



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

History Educators in Two Different Geographies: Lucy Maynard Salmon and Abdurrahman Şeref

İki Ayrı Coğrafyada Tarih Eğitimcileri: Lucy Maynard Salmon ve Abdurrahman Şeref

Aslı Gövercin¹, Bahri Ata²

Keywords

1. History education
2. Lucy Maynard Salmon
3. Abdurrahman Şeref

Anahtar Kelimeler

- 1.Tarih eğitimi
- 2.Lucy Marnard Salmon
- 3.Abdurrahman Şeref

Received/Başvuru Tarihi

22.09.2020

Accepted / Kabul Tarihi

18.11.2020

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this research is to provide information about the lives and activities of Lucy Maynard Salmon (1853-1927), the history educator of America and Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925), the history educator and politician of the Ottoman Empire, who lived in the same periods, and to compare the understanding of history education in the light of the American and Turkish social structure of the period.

Methodology: In this study, which used the document review technique from qualitative research methods, books and articles written by scientists, as well as books, articles and dissertations written about them, were interpreted by subjecting them to descriptive analysis.

Findings: It is expected that two scientists who grew up and received education in two different societies will also differ in their understanding of history and education. Although there are differences in the educational understandings of the two intellectuals who are light in the societies in which they live, they have something in common in terms of bringing many innovations to the understanding of history of the society in which they live. Salmon develops students critical thinking and creativity skills through extracurricular practices, exams and assignments, while Şeref improves their professional competence by having graduate students teach courses at school.

Highlights: Although Şeref's understanding of education is more traditional than Salmon's, it can be considered innovative compared to the Ottoman education system of the period. They both tried to break down the taboos in the field of education that society had created over time, brought innovations to history education with their practices and thoughts, and laid the foundation for today's understanding of social studies and history education. The success of both scientists in the field of education led them to serve in different fields. Salmon worked as a manager in non-governmental organizations and associations, while Şeref served as a minister and deputy in the political field.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Aynı dönemde yaşayan Amerika'nın tarih eğitimcisi Lucy Maynard Salmon (1853-1927) ile Osmanlı Devleti'nin tarih eğitimcisi ve siyasetçisi Abdurrahman Şeref'in (1853-1925) hayatları ve faaliyetleri hakkında bilgi vermek ve dönemin Amerikan ve Türk toplum yapısı ışığında bu iki bilim insanının tarih eğitim anlayışlarını karşılaştırmaktır.

Yöntem: Nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden doküman incelemesi tekniği kullanılan bu çalışmada bilim insanlarının yazdığı kitaplar ve makalelerin yanı sıra onlar hakkında yazılan kitaplar, makaleler ve tez çalışmaları betimsel analize tabi tutularak yorumlanmıştır.

Bulgular: Farklı iki toplumda yetişen, eğitim alan iki bilim insanının tarih ve eğitim anlayışları da farklılık göstermesi beklenir bir durumdur. Yaşadığı toplumlara ışık olan iki aydının eğitim anlayışında farklılıklar olsa da içinde bulunduğu toplumun tarih anlayışına birçok yenilik getirmesi bakımından ortak yanları bulunmaktadır. Salmon, ders dışı uygulamalar, sınavlar ve ödevler ile öğrencilerin eleştirel düşünme ve yaratıcılık becerilerini geliştirirken Şeref'in ise mezun öğrencilerine okulda ders anlattırarak mesleki yeterliliklerini geliştirdiğini görüyoruz.

Önemli vurgular: Şeref'in eğitim anlayışı Salmon'a göre daha geleneksel olsa da dönemin Osmanlı eğitim sistemine nazaran yenilikçi sayılabilir. İkisi de toplumun zaman içinde oluşturduğu eğitim alanındaki tabuları yıkmaya çalışmış, uygulamaları ve düşünceleri ile tarih eğitimine yenilikler getirmiş ve bugünün sosyal bilgiler ve tarih eğitim anlayışının temelini atmışlardır. Her iki bilim insanının eğitim alanında gösterdikleri başarı onları farklı alanlarda da hizmet vermeye yöneltmiştir. Salmon sivil toplum örgütlerinde ve derneklerde yöneticilik yaparken Şeref ise siyasi alanda nazırlık ve milletvekilliği görevlerinde bulunmuştur.

¹ Corresponding Author, Gazi University, Faculty of Education, History Education Department, Ankara, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0377-0695>

² Prof. Dr., Ministry of Education, Member of the Board of Education, Ankara, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2214-0560>

INTRODUCTION

Two intellectuals in two separate geographies in the 19th century, a period in which balances of power changed, imperialism destroying the empires spread to every continent of the world and instead, nation states replaced them. One is Abdurrahman Şeref (1853-1925), both a history academician and a politician of the Ottoman Empire at the very heart of the war and the other is Lucy Maynard Salmon (1853-1927), the history academician of America, a country rising in a geography so far from the war. It is something that is normally expected that two scientific men who grew up and received education in the societies with different political interests, lifestyles, faiths and values assume different concepts of history and education from each other. Even if such two intellectuals raising the awareness of their societies assume different understanding of education, they share a common ground in terms of introducing many novelties to the history concept of the societies they lived in. Both tried to break the taboos in education, which were created by society in the course of time and brought novelty to history education with their practices and thoughts and laid the foundations of today's concept of social sciences and history education.

There are many studies about Lucy Maynard Salmon who led the way for the education and social rights of women in America and evaluated history education with an innovative perspective. All articles of Salmon were compiled in the book of *history and the texture of modern life: Selected essays* under the editorship of Nicholas Adams and Bonnie G. Smith in 2001. Other valuable book is *go to the sources: Lucy Maynard Salmon and the teaching of history* written by Chara Haeussler Bohan in 2004. These books present all unknown sides regarding Salmon's concept of history and education activities. In addition to these two books, Bohan's (1999) study called *Lucy Maynard Salmon: Progressive historian, teacher, and democrat* and Webb and Bohan's (2015) studies under the name of *Beyond Jane Addams: The progressive pedagogies of Ella Flagg Young, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Lucy Maynard Salmon and Anna Julia Cooper* better clarify Salmon's concept of history and education and also, how the tasks assumed by her as a woman were fulfilled successfully.

There are books, theses and articles written about Abdurrahman Şeref. The books written about Şeref are as follows; Demiryürek (2003) *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e bir Osmanlı aydını Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925) (Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925), an Ottoman highbrowed from Tanzimat reform era to the Republican period); and Demiryürek (2009) son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendiyle Osmanlı tarih sohbetleri (Ottoman history conversations with the last historiographer Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi)*. The theses written about Şeref are provided below; doctoral thesis called *a devlet adamı ve tarihçi Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925) (statesman and a historian Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925))* by Demiryürek (1999), Taştan (2004) *Abdurrahman Şeref, yaşadığı dönem ve eserleri (Abdurrahman Şeref, his period and works)*, Kozan (2011) *Abdurrahman Şeref Bey'in eğitim din ve ahlak eğitimiyle ilgili görüşleri (Abdurrahman Şeref Bey's views on education, religion and ethics education)*, and Çetin (2019) *Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi tarihinde Osmanlı Devletinin ilk yüzyılı (1300-1400): Osmanlı hanedanının kökeni, fetret devri ve siyasetten katl meselelerinin değerlendirilmesi (the first century of the Ottoman Empire in the history of Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1300-1400): postgraduate theses are; roots of the Ottoman dynasty, interregnum and evaluation of fratricide from a political perspective)*. The articles; Binark (1980) *arşivlerimizin değeri ve son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Beyin 'evrak-ı atika ve vesai-i tarihiyemiz' (value of our archives and the last historiographer Abdurrahman Şeref Bey's 'our old papers and history documents)*, Tekiner (2009) *Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (biyografisi, resmi ve özel hayatı) (Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (his biography, picture and private life))* prepared by Vehbi Günay for publication, Demiryürek (2003) *biyografi yazarı olarak Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi as a biography writer)* and Demiryürek (2003) *ölümünün 78 yılında son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi ve Cumhuriyet (the last historiographer Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi in the 78th year of his death and the Republic)*.

Purpose and Importance of the Research

The aim of this research is to provide information about the lives and activities of Lucy Maynard Salmon and Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi who lived in the same periods, and to compare their understanding of history education in the light of the American and Turkish social structure of the period. Lack of any study about both scholars and comparing the history education of both societies in the 19th century makes this study important.

Problem Statement of the Sub-study

Problem statement of this study has been described as "What can be said about the lives and activities of Lucy Maynard Salmon and Abdurrahman Şeref, their understandings of history education and similarities and differences between such understanding of theirs. "Sub-problems in this context are summarized as follows: a) What can be told about Lucy Maynard Salmon's life, activities and understanding of history education, b) What can be told about Abdurrahman Şeref's life, activities and understanding of history education, c) What are the similarities and differences between both scholars' understandings of history education."

METHOD

Design of the Research

In this study, document review technique, one of the qualitative research methods, was used. According to Yıldırım and Şimşek (2008), document review covers analysis of the written materials containing information about facts and cases intended to be studied. Data collected from the academic studies regarding the works of both scholars and themselves have been analyzed and interpreted.

Data Acquisition and Analysis

The documents that make up the data set of the study consist of the articles of Lucy Maynard Salmon obtained from the library of Vassar College and the book of Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi translated into modern Turkish and 4 books, 6 articles and 4 dissertations on the lives and activities of these scientists. These works were interpreted within the framework of these scientists' lives, activities, and perspectives of history by subjecting them to descriptive analysis and their understandings of history education were compared by considering the social characteristics of the period.

FINDINGS

Lucy Maynard Salmon's Life and Activities (1853-1927)

Lucy Maynard Salmon was born in 1853 in Fulton, NY as the daughter of an English and French-origin family. Her mother Maria Clara Maynard, manageress of Fulton Female Seminary, supported her education in a period in which few women were educated in America and most of whom were deprived of their rights. Salmon completed her undergraduate study in history department in Michigan University in 1876. Then, she worked as the assistant principal and the principal of McGregor High School. Salmon completed her graduate study in Political Science department of Michigan University in 1883 and focused on European history, English and American constitutional history (Webb & Bohan, 2015). Her postgraduate thesis named as "A History of the Appointing Power of the President" was published in the first issue of American Historical Associations' Papers in 1886. Next year, she established the history department of Vassar University and retained her position as the head of this department until the end of her life. At first, Salmon was the only academician of the department but she expanded it soon and received a full professorship in 1889. Salmon, who participated in American Historical Association (AHA) in 1885, was elected to be a member in Executive Council of the Association in 1915 became the first woman to take office in the council. She established Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, which was the oldest association in history education (Bohan, 2004).

Salmon's ideas were extremely innovative and democratic for the society which was unable to form participatory democracy completely. She was the one who held an innovative, progressive and pluralistic vision in history education and pioneer and supporter of women's rights as well as being an academician. Her studies were particularly on women's possession of rights in education and politics. The American society and government during that period did not support equal education and voting right for all citizens and particularly for women. Therefore, Salmon's ideas and studies were criticized by most of her colleagues and politicians (Bohan, 1999).

In 1870, 60% of all universities in the USA were dedicated to men and 12% to women. Even though the rest of the schools provided coeducation, proportion of men was extremely predominant. Social structure, perspective on women and the role played by women in the society in Victorian age had not only affected the English society but also America was affected by this viewpoint. Woman's role in the society was to get married and bring up a child. This understanding made women emotionally closer to each other. Few women could study in university and those graduated from university had to make a choice between marriage and career due to the perception that married women would not be able to dedicate themselves to their professions. Business life for the women particularly in the top-class in America meant social recognition. However, higher education provided many women with the feeling of freedom and educational institutions became the most widespread employment area for women. Just like the other women in that period, Salmon also chose to teach as her profession and never got married. She shared the same house with her female friend Adelaide Underhill for 30 years (Bohan, 2004).

Lucy Maynard Salmon's Understanding of History Education

Salmon's education vision was affected by the gender issues of Victorian age, lives of ignored people and reflected on historiography and history teaching. As a student, Salmon wrote on political history and as a lecturer, on social history. Salmon and the prominent historians of the period, James Harvey Robinson, Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles Beard and Woodrow Wilson supported social history as a new field. Instead of confining history to military and political figures and events, these historians tried to expand the ground of historiography. They believed that all people made a contribution to history and their stories had to be told. Salmon also and primarily wrote about immigrants and minorities with low socio-economic status and women issues and made a contribution to this trend. However, she supported equality of all people and made efforts in order to contribute development of democratic feelings. At the beginning of her career, she made researches into domestic economic activities and household services particularly in the United States of America and at the end of her career, newspaper issues. Salmon conducted studies on the history of workers, employers and ordinary people and wrote articles about domestic economic activities too besides that she created a new working field named as home economics, domestic science and crafts. Salmon used innovative methods such as questionnaire and statistics in order to collect data for domestic service researches. Since these methods were considered to be rare historical research forms in the earlier periods of the twentieth century, they were criticized as well. Having conducted studies on newspaper towards the end of her career, Salmon stated that newspaper could be used as a tool to understand political and social events. According to Salmon, newspaper was an important source of information for historians in reconstructing the past allowing society to be examined as a whole. Newspapers were the leading means of mass communication prior to radio, television and film. Newspapers made a contribution to acquire information regarding the course of the war during the American Civil War and the World War 1 in the political field, and social life thanks to the pictures and advertisements.

Salmon's books published in this respect are as follows; *Domestic Service* (1897), *Progress in the Household* (1906), *The Newspaper and the Historian* (1923) and *The Newspaper and Authority* (1923) (Bohan, 1999).

In her article "What is Modern History?", Salmon clarifies the issues we are still arguing on. Modern historians describe the history after 15th century as modern history and the historians of the classical periods as reactionist (anti-modern, traditionalist). Salmon criticizes this approach. According to her, chronology is not as fixed and direct as it is put forward. Time has been defined by people as a result of political and religious events. For her, "Time called Greenwich time is untrue. The only real time is solar time" and in this way, Salmon put forwards that times of the ancient age and the modern age cannot be determined. Additionally, since development of every society is different, their modernization process occurs in different periods too. Salmon puts forward that formation of chronology is not necessary so as to determine the modern history. However, Salmon states in this article of hers that literature, art and science are universal. Even though they are the products of individual effort, such elements become part of a whole as they are continuation of former efforts occurred with the incremental growth of previous conditions even if they are completed (Salmon, 1917).

Salmon's views about historiography can be summarized as follows; historiography is the job of historians. Historians should write about the period they live in regardless of whether what happened is important or not. An event considered to be unimportant today may be the cause of different events over the next periods and gain value. If any trivial information at present is associated with the past, it is valuable. The scholar John Bright says, "We stand thanks to our ancestors and are able to perceive more." The smallest piece of information incrementally increases like a snowball. "The darkest age is the one we live in" said Salmon. She notes that an extensive examination of an event over the example of the First World War has been censored in terms of political, military, economic and social aspects and prevented from being disclosed. Historians should continue writing about what they have observed without fear since we tend to believe in what we see rather than what we hear. Salmon says, "trendy things are temporary, but seed grows well and becomes permanent in the soil with a solid ground." Therefore, she expressed her views in this respect stating, "historians should not write about every subject, but they should be specialist in a specific subject and conduct deep studies on that topic" (Salmon, 1917).

Salmon, who always considers history from a different perspective, indicates in her article called *History Museum* that museums are great antiques which cannot be restricted into geographical boundaries and thus, she makes museums universal. She describes museums as not only teaching areas but also sophisticated places where people become socialized and share information in the cafes and rest areas located in museums. In this article, Salmon gives information about the museums she visited during her trip to Europe and as for the American history museums; she states that ethnical elements making up today's America are kept in history museums. Salmon puts forward that we can examine the English furniture, Dutch household goods, French tiles, German toys, Swiss embroidery, Italian laces, Swedish textiles and all other solid remains being part of American life today in history museums. Salmon emphasizes that just as we follow chronology in historiography, chronology should also be taken into account when placing the objects in museums. In the same article, Salmon states that the point is not to bring the objects in different parts of the world together but the objects should be left as they are in their original locations and for example, Egyptian Obelisk in Central Park and Bunker Hill Monument in Boston are not significant by themselves but these works will gain meaning when they are examined together with the other objects in Egypt and the Sahara Dessert (Salmon, 2019; Trans., Bahri Ata).

History teaching methods developed by Salmon were innovative and advanced compared to the period she lived in. For her, goal of the history lesson is, on the one hand, to give information and on the other hand, develop students' skills of reasoning. When selecting materials for their lessons, teachers should consider the appropriateness of such materials to their students' mental development as well as appropriateness to their subjects. Many times, before Jean Piaget wrote about cognitive development stages in 1960s, Salmon indicated that textbooks and history lessons had to be prepared according to the mental development of child. Salmon put emphasis on five mental development characteristics which she found pedagogically useful in history teaching. These are given below; 1. Imagination, 2. Learning Enthusiasm, 3. Unity/Integration, 4. Judgment, 5. Creativity. Salmon explained these stages as follows; the first and the second stages of development correspond to primary and secondary school terms and during this period, imagination, reasoning skill, learning enthusiasm and desire of a child should be increased benefiting mythology and biology. Third stage of development corresponds to high school period and students should learn the national history during this period. The fact that students learn about the development and growth of their nations increase their feelings of national unity and solidarity and they learn integration of facts and ideas. Fourth stage corresponds to university period and in this process, more limited periods in which students can make comparisons should be examined and they should develop their judgment skills by focusing on the cause and effect among the cases. Fifth stage is graduate period and at this stage, students should be encouraged to focus on original historical resources and independents studies and their creative skills should be developed by creating new works (Bohan, 2004).

According to Salmon, using textbooks by teachers only for memorizing and supporting verbal memory was wrong. On the other hand, she also disapproved of the source method in which textbooks were totally excluded and history was reconstructed with original and multi-part documents. The most suitable method was to prepare textbooks covering both methods according to the age characteristics of students by supporting such textbooks with descriptive texts and original sources. She believed that reading textbooks instead of memorizing them, listening to the lesson and examining sources were inseparable components of history learning process. Ultimate goal of history teaching at the university level was to encourage students to conduct independent study

with original sources and materials. For other levels, when using original sources, their suitability for student level had to be taken into consideration. With these views, Salmon influenced American Historical Association (AHA). The committee decided to teach students how to read history books instead of memorizing as a teaching method, how to develop a thinking process about historical facts and how to analyze the relationships between a proof and a historical sentence. However, the committee also decided to support development of skills of historical thinking, critical thinking, preparing written study, presenting verbal reports, making and reading map, preparing notebook and proper use of original source materials (Bohan, 2004). Today, signs of these recommendations are observed in the social sciences and history teaching programs. Salmon's support regarding use of primary historical sources by students became the key point of her life. This was her "magnum opus" (masterpiece) and was planning to prepare a book about historical materials. Nevertheless, she did not live long enough to achieve this and in 1933 her colleagues in Vassar published her incomplete article under the name of *Historical Material* (Bohan, 1999).

Salmon's classes, events and methods were always subject of debate and drew criticism a lot. Salmon changed the understanding of traditional method in which teacher transferred knowledge and students learnt it by memorizing in the classroom environment. She used to take the students to the library and gathered them around a long table so that discussions could be made freely and in a comfortable atmosphere. "Long table" became Salmon's brand (Webb & Bohan, 2015). As one of Salmon's important events, she brought her students to the kitchen of the house in Poughkeepsie in order to discover history. For her, native works were part of history and wanted the students to determine which history emerged by examining kitchen utensils, kitchenware and machines. For comparison, she put up the photo of a kitchen from the colonial period in Victorian age. While Salmon's pedagogical approach showed for students that history was observable in the ordinary sides of life, this approach increased the students' interest in cultural and social history.

Salmon's another interesting event was to take her students to the main street in Poughkeepsie for examination. Her student GL Chase (Fletcher) stated that the signs and symbols on the architecture of the buildings were the traditions from the periods when people were illiterate and the immigrants from different countries had an effect on the names of the stores. While the factories surrounding the street and the trucks on the street were the proof and reflection of modern industry, the columns and the arches on the street bore the traces of Roman and Greek history (Bohan, 1999). It was likely that these site visits made a deeper impression on the students than merely reading a book on the history of kitchen and city. With such out-of-school events, Salmon proved that historical materials were accessible everywhere and in fact, our living spaces were historical documents. In her article called *History in a Backyard*, she resembled the hedge in the backyard of her house to the boundaries of a country and stated that the flowers in the backyard belonging to different nations were living peacefully. "Can the nations of the world live peacefully like their representatives in our backyard" was the question asked by her and with this analogy, she argued that whether all nations could live in a peaceful environment without countries and without boundaries (Salmon, 1913). Salmon evaluated history from a different perspective and stated that individuals could conduct historical studies related to different subjects and history could address a larger group of people than a certain group of academicians. She believed that literary history was more interesting than traditional or academic history and would address a wider group of people. So, she tried to receive a support for a new AHA magazine dedicated to the literature history and address general readers, but her efforts were fruitless (Bohan, 1999). In fact, this thesis of Salmon accounts for why historical novels are among best-sellers, historical series and films are blockbusters today.

Salmon's exams, homework and teaching methods were advanced compared to the methods we still make discussions on today. She used to require her students to define or explain a certain historical fact by using their creative skills. Salmon encouraged her students to collect lake photographs, postcards as a source, examine the buildings and monuments, read original documents on the newspapers in order to discover history in homework and exams during the year and in this way, she made them write history by having her students analyze the knowledge and use their imaginative power. She tested her students for historical material at the end of the year and evaluated their skills of analysis, judgment, finding the sources of historical knowledge and identifying the relationships in this respect and encouraged them to be interested in history (Bohan, 2004). In American history lesson and in the lesson called ethnical elements, Salmon used to direct her students to examine the contributions of the immigrants to the American music, political, social, literary and industrial development (Bohan, 1999). As it is seen in these examples, Salmon encouraged her students, on the one hand, to examine and study the traditional and extraordinary subjects and on the other hand, to use the methods of collecting innovative historical knowledge.

Abdurrahman Şeref's Life and Activities (1853-1925)

Abdurrahman Şeref, whose grandfather, father and brother were military men, was born in 1853 in Istanbul as the son of Hasan Efendi being one of the accounting secretaries of Tophane-i Amire and Şevket Feza Hanım. After he completed his first education in Sıbyan Mektebi (Ottoman Primary School) in his neighborhood, he went to Eyüp Rüştiye (Ottoman Middle School) and then, attended to Mahrec-i Aklam and Mekteb-i Sultanî (Galatasaray High School) and graduated from this school in 1873 (Demiryürek, 2017).

Abdurrahman Şeref's successful activities as the principal of Mekteb-i Mülkiye (School of Political Sciences) drew attention and he was rewarded by Sultan Abdülhamid II with continuous rise in rank. Despite all these positive processes, some events in the school disturbed the ruling regime. Murat Bey, teacher of Tarih-i Umumi (General History) at school published a newspaper called *Mizan* and it raised the topics of freedom, equality, justice and constitutionalism and etc. These ideas met with approval by the

students and reached through graduated students other places than school. Discontentment with the regime of the Sultan Abdülhamid II were begun to be expressed verbally and in written. Abdurrahman Şeref was dismissed from his position in Mekteb-i Mülkiye (School of Political Sciences) due to various intrigues and the reports of informers and appointed as the principal of Mekteb-i Sultanî (Galatasaray High School). He tried to protect the students against the reports of informers in order not to experience the same problems. He was rewarded with various medals by the Ottoman Empire owing to his successful and devoted activities during his management at this school and by some European states since he revitalized the spirit of Tanzimat (Reforms). After Abdurrahman Şeref left his position in Mekteb-i Sultanî in 1908, he continued teaching general history and the Ottoman history in Darülfünun (Istanbul University). Following announcement of the Second Constitution, he started political life as Defteri Hakanı Nazırı (General Director of Land Registry and Cadastre). He was appointed as the member of Ayan Meclisi (The Senate) by the Sultan Abdülhamid II in 1908 (Demiryürek, 2003). In 1909, the Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni (Ottoman History Association) was established under the presidency of Abdurrahman Şeref upon the request of the Sultan Mehmet Reşat V with the purpose of searching and writing the Ottoman history. The counsel continued its activities under the name of Türk Tarih Encümeni (Turkish History Association) until 1931 and published a magazine at regular intervals for 11 years and released the 1st volume of the *Ottoman History* in 191 (Yazgan, 2003).

Appointment of Abdurrahman Şeref to the Ministry of Education occurred actually in 1909 during the government of Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa and he was assigned to Şûrâ-yı Devlet Reisliği (The Council of State), Ministry of Trade and Agriculture until the last Ottoman Parliament (Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi) was dissolved and to the Ministry of Education and the Council of State by proxy in the last government. This was the last Ottoman government in which Abdurrahman Şeref took office (Türkgeldi, 1987). When the Turkish War of Independence resulted in success, Abdurrahman Şeref was the first member of the assembly of notables to visit and support Ankara. Abdurrahman Şeref, who was recognized with his patriotism, was nominated as a candidate from Istanbul. Following elections, he got into TBMM (Turkish Grand National Assembly) as the Member of Parliament of Istanbul. He made the opening speech of TBMM as the oldest member of the assembly. As being one of the two people who became the Republican deputy from the Constitutional assembly of notables, Abdurrahman Şeref continued this duty until the end of his life (Demiryürek, 2003).

Abdurrahman Şeref's Understanding of History Education

Abdurrahman Şeref fulfilled his duties of administration and teaching in Mekteb-i Mülkiye (School of Political Sciences). He gave lectures such as Moral Philosophy, the Ottoman History, General Geography, Statistics and method of Translation. Abdurrahman Şeref was loved and respected very much as both an administrator and a teacher and influential on the students in this school in terms of holding modern ideas considering the relevant period and made every effort to ensure that the students completed their education. Abdurrahman Şeref made some changes in this school. One of these changes was to convert the school building into a boarding school. He aimed at strengthening the moral bond among the students and with this change, students would have the feeling of the privilege of being the member to Mülkiye (Political Science Graduate) (Taştan, 2004).

Abdurrahman Şeref defined discipline in his book called *İlm-i Ahlâk* (Moral Philosophy) and drew the attention to the fact that it was used by the public in order to explain polite behaviors and kind attitudes and the reason why those acting in line with the general acceptance of the society were described as well-behaved children resulted from this acceptance. He argued that only education could allow man to reveal their inherent qualities, use such qualities and make themselves and others different from other living creatures through such qualities developed (Kozan, 2011). In this book, Şeref says: "disciplining ideas may denote education and learning knowledge. Education does not only consist of knowledge and sciences we learn in schools. Lessons in schools are the key to the mine of knowledge. We should be enthusiastic to continue our education and learn knowledge not only in schools but also during our lifetime." He states that education starts in family and is shaped in the society in which we live. In the same book, Şeref divided sciences into parts and stated that each type of science developed another aspect of mind and helped men to understand and know themselves and made a contribution to the moral development. He mentions about natural sciences such as religion, mathematics, philosophy, chemistry, history, poetry and literature (Şeref, 2019).

Abdurrahman Şeref made recommendations to the teachers and academicians in the same book. These recommendations may include treating students with affection and politely, forgiving their mistakes. According to him, following order must be observed in order to discipline a child with affection; "1. First what is good and bad should be taught to the child. 2. When children do good things, they should not be appreciated to their faces. 3. Children should not be compared with their peers for their good or bad behaviors. 4. Children's mistakes should sometimes be ignored, and children should not be embarrassed. 5. Children should not be allowed to do some things secretly. 6. Children's stubbornness for their bad attitudes should be overcome." It can be said that these views reflecting authoritarian education understanding are still used today in order to maintain discipline in education. Abdurrahman Şeref did not make recommendations only to the teachers but also all people in the society and indicated the responsibilities of individuals to themselves, each other and the state. He mentioned about the responsibilities of spouses to each other, children's responsibilities to their parents and parents' responsibilities to their children as well (Şeref, 2019).

Abdurrahman Şeref educated students who were likely to affect and dominate the mindset of a period. These included Efdaleddin Tekiner, Hamdullah Suphi, Tevfik Fikret, Ahmet Haşim, Ahmet Bedii, İbrahim Hakkı Paşa, Kazım Bey (Demiryürek, 2003). Efdaleddin Tekiner, one of Şeref's students and his assistant speaks about his teacher as follows; "Abdurrahman Şeref used to call his students "molla (scholar)", "flowers of my garden", "şakirdan efendiler (my dear pupils)" and similar soft expressions and he

was not too familiar with his officials but treated them sympathetically and pleasantly. He treated each of them according to their positions and did not hurt them. He never used vulgar language in his relationship with his students during the lessons and when he found it necessary to warn and advise them for any problem. On the contrary, students were very enthusiastic to attend to his lessons. Morals, advice, proverbs, warnings, encouragement, and all other essential elements were included in his curriculum during his lessons with the purpose of educating the students completely. Şeref defended and supported the rights of his students and in case of any event in which his students were involved, he used to take the side which was in favor of his students. Abdurrahman Şeref definitely succeeded in drawing the attention of the student to the lesson and found the ways of not reflecting the faults of the students to them. Therefore, his students always showed respect and love to him” (Kozan, 2011).

When we look into the memories of Abdurrahman Şeref, we observe that he is a kind-hearted, helpful and traditional teacher. Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, one of his students, speaks about him as follows: “Our master used to close his eyes while he was speaking. Our teacher, being adhered to the previous discipline methods, created a certain degree of formality between himself and us. He knew that when we caught each other’s eyes, we broke the ice, and this was contrary to the dignity of teaching profession.” We observe that this attitude reflects authoritarian teacher profile of the period. Today, the discipline in which eye contact with students during the lesson makes teaching more permanent prevails unlike what we have observed in the method utilized by Abdurrahman Şeref. In his memories, Ahmet İhsan Tokgöz says; “Abdurrahman Şeref was extraordinarily conversationalist. You could never find anybody who did not enjoy spending time with him when they listened to his anecdotes and tales. He used to tell jokes when teaching the lesson and we admired the way he told the lesson.” Refet Avni Aras adds the following: “we not only learned about history in his lessons against irreplaceable authority in his branch but also we learned many things about our moral improvement, requirements of humanity, Turks’ heroic deeds beyond what was given in the history books, vivid examples of lofty excellence.” (Demiryürek,2009). As it is understood from the memories of the students; when teaching the lesson, Abdurrahman Şeref used to tell the events as if he had experienced them, revitalized the events with stories and made teaching permanent. He talked about the developments related to freedom and innovations with extremely happy and content spirit and imbued his students with these ideas. His way speaking and telling was different from the way he wrote. He preferred to use a language which was difficult to understand in his writing but used a simple and pleasant language during the lesson.

Abdurrahman Şeref tried to protect both his students and Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şahane (School of Political Sciences) and Galatasaray Mekteb-i Sultanî (Galatasaray High School) as the manager of these institutions against the oppressions of the period of the Sultan Abdülhamid II and widespread spying activities during that period. During his administrative positions in these schools, he tried to educate his students in western mentality and as the supporters of freedom and democracy and succeeded in his efforts too. For instance, he did not avoid from telling his students about French revolution despite the oppressions of the Sultan Abdülhamid II. He told the students proudly; “freedom is not given but acquired” even if the first Ottoman Constitution of 1876 and freedom were not present in the country. He also tried to develop the education during his position as the Ministry of General Education, made efforts to find funds with the purpose of opening new schools and attached importance to train new teachers with modern ideas. Şeref believed that plan and programs in education would increase continuous success and indicated during his ministry of education that changes as it is on a scratch pad could not be made in education and raised an objection to the changes of lesson and curriculum in the middle of an academic year (Demiryürek, 2003).

As a history teacher, Abdurrahman Şeref prepared many textbooks. These textbooks consisted of compilation of the lesson notes and did not include only history but also geography and morality. The first book written by Şeref was *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Düvel-i İslamiyye* (A Short History of Islamic States). His first work related to the Ottoman history was *Tarih-i Osmani* (The Ottoman History). Other history books of his were as follows: *Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniye* (History of the Ottoman Empire), *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniye* (A Short History of the Ottoman Empire), *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Düvel-i İslamiyye* (A Short History of Islamic States), *Zubdet-ül Kisas* (General History) and *Tarih-i Asr-ı Hazır* (Contemporary History). His other book named as *Tarih Musahabeleri* (History Conversations) was published by the Ministry of National Education and created by the compilation of some articles written by Abdurrahman Şeref in *Sabah* newspaper between the years of 1917-1918 and in *Vakit* newspaper between the years of 1921-1922. This book was simplified by Enver Koray and reprinted with the new alphabet in 1985 (Tan, 2014).

DISCUSSION

Comparison within the Framework of Historical Context

We observe that both scholars gave history lessons in the secondary education at the beginning of their professions and then, at university. We know that one of Salmon’s lessons in Vassar College was ethnical elements in American history while Abdurrahman Şeref gave lectures under the name of general history and the Ottoman history in Darülfünun (Istanbul University). When we consider the views of the scholars about history education, we observe that they tried to destroy the stereotyped thinking of their societies about history education. It should not be difficult to guess that verbal lessons particularly such as history were taught by teacher’s transfer of information to student in the classroom in the education system of the 19th century. Bohan (2004) reports that Salmon was criticized by her colleagues since she taught the lessons unlike the established methods of her age and she was a successful woman. Salmon encouraged her students to think, discuss and analyze with the practices in her lessons, out-of-school activities, homework and exams rather than memorizing the historical facts. She took the lesson away from classroom environment and proved that history could meet them everywhere by taking her students to the library, kitchen of her house and to the main streets of the city. It can be put forward that Şeref’s understanding education is more modern than the

society he lived in but more traditional than Salmon's understanding. As far as the memories of his students, Abdurrahman Şeref taught his lessons with direct instruction method in the classroom and used simple and understandable language, strengthened the subject with different stories and succeeded in drawing the attention of the students with his tone of voice. Reflecting an authoritarian teacher model, Abdurrahman Şeref tried to protect his students against spying activities while he made efforts to support development of the ideas such as equality, freedom and justice on the part of his students.

According to Salmon, goal of the history education should emphasize the difference between reading and analyzing history and develop students' skills of thinking, interpreting and analyzing, give information to every student about the best independent studying methods and encourage them to study individually. Present developments of different nations should be correlated with their past and multi-disciplinary comparison skills of students should be developed by identifying the relationships of history with other disciplines (Bohan, 2004). The goal expected from Abdurrahman Şeref's history education has been summarized by Demiryürek (2017) as follows; only occurrence of historical facts should not be told but causes and effects should be analyzed and the essential points should be taught and students should be encouraged to understand and guess the future events through the past events. Thus, history served a bridge and past events should be taken as an example in constructing the future. It can be said that Şeref's understanding of history is between traditional and modern but closer to the modernization.

We can say that Salmon behaved as an older sister toward the female students and Şeref behaved as an older brother toward male students and both acted as a mentor for development and education of their students. Salmon acted as a mentor for her students not only during the school time but also after school. She gave academic support to postgraduate students, provided letter of recommendation, books and sources. She helped those who wanted to continue their profession as teachers and gave letter of recommendation at the request of the relevant students (Bohan, 2004). Şeref provided the graduate students, the students attending to school in the evenings with the opportunity of giving lessons and developed their professional skills by allowing them to undergo a kind of training with the purpose of increasing their success. Additionally, he led the way to make Galatasaray Football Team so as to contribute physical development of the students. Abdurrahman Şeref voluntarily participated in every activity which might be useful for the students in the schools where he worked as a manager and did his best so that his students could complete their education. He tried to keep his schools and students away from spying activities. He adopted providing his students with modern sciences and imbuing them with freedom and equality ideas commonly supported in the west as a principle when educating them. Additionally, Şeref aimed at combining these ideas with the religious principles and wanted his students to achieve the goals of the modern world and on the other hand, to be individuals living in line with the rules of the religion and aiming at acquiring after-life happiness too (Kozan,2011).

Salmon did not find use of the textbooks by teachers only for the purpose of memorizing and supporting verbal memory right. History textbooks should be prepared by supporting them with explanatory texts and original sources depending on the age characteristics of students (Bohan, 2004). Şeref's views about history textbooks are similar to Salmon's. He attached importance to use of source in his books, compared the sources while examining them and tried to give complementary knowledge with the footnotes. According to him, among the fields, writing history textbooks was the most difficult one. From his point of view, telling the historical facts chronologically was not the point but telling them in line with the cognitive development of students was important. History textbooks should not only transfer occurrence process of historical facts, but they should state the reasons and results of such facts and provide insight into the future through the facts of the past. Şeref puts forward that the textbooks of his period are suitable for the primary and secondary school level but not suitable for the age levels of higher education students. He designed his book called "*Tarih-i Devlet-i Osmaniye (The Ottoman Empire History)*" in order that it would address higher education level and in consideration of the skills and knowledge of Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şahane (School of Political Sciences) students. The book does not include only the facts but information about important persons and politicians, former ruling order and organization structure of the Ottoman Empire as well. He suggested that not only students, but also civil servants would benefit this book owing to said characteristics (Demiryürek, 2009). As it is seen, both scholars insistently emphasized that history textbooks should be suitable for the age and development levels of students and make a contribution to the mental development of students in addition to giving information.

Museum was very important for both scholars. Salmon, in her article called *history museum*, diversified the museums as art, handicrafts, industry, mineralogy, nature history, ethnology, biographic, archeology and history museums and talked about the objectives of these museums, and how the objects in museums should be placed and kept. In the same article and in his trip to Europe, she gave information about the museums she examined. In Şeref's articles called *Topkapı Sarayı Hümayun ve Topkapı Sarayı Hümayun harem dairesi* (Topkapı Palace Imperial and Topkapı Palace Imperial women quarters) published in *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* (Magazine of Ottoman History Association), Abdurrahman Şeref revealed unknown sides of Topkapı Palace which is presently used as a museum. Another service of Şeref about museums was that he submitted a report to the Sublime Porte about the library and museum of Yıldız Palace, which was saved from a potential looting due to 31 March Incident and presented his observations and solutions regarding emptying it. With this report, in 1910, Library of Yıldız Palace was transferred to the Ministry of Education and the Museum of Yıldız Palace to Hazine-i Hassa (The Sultan's privy purse). The Library was transferred to Darülfünun (Istanbul University) in 1925 with the order of Mustafa Kemal. After Darülfünun was transformed to Istanbul University, these works are still kept in rare works library of the university (Candemir, 2008).

Since newspapers and magazines were the most important mass media of the period, both scholars used them so as to communicate their ideas to the public. Salmon wrote articles about the historical subjects of the newspaper and suggested that

historians could use the newspaper in order to do researches about both political and social issues. For Şeref too, newspaper was a tool in order to publish newspaper articles. Additionally, Salmon's articles were published in the Papers of American History Association and Şeref's articles were published in Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası (Magazine of Ottoman History Association). When we evaluate the subjects of the articles in general, we observe that Salmon wrote about the social historical subjects such as household services, newspaper, democracy, social rights of the people and women with low social-economic level. In Şeref's articles, we observe that he wrote about biographies of the statesmen political events of the period, government budget, affairs with other states, political historical subjects such as the duties of the statesmen and their effects on the political events.

CONCLUSION

It is observed that social, political and economic characteristics of the American and Turkish society of the period affected Salmon and Şeref's mindsets and despite their common points, differences between them were more than the similarities. There are similarities in terms of woman's place in both societies in the social structure of the period and women are expected to do housework and bring up children. In America having its share of oppressive attitude of the Victorian age, it is observed that they acted together in favor of freedom and equality when the education levels of women rose. Salmon was also affected by this movement and made efforts for positive discrimination for women and led the way for women through civil society organizations. When we examine Şeref's views on this issue, we observe that he attached importance to the education of girls. In his book called *İlm-i Ahlâk* (Moral Philosophy), Şeref clearly puts emphasis on the duties of individuals, spouses, children and parents in the society to each other. As far as it is understood from this book, his ideas specifying that woman should bring up children beneficial to the society, do housework and respect her husband coincide with the social and political structure in the last period of the Ottoman Empire.

Success of both scholars regarding history teaching led them to provide service in more different fields. Salmon took office in the board of directors of American Historical Association (AHA) and establishment and function of certain non-governmental organizations in addition to her administrative position in Vassar College. Şeref established Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni (the Ottoman History Association), worked as a manager in Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şahane (School of Political Sciences) and Galatasaray Mekteb-i Sultanî (Galatasaray High School) and acted as Istanbul deputy in the 2nd Term assembly of TBMM (Turkish Grand National Assembly) in addition to his positions as the Minister of Education for twice, the Minister of Foundations for once and historiographer, official historiography of the Ottoman Empire.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.

Statements of Publication Ethics

We hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

Researchers' Contribution Rate

The study was conducted and reported with equal collaboration of the researchers.

Ethics Committee Approval Information

In this study, document review technique, one of the qualitative research methods, was used. Ethics committee approval is not required for document review research.

REFERENCES

- Binark, İ. (1980). Arşivlerimizin değeri ve son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Beyin "evrâk-ı atîka ve vesâik-i tarihiyemiz" adlı yazısı. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği Dergisi*, (29)1, 23-38.
- Bohan, C. H. (1999). *Lucy Maynard Salmon: Progressive historian, teacher, and democrat*. In M. S. Crocco & O. L. Davis, Jr. (Ed.) 'Bending the future to their will': Civic women, social education, and democracy (pp. 47-72). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bohan, C. H. (2004). *Go to the sources. Lucy Maynard Salmon and the teaching of history*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Candemir, M. (2008). Yıldız Sarayı Kütüphanesi: Saray'dan üniversiteye. *Tarih Dergisi*, sayı 45, 123-153.
- Çetin, E. (2019). *Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi tarihinde Osmanlı Devletinin ilk yüzyılı (1300-1400): Osmanlı hanedanının kökeni, fetret devri ve siyasetten katlı meselelerinin değerlendirilmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mardin.
- Demiryürek, M. (1999). *Devlet adamı ve tarihçi Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925)*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora Tezi), Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü, İzmir.

- Demiryürek, M. (2003). *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e bir Osmanlı aydını Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1853-1925)*. Ankara: Phoenix
- Demiryürek, M. (2003). Biyografi yazarı olarak Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi. *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 18(1), 45-59.
- Demiryürek, M. (2003). Ölümünün 78 yılında son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi ve Cumhuriyet. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 128.
- Demiryürek, M. (2009). *Son vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendiyle Osmanlı tarih sohbetleri*. İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar.
- Demiryürek, M. (2017). *Son Vakanüvis Abdurrahman Şeref*. Ahmet Şimşek (Ed.), *Türkiye'de Tarih Eğitimi*, (s. 29-36) içinde. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kozan, N. (2011). *Abdurrahman Şeref Bey'in eğitim din ve ahlak eğitimiyle ilgili görüşleri*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Salmon, L. M. (1913). *History in a back yard*. New York: Poughkeepsie.
- Salmon, L. M. (1917). *What is the modern history?* New York: Vassar College Poughkeepsie.
- Salmon, L. M. (2001). *History and the texture of modern life selected essays*. Nicholas Adams And Bonnie G. Smith (Eds.), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Salmon, L. M. (2019). Tarih müzesi. (Bahri ATA, Çev.), *Uluslararası Müze Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 76-88.
- Şeref, A. (2012). *Tarih musahabeleri*. İstanbul: Kapı.
- Şeref, A. (2019). *Ahlâk ilmi*. (Sadeleştiren Mevlüt Uyanık, Aygün Akyol), Ankara: Elis.
- Tan, Ç. (2014, Ekim). *Son Osmanlı vakanüvisi Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi'nin Osmanlı tarih eğitimindeki ve tarih yazıcılığı üzerine bir derleme*. I. Uluslararası Türklerde Tarih Bilinci ve Tarih Yazıcılığı Sempozyumu, Zonguldak.
- Taştan, Y. K. (2004). *Abdurrahman Şeref: Yaşadığı dönem ve eserleri*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi) Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kırıkkale.
- Tekiner, E. M. (2009). Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (Biyografisi, resmi ve özel hayatı), Hazırlayan Vehbi Günay, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 24(1), 253-278.
- Türkgeldi, A. F. (1987). *Görüp işittiklerim*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları 4. Baskı.
- Webb, R. & Bohan, C. H. (2015). *Beyond Jane Addams: The progressive pedagogies of Ella Flagg Young, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Lucy Maynard Salmon, and Anna Julia Cooper*. In Eryaman, M.Y. & Bruce, B.C. (Ed.) *The International Handbook of Progressive Education*, (pp. 137-154). New York: Peter Lang.
- Yazgan, M. (2003). *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni (kuruluşu, çalışmaları, mensupları, çıkardığı mecmua, kapanışı)*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi, Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin.