. 8-10.

Munachonga, M. L. (1982). Income Allocation and Marriage Options in Urban Zambia: Wives Versus Extended Kin. Paper Presented at the Conference on Women and Income Control in the Third World, New York.

Mutluay, R. (1973). *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Namık Kemal (1895) [1311]. Bahar-ı Daniş, *Mukaddeme*, İstanbul: Ebüzziya Matbaası.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1912a). Hitabe. In *Darülfunun Konferans Salonunda Kadınlarımızın İçtimaları* (pp. 80-83). İstanbul: Tanin Matbaası.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1912b, September). Ceng Ninnisi. *Donanma*, 320-25.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1913, April 6). Konferans, *Kadınlar Dünyası*, 3, pp. 3,4.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1923, Jun 4). Türk Kadınının Hakkı, *Vakit*.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1925, July 23). Cumhuriyetin Türk Kadınlığı Üzerindeki Feyzi. 2, pp. 18,19.

Nezihe Muhiddin. (1931). *Türk Kadını*. İstanbul: Numune Matbaası.

Nezihe Muhlis. (1913, April 17). Bir Mütalaa, *Kadınlar Dünyası*, 14.

Nigar bint-i Osman. (1896, Jan 16). No Title. *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, 40, p. 2.

Nigar bint-i Osman. (1908, November 8). Kadına Dair, *Kadın*, 5, p. 7.

Nigar Bint-i Osman. (1909, Feb 1). Kadın, *Kadın*, 15, p.1.

- Önertoy, O. (1965). Halide Edib'in Yeni Turan'ı ve Ziya Gökalp. *Türkoloji Dergisi*, 2, pp. 251-258.
- Özer, H. A. (2001). Roman Tenkidleri (Master Thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı. İstanbul.
- Parla, T. (1991). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Atatürk'ün Nutuk'u*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Patrick, M. M. (2001). *Bir Boğaziçi Macerası*. Tez Yayınları.
- Ragin, C. (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rıza Nur. (1992). *Hayat ve Hatıratım*. İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları.
- Sarıhan, Zeki. (Ed.) (1993). *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü*. Cilt 1,2,3,4. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Sewell, W. H., Jr. (1996). Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology. In T. McDonald (Ed.), *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences* (pp. 245-80). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Sirman, Nükhet. (1989). Feminism in Turkey: A Short History. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 3(1), 1-34.
- Skocpol, T. 1984. Emerging Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology. In T. Skocpol. (Ed.) *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology* (pp. 356-91). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stinchcombe, A. (1978). *Theoretical Methods in Social History*. New York: Academic Press.

- Swartz, D. L. (2013). Metaprinciples for Sociological Research in a Bourdieusian Perspective. In P. Gorski (Ed.), *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*, (pp. 19-35). Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.
- Şukufe Nihal. (1925, July 16). Ankara, *Kadın Yolu*, 1, pp. 6,7.
- T.N. (1923, June 26). Kadınlar Halk Fırkası Mü'essislerinin Niyyeti. *İleri*. Sayı 1937, pp. 1,2.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1997). *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi.
- Taşkıran, T. (1973). *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk kadın Hakları*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.
- Tekeli, Ş. (1982). *Kadınlar ve Siyasal-Toplumsal Hayat*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Tilly, C. (1984). *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Toprak, Z. (1995). *Milli İktisat-Milli Burjuvazi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Toska, Z. (1998). Cumhuriyet'in Kadın İdeali: Eşiği Aşanlar ve Aşamayanlar. In A. B. Hacımırzaoğlu (Ed.), *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler/ Bilanço 98*, (pp. 71-89). İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Tuchman, G., and Fortin, N. E. (1984). Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 72-96.
- Türk Kadınları Siyasi Hayata Atılmalı mıdır? *Cumhuriyet*, Issue 602, 10 Jan 1926 pp. 1-2
- Uğurcan, S. (1991). Makbule Leman Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri. *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi, Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayını*, (6).
- Uraz, M. (1941). *Resimli Kadın Şair ve Muharrirlerimiz*. İstanbul: Tefeyyüz Kitabevi.

- Wallerstein, I. (1974). The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16, 387-415.
- Weller, S. C., and Romney K. A. (1990). *Metric scaling: Correspondence analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wood, E. (1980). Women in Music. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 6, 283-97.
- Yunus Nadi (Abalıođlu). (1927, September 28). Çok Őükür Kurtulduk. *Cumhuriyet*, 1217, p. 1.
- Zehra (1908). Kadın Yazıları: Muharrirelerimize, *Mehasin*, 5, pp. 295, 297.
- Zehra. (1909, March). Kadın Bilgileri, *Mehasin*, 7, pp. 469,72.
- Zihniođlu, Y. (1998). *An Ottoman Turkish Women's Right Defender* (MA Thesis). Bođaziçi University. Department of Political Science and International Relations.
- Zihniođlu, Y. (2003). *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhiddin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliđi*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Zürcher, E. J. (1994). *Turkey: A Modern History*. London and New York: IB Tauris.