

Konferans Raporu/Conference Report

Report on the Symposium “Ottoman Ego-Documents”: Towards an Inventory of Ottoman Ego-Documents

SEMRA ÇÖREKÇİ

İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü
Istanbul Medeniyet University, Faculty of Letters, Department of History

(semra.corekci@medeniyet.edu.tr), ORCID: 0000-0001-5495-8829

Çörekçi, Semra. “Report on the Symposium “Ottoman Ego-Documents”: Towards an Inventory of Ottoman Ego-Documents.” *Ceride* 1: 1 (Haziran/June 2023): sayfa/pp. 183-198
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10015690>

The “Ottoman Ego-Documents” symposium was held at Istanbul Medeniyet University on 15-17 June 2022. The symposium was organized by Istanbul Medeniyet University’s Faculty of Letters and supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK), the Turkish Historical Society and the Foundation for Science, Art, History and Literature (İSTEV), Eyüpsultan, Tuzla and Beyoğlu municipalities. The symposium started with the opening speeches by Professor Hasan Mandal, the chair of TÜBİTAK, Professor Gülfettin Çelik, the rector of Istanbul Medeniyet University, and Professor Bülent Zülfikar, the chair of İSTEV.

In his opening speech for the symposium on June 15, “Ego-Documents During the Corona-Virus Pandemic 2020-2022: A Progress Report”, Selim Karahasanoğlu summarized the path taken in the study of Ottoman ego-documents during the Covid-19 pandemic period. Karahasanoğlu talked in de-

tail about the developments in Ottoman ego-document studies since the "Ottoman Ego-Documents" workshop held in 2020. Karahasanoğlu noted that a detailed event report was published in *Toplumsal Tarih* in August 2020 and in the *Review of Middle East Studies* (RoMES) in 2021. He also stated that a selection of the papers presented in the workshop was published in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (IJMES) in 2021. Karahasanoğlu added that despite the adverse effects of the pandemic, they organized this symposium. He explained that the symposium aimed to take the success achieved with the workshop one step further and open the path towards creating an inventory of Ottoman ego-documents by introducing and including works that were unknown or not previously evaluated under the concept of ego-document. To this end, he declared that the necessary steps had already been taken. They applied for a TUBITAK 1001 (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) project with a study titled "Ego-Documents in Ottoman Literature: Inventory and Analysis, 1500-1800." They aim to conduct a research project for the inventory and analysis of Ottoman ego-documents found in manuscripts libraries in Turkey.

After Karahasanoğlu's speech, İhsan Fazlıoğlu gave an opening conference evaluating ego-documents in Islamic/Ottoman literature. Fazlıoğlu underlined that he understands the concept of ego-document as a framework consisting of different concepts of selfhood. When studying these texts, one should question if the author wrote a narrative of the society in which he belonged, the narrative of the group he took part, the narrative of the state, or the narrative of his personality. It should not be forgotten that the self can be represented through talking directly about one's inner being or through a narrative of the group to which one belongs. Fazlıoğlu further noted that one cannot comprehend and express himself in a pure way. Still, he reveals himself through his own actions or the actions of others, and sometimes, he surprises the reader and leaves him in doubt by hiding/covering himself. He thus noted that ego-documents must be evaluated by considering their layered structure. Pointing out different ways and strategies of talking about the self, Fazlıoğlu enlarged the scope of the term "ego-document" by including those talking about the self through the narratives of their groups, society, or state.

The field pioneers shared their experiences on European ego-documents in the first panel titled "Towards an Inventory of Ottoman Ego-Docu-

ments: Benefiting from European Experience.” Rudolf Dekker, who has already introduced the experiences of the Dutch group in the workshop organized in 2020, talked about the issue of fact and fiction concerning ego-documents in his presentation titled, “How to separate fact and fiction in ego-documents?” Dekker introduced some of the texts which were proved to be novels or fake memories and discussed their fit with the definition they developed when making the inventory of Dutch ego-documents. Dekker noted that evaluating these texts and deciding whether to include them in the inventory created a complex problem; however, discussions in their group were very useful in refining their definition of ego-documents. Such doubtful text showed how complex the relationship between literature and autobiography. Dekker ended his presentation by noting that discussing fake ego-documents is essential because one can learn much about the concept and the scope. Claudia Ulbrich, who gave her speech online, explained the objectives of the German research group and reasons for accepting another term -*Selbstzeugnisse* (self-testimony) in German and “self-narrative” in English. The German group developed a new research design according to which individuality is only one among many concepts of persons. They emphasized that the authors of autobiographical writings described their social relations when portraying their selves. Therefore, they preferred to use *Selbstzeugnisse* to make the authors of autobiographical writing visible as narrators and to encompass both one’s experiences and self instead of focusing on the concept of individuality for their research. Ulbrich noted that it was essential to consider the political, social, and cultural context to understand how the authors were transposing their lived experiences into another medium, that of writing. They also developed a concept of transculturality for their research as they realized that a large number of ego-documents in Japan, Arabic, and Ottoman Turkish existed before modern times. According to Ulbrich, the main problem of relying on individuality and related concepts was that it resulted in the exclusion of texts produced in these cultures. She concluded her words by stating that it is not possible to make one single definition for such diverse materials found in Germany and elsewhere. In his presentation titled “Personal Writings in France: Successes, Limits and Life Cycle of a Scientific Investigation (2002-2022)”, François-Joseph Ruggiu shared the experiences of the French research group in creating an inventory. Ruggiu stated that the research group had

two objectives: the first was to make an inventory of the texts, which they defined as *les écrits du for privé* in French, and the second was to develop research methods to examine these texts by encouraging different methodological approaches. Ruggiu noted that the major success of the project was creating an online analytical inventory, building international collaborations, creating very close ties with other European research groups, and finally making a global expansion possible by developing contacts with Asia, Africa, and America. Ruggiu noted that they also achieved their scientific objectives. The primary scientific achievement of the French research group was to evaluate personal writings as a corpus rather than focusing on the analysis of individual texts. They preferred to study the personal writings not in isolation but to locate them in a broader collection of texts. Ruggiu considered the research program as a semi-failure because there were technical limits and some scientific/academic failures. Ruggiu also talked about some scientific constraints they had. Their study was limited to the field of history, and they were unsuccessful in developing a fully multidisciplinary approach, although there were many links to be established. Ruggiu also criticized the concept of *les écrits du for privé* in that it is difficult to define and cannot be easily used on an international level. Ruggiu ended his words by underlining the importance of being aware of the changes in the academic environment and following new approaches, such as the new digital humanities. Yury Zaretsky, who was present at the symposium in person, shared his experience on Russian ego-documents. He talked about Early Russian official self-accounts, which were written at the request of public authorities in recurring social contexts. He discussed whether it is possible to detect individual voices in these life stories and what strategies people used to introduce their life stories to the authorities. European scholars' presentations were very inspiring for the inventory project of Ottoman ego-documents that Selim Karahasanoğlu mentioned in his opening speech.

Presentations devoted to ego-documents produced outside the Ottoman Empire were given comprehensive coverage on the first day. Mordechai (Motti) Levy discussed the diary of Shah Tahmasp I (r. 1524- 1576), paying attention to the ideological dimensions of the work. Levy talked about how Shah Tahmasp formed and presented his self-image in sharp contrast to Ottoman ruler Kânûni Sultan Süleyman (r. 1520-1566) and how he disclosed his perception of the Ottoman other through his diary. Rûmeysa Nur Şahin

discussed the life of Mirza Makhdum (d.1587), who was an Iranian scholar who came to the Ottoman Empire and studied with influential scholars of the time, based on his autobiography. According to Şahin, Mirza Makhdum constructed his autobiography to prove his Sunni beliefs. Peyman Eshaghi presented a hajj travelogue written by Iranian Farhad Mirza Mo'tamad al-Dawla (d. 1888). He discussed this understudied hajj travelogue as an ego-document. The final presentation was made by Sebastian Cwiklinski, who talked about another travelogue from a later period. He analyzed Abdurrashid Ibrahim's (d. 1944) travelogue as an ego-document and discussed literary strategies that reveal how the author created and presented a particular image for himself.

In the parallel session, Barbara Kellner-Heinkele focused on Mirza Muhammad Haydar Dughlat's (d. 1551) *Tarikh-i Rashidi*. She analyzed how Mirza Haydar reflected his self-perception through including his own historical role as a courtier, statesman, warrior, conqueror, and man of letters in describing events. Kellner-Heinkele stated that Mirza Haydar narrated the history of the Chaghatayid Khans in a time of political upheaval by putting himself and his family on the fore. Büşra Sıdıka Kaya discussed the autobiography in verse written by Muhammad ibn Arabshah (d. 1450), who was an Arab writer lived through the Mongolian, Ottoman and Mamluk worlds. Nilgün Dalkesen held another presentation focusing on Mongolian times. Dalkesen discussed the importance of autobiographical and biographical works for the history of Turco-Mongol women using *Baburnama*, *Humayunnama* written by Babur's daughter Gulbadan Begum and *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Tuğba İsmailoğlu Kacı held the last presentation of the session on the memoir of Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (d. 1856), well-known orientalist and the author of *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*. She analyzed the life of an orientalist who felt and lived as if an oriental and focused on the question of how to evaluate the memoir of such a versatile intellectual who positioned himself between two worlds.

The last panel of the first day was held on the ego-documents belonging to the 16th century. Nabil al-Tikriti analyzed the ego-documents produced by Bayezid II's (d. 1512) nuclear family to provide a fresh contribution to the emerging field of ego documents and autobiographical writing. Al-Tikriti noted that all early modern Ottoman examples of autobiographical writing offered "constructed personas" for cultivating the public presentation of

self. Christiane Czygan presented Kânûni Sultan Süleyman's (d. 1566) *Dîvân* from an ego-document perspective and revealed how the sultan expressed his feelings and shaped an imperial image for himself. Serap Şimşek Padar evaluated autobiographical texts, *Tezkiretü'l-Ebniye* and *Tezkiretü'l-Bünyan*, dictated by Mimar Sinan (d. 1588) and written by Sai Mustafa Çelebi. Şimşek Padar noted that these texts were written at a time when the financial situation weakened, the sultan was not interested by large-scale architectural projects, and the elderly Sinan started to fall out of favor. Considering the circumstances in which the text was written, Şimşek Padar argued that Sinan might have felt the need to present a text in which he talked about his life. The last speaker of the panel was Erol Fırtın who made a presentation on the self-descriptions found in the introductions of Lâmiî Çelebi's (d. 1532) *Münşeât* and *Şerefü'l İnsân*.

The first day of the conference ended with Cemal Kafadar's keynote address: "Secret and Plaint: On the Adventures of First-Person Narratives in Ottoman and World History." Kafadar gave a very illuminating speech discussing the limits and possibilities of the concepts used in the field of ego-documents. Kafadar started his speech by underlining that a lot has already been achieved in the field of Ottoman Ego-documents with this symposium. An ego-document corpus gradually began to be created and gained a strong place in Ottoman studies. Kafadar shared some new findings by his students; an Armenian bishop, who worked in Tokat for two years and was appointed as patriarch in Jerusalem, kept a 150-sheet diary for two years between 1680 and 1682. Another discovery was that certain Derviş Yusuf buried an ego-document in his pilgrimage narrative at the beginning of the 17th century. Another ego-document belonged to a weaver from Aleppo who wrote his memoirs at the end of the 16th century. These texts, coming from different social groups and geographies, suggest that it is not easy to understand the Ottoman world with today's notions, and we need to broaden our perspectives and concepts. At this point, Kafadar started to discuss the concepts and their implications. He noted that the concept of *ben-anlatısı* (ego-document) must be questioned. Selim Karahasanoğlu noted that texts in which the author's real motivation was to talk about himself/herself should be defined as ego-documents. Although he said he was not fully against Karahasanoğlu's ideas, Kafadar noted that a middle way must be found. He underlined that every author has a self to

express, even in the smallest details, in a sentence or a word. Kafadar called for thinking about and discussing the limits again and again. For this point, Kafadar stated that the German concept of *Selbstzeugnisse*, which can be translated as self-testimony in English and *şahit olma hali* in Turkish, has important implications. It emphasizes the value of awareness. Being aware of actions and valuing even the smallest things in life and recording them is not something to ignore, such as the shaving experiences of Seyyid Hasan recorded in *Sohbetnâme*. Having discussed the concepts and their limits, Kafadar moved in a different direction and examined different ways of expressing the self, such as expressions used in oral culture and self-portraits from miniatures. He noted that oral and written cultures are engaged in continuous and multifaceted exchange. Giving too much emphasis on the written culture leads to the neglect or oversight of oral culture. Mevlana's *Mesnevî*, Karacaoğlan's poems, the story of Âşık Garip, and epics give important clues to the expressions used in oral culture. Kafadar stated that visual material should also be given special attention. He pointed out a miniature related to the phenomenon of the child levy found in the famous work *Süleymannâme*. Kafadar noted that the miniature is rather autobiographical because the artist was probably one of the children depicted in the scene. The artist used the miniature to convey aspects of his own life and experiences and expressed emotions more clearly than expected. Kafadar expanded the scope of the term "ego-document" by emphasizing that it is necessary to consider different genres, texts, and even objects beyond the text in which the self might be expressed when inventorying ego-documents. He continued his speech by underlining that thinking about how the ways and mediums of talking about "the self" have changed over time is very meaningful and necessary. In the last part of his speech, he explained the reasons behind the emergence of new possibilities for talking about the self from the 17th century on. Ordinary people who were not expected to write books started to write, and things that were not expected to be recorded in writing started to be expressed in written forms. Urbanization, important developments in city life, the spread of literacy and book culture were the reasons behind this proliferation. The spread of Sufi practices and teachings among various social layers also significantly affected the expression of inner awareness. Those Sufi practices posed an example for people to comprehend the relationship

and the distance between their inner and outer beings. Kafadar stated that these factors altogether created a geography of self and paved the way for producing works in which authors talked about themselves. After this illuminating speech, Karahasanoğlu posed a question about the memoir of an Egyptian janissary in Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément turc 221. Karahasanoğlu reminded the claims that this work was fictive and not produced by an Ottoman janissary. He asked if it mattered that this text be fictional. His question sparked an important discussion about fictional ego-documents. Kafadar said that if we look for different ways of expressing the self, it does not matter whether a text is fiction. However, deciding how to categorize such texts in the inventory work is important. The issue of separating fact and fiction in ego-documents, an important problem in inventorying the ego-documents, was widely discussed in the presentations on the first day of the symposium.

June 16, the second day of the symposium, started with a panel focusing on ego-documents from the 18th century. Mustafa Demir talked about the life of an Ottoman clerk, Yazıcı Murtaza (d. 1673-74), based on his autobiography in verse. Mehmet Yaşar Ertaş also made a presentation on the same work. He evaluated the act of writing the self in the Ottoman world through the example of Yazıcı Murtaza. Joachim Östlund considered Mehmed Said Efendi's (d. 1761) *Sefâretnâme* in 1733 as an ego-document and argued that Said Efendi presented different self-images through his work. Östlund stated that Said Efendi became a traveler when reporting his journey, an envoy and negotiator when representing the Ottoman Empire, and a scholar and ethnographer when giving information about Swedish culture. Östlund also argued that *Sefaretnâme* was a unique document giving insights into Said Efendi's inner voice. Yahya Nurgat gave his presentation on Abu'l-Barakât Abd Allah b. Husayn al-Suwaydî's (d. 1761) travelogue to Mecca in 1744. Nurgat argued that this account was much more than narrating hajj experiences. Suwaydi narrated his transformation from a respected scholar of Baghdad into an important religious figure and intellectual in the wider Ottoman world, especially in Aleppo and Damascus. Nurgat focused on the broader objectives behind this hajj travelogue and evaluated Suwaydi's self-construction, mentality, and emotions.

The second panel on Thursday comprised a discussion on memoirs of soldiers and war narratives. Abdullah Güllüoğlu gave a presentation on an

understudied self-narrative written by the famous Osman Agha of Timisoara. Güllüoğlu stated that this work, which can be considered as the continuation of his well-known narrative of captivity, attracted little attention. He examined what prompted Osman Agha to write a sequel to his autobiography and evaluated his strategies for self-presentation. Osman Agha is an essential figure for ego-document studies as he left a lengthy account of his years under captivity. His captivity narrative was widely discussed at the workshop in 2020. Güllüoğlu's presentation on this less-known and understudied work, which comprised Osman Agha's life after 1700, was intriguing and eye-opening for inventory studies. It was important to show that some well-known authors might have left multiple autobiographical narratives. İlhami Daniş talked about the memoir of a janissary who was present in the wars with Russia in 1736 and 1737. Daniş examined what an Ottoman naval expedition looked like from the eyes of an unknown soldier. Gül Şen evaluated Necati Efendi's (d. 1793) captivity memoir as an ego-document. She examined Necati Efendi's intentions in writing his memoir after returning to Istanbul from captivity.

One of the criticisms made in the closing session of the workshop held in 2020 was that the narratives written by non-Muslims were not covered in the program. This criticism was taken seriously, and the symposium program included a panel devoted to non-Muslim ego-documents. Gayane Ayvazyan talked about the diary of Eremia Komurjian (d. 1695), who lived in 17th century Istanbul. Ayvazyan examined how the diary of Komurjian depicted the public spaces of Istanbul and how they shaped his writing. Ayvazyan stated that the diary described the history of the bourgeois capitalist urban life in Istanbul, encapsulating the views and values of an Armenian intellectual from the upper middle class. Henry Shapiro gave a presentation on the chronicle of Elia of Erzurum (d. 1750?), an Armenian merchant and diplomat. Shapiro described Elia's memoir as a text of confession and warning in which he narrated how he had been mistreated and betrayed by European Christians. Mehmet Yılmaz Akbulut talked about two autobiographical narratives written by Yosefo from Tbilisi and Arutin from Istanbul. These two texts narrated the crises and major changes that took place in Iran in the 18th century. According to Akbulut, these narratives, written in the first person singular, show that personal observations and individual testimonies became important especially in describing unexpected, strange, and frightening events.

In the panel titled "Ulama and Sufi Ego-documents," led by Cemal Kafadar, Selim Karahasanoğlu, and Semra Çörekçi presented two diaries produced by the members of the same family: the diary of Sıdkı Mustafa Efendi (d. 1790-1) and the diary of his grandson Sıdkızâde Mustafa Hamid Efendi (d. ca.1850). The Diary of Grandfather was first discovered and introduced by Madeline C. Zilfi in her article published in 1977. Karahasanoğlu carried out extensive research on this exciting work by an Ottoman judge. The grandson's diary was first discovered by Semra Çörekçi and included in her doctoral dissertation in 2022. In the first part of the presentation, Karahasanoğlu introduced Sıdkı Mustafa's diary and gave information about the content and the form. Sıdkı Mustafa Efendi kept his diary between 1749-1756. He recorded his illnesses, dreams, clothing expenses, and other purchases and gave details about his family members. He extensively talked about appointments and dismissals of the ulama. The diary also revealed information about the weather conditions, earthquakes, and fires. In the second part of the presentation, Çörekçi talked about the form of the diary and the way Mustafa Hamid Efendi kept his records. She then gave information on the content. Mustafa Hamid Efendi's diary covered the period between 1822-1829. Like his grandfather, he recorded his illnesses, clothing expenses, and many other purchases and the constant flow of gifts. He mentioned much about his family members; his father, brother Mehmed Rıfat Efendi, daughter Saliha Sabite, and wife Ziyet Ziba often found a place in diary entries. As in his grandfather's diary, appointments and dismissals were topics the diary writer liked to record. Mustafa Hamid Efendi also recorded trivial details of his daily life, like shaving, bathing, wearing new clothes, or cutting his nails. Karahasanoğlu and Çörekçi stated that similarities in content and form between these two diaries offer clues as to the nature of the diary as a genre. They also questioned whether this was a common practice and other families operating in scholarly cadres wrote similar diaries. Jun Akiba evaluated Şemdanizâde Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi's (d. 1779) chronicle, and the court registers kept during his tenure from the perspective of ego-documents. Akiba stated that Şemdanizâde wanted to leave a record of his achievements and present himself as a fair judge and a loyal official. Özlem Özdemir Kumbar talked about the dreams of Köstendilli Süleyman Şeyhî (d. 1819-20), a Sufi and a local notable in Köstendil. Kumbar noted that Köstendilli's dreams coincided with a time when he ex-

perienced various spiritual and personal hardships in life. His dreams reveal much about his fears, worries, and expectations and give substantial clues to his self. Şeyma Dereci discussed Nabil Salih's study on the diary of Sheikh Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Abu Bakr al-Jabburi and examined the diary from the perspective of fact and fiction.

İbrahim Şirin was the first speaker of the panel, "Ego-documents by Women". He talked about narratives of women from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. He focused on how women's narratives can be evaluated in the axis of Orientalism and Occidentalism. Şirin reflected on the issue of how these narratives can be used by social scientists. Merve Aydın gave a presentation on a notebook belonging to a girl named Saliha. Aydın tried to shed light on the universe of a young girl and her friends by examining the format and context of the text. Hanife Karasu presented Süreyya Aġaoġlu's (d. 1989) seventy-three-page diary in which she narrated her travel to the United States of America in 1946. Süreyya Aġaoġlu was the first female lawyer of the Turkish Republic and lived through a period of transition from the empire to the republic. Karasu evaluated how the author reflected her feelings and ideas through the text. One of the criticisms made by Suraiya Faroġhi in the workshop in 2020 was that narratives written by women were not included in the program. It was, therefore, essential to organize a separate panel on ego-documents written by women.

In the panel on memoirs, Ahmet Koçak talked about the memoirs and letters of Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil (d. 1945). Canan Torlak-Emir presented the memoir of a governor, Hamdi Bey (1876-1909). Akansel Yalçınkaya gave a portrait of Mustafa Asım Çalıkoġlu (d. 1969) using his memoirs, autobiographical works, and archival documents. Ayşe Güher Gülaçar made a presentation about the memoirs of the members of the Committee of Union and Progress. Although the event mainly included presentations on ego-documents produced in the early modern period, studies dealing with later periods were not rejected.

The last event on Thursday was a roundtable discussion by Gülşen Yakar, Tunahan Durmaz, and Fatma Deniz Uzundaġ. The roundtable focused on a well-known text, Seyyid Hasan's *Sohbetnâme*. The roundtable was led by Suraiya Faroġhi. After being informed about the form of the diary and the records kept, Yakar focused on what might have triggered Seyyid Hasan to keep a diary. Yakar noted that it is hard to find the author's exact

motivation for keeping a diary; it is only possible to make an inference based on the clues in the text. She observed that Seyyid Hasan, as a Sufi dervish, made no mention of his religious life or spiritual growth, which was a well-known motivation in Sufi circles for composing an ego-document. According to her, the ongoing plague, the death of loved ones, and the need to ease the deep feelings of sorrow it caused might have pushed Seyyid Hasan to keep a diary. The author might have wanted to preserve his memories, which would fade with age. Yakar also speculated that the possible desire to be read by someone in the future might have prompted the author to compose his work. After talking about the reasons for the work to be named *Sohbetnâme*, Tunahan Durmaz focused on the form, timekeeping practices, content organization, and headings. He stated that the form Seyyid Hasan used in composing his work became more evident over time. Durmaz focused on the possibility that diary-keeping might have been a practice learned, developed, and refined over time. In the last part of his speech, Durmaz focused on the social milieu of the author. He drew a picture of Seyyid Hasan's environment through the people he was in contact with. He noted that this work was a narrative of "us," and it is not easy to find the author's self and emotions in the text. The last presentation was given by Fatma Deniz Uzundağ. She examined the everyday practices of the Sufis based on a spatial analysis of *Sohbetnâme*. Deniz Uzundağ stated that Seyyid Hasan led a life in constant motion. He did not live a life focused on worship and spiritual practices in a lodge. His ego-document was a narrative of meals eaten, coffees drunk, and times spent in gardens, shops, or houses of friends. Deniz Uzundağ ended her speech by underlining that ego-documents can be evaluated from different angles and used as valuable sources for historical studies from various perspectives.

The first panel on Friday, June 17, started with a presentation focusing on letters. Using the example of Lâmiî Çelebi's (d. 1532) compilation of letters, Aysu Akcan examined whether Ottoman epistolary literature could be used for ego-document studies. Yahya Koç evaluated *Yevmiyye* of Ibn Kan-nân Muhammad b. Isa (d. 1740) and *Mektûbât* of Hasan Sezâî (d. 1738) from the perspective of ego-documents. Koç compared the works of these two Sufis, who were sheiks in the Halvatiyya order, and made observations about the religious, social, and political life in the cities where they lived. Ensar Karagöz evaluated Ottoman miscellanies (*mecmua*) as sources of au-

tobiography and discussed their value for ego-documents studies. Karagöz aimed at drawing the attention of scholars to these very interesting and understudied sources by examining the miscellanies of one of the most prolific scholars of the 18th century, Mustakimzâde Süleyman Sadeddin (d. 1788).

The second panel focused on autobiographies and resumes. Ümit Karaver and Muhammed Takî Hüseyinî presented the autobiographical section in *Tuhfa-i Mahmûdî* of Shaykh Alî Al-Bistâmî Musannifak (d. 1470). Christopher Whitehead talked about the autobiography of Çerkes Dilaver (d. 1658), which was contained in the chronicle of Naima. The pasha narrated the story of his rise to prominence, his thoughts about the dangers of having a position in high governmental posts, and his emotions against painful events. Esra Çon Yılmaz talked about the author's motivation to write, which she considered the most important criterion for a text to be accepted as an ego-document. Çon Yılmaz focused on the diary of Başeski Şevki Molla Mustafa, who lived in 18th century Sarajevo. She focused on the author's intention for producing the text and questioned if it could be accepted as an ego-document or not. Hüseyin Örs was the last speaker of the panel. He presented the autobiography of Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi (d. 1899).

In both the workshop in 2020 and the symposium in 2022, debates were made about whether to include texts in which the authors' motivation for writing was not to talk about themselves in the inventory. A panel was reserved for the presentations in which such controversial texts were presented. Rukiye Ashlan Aksoy-Sheridan examined Evliya Çelebi's (d. 1685) work, the famous travelogue about which Karahasanoğlu noted that the author's motivation was not to talk about himself, and it cannot be accepted as ego-document. Aksoy-Sheridan focused on the question of whether Evliya Çelebi's *Seyahatnâme* can be evaluated as an ego-document by exploring the text in terms of what it reveals about the author's life and act of writing. Yunus Aktı talked about Âsafî Dal Mehmed Çelebi's (d. 1597-98) *Şecâ'atnâme* in which the author narrated the war between the Ottoman Empire and Safavids and his years under captivity. Aktı stated that the text included two narratives: one was the narrative of the victories of Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha (d. 1585), and the second was the narrative of the author's own life and hardships he experienced under captivity. Hilal Görgün evaluated Cevdet Pasha's (d. 1895) *Tezâkir* within the framework of ego-document studies. Şükran Fazlıoğlu presented the work of Ali Mubarek

(d. 1893), *A'lemuddîn*. Fazlıođlu noted that although it was a storybook, *A'lemuddîn* can also be read as a memoir because of the significant similarity between the author and the character he created in the book.

The parallel session focused on genres. Aslı Çiftçi talked about Mehmed Dai Efendi's *Nevhatü'l Uşşâk*. Çiftçi stated that, unlike classical *mesnevis*, Dai Efendi constructed a different type of lover who lived his love in secrecy and controlled his emotions. Çiftçi questioned the reason behind such a construction by considering Gabriele Jancke and Berlin research groups' ideas that authors of ego-documents should be perceived as social beings acting in a group, in a network of relationships. Thus, Çiftçi argued that Dai Efendi was influenced by the social environment in which he lived and acted in line with the prevailing social norms and values. He created a narrative in which the lover controlled his emotions and always acted with his mind under the influence of the arguments put forward by Kadizâdelis, who emerged as the dominant voice of the period. İsa Uđurlu examined the daily records written by Mehmed İsmet Efendi (d. 1747) on astrological calendars in the framework of ego-documents. Süreyya Pekşen introduced a newly discovered ego-document written by Yahya b. Abdurrahman, *Hasb-i Hâl-i Bende-i Pür-melâl 'İşkî-i Âşüfte vü Bî-mecâl*. Pekşen talked about the author's life and his motivation for composing this work. After praising Mehmed III (d. 1603) in the reasons for writing section (*sebeb-i telif*), Yahya b. Abdurrahman gave information about his family and himself. He described in detail the hardships he faced during his tenure as judge in Rume-
lia, and especially the persecutions of the head doorkeeper. The author also described his emotions and expressed his expectations from the grand vizier through a dream narrative he included at the end of his work. Pekşen concluded her presentation by noting that this work, which sheds light on the political events of the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries, will also contribute to the history of Ottoman literature and science.

The following two panels were on the ego-documents written by poets. Aslıhan Erkmen talked about Ottoman poet *tezkires* and searched for autobiographical information in the works of Âşık Çelebi (d. 1572) and Lâtîfî (d. 1582). Fatih Tıđlı gave a presentation on the autobiographical aspects of *şehrengiz* literature. Ali Emre Özyıldırım analyzed İzzet Molla's *Mihnet Keşân* from an ego-document perspective. The first speaker of the parallel session was Sadık Yazar, who talked about the intention of Vücdüî (d. 1612)

in adding a self-narrative at the end of his work, *Hayâl ü Yâr*. Recep Uslu presented the autobiography of Abdülkadir Merâgî (d. 1435). He argued that the author wrote his work at the age of eighty. Gülşah Taşkın analyzed Şirvanlı Sevâdî's *Hâl-nâme*, which was written in 1540. Taşkın stated that it is the first known example of non-fiction ego-documents in verse. Taşkın made a presentation on the possible social, cultural, and personal reasons that prompted Sevâdî to write his life story. The subject of Halil İbrahim Salman's talk was the work named *İftirânâme*, in which Abdullah Sâfî (d. 1898) narrated his travel from Kirkuk to Istanbul, the time he spent in a Sufi lodge, his imprisonment because of slander and finally getting out of prison.

The closing session, "Biography and Autobiography," was participated by Ali Birinci, İsmail Kara, and Ali Akyıldız. İhsan Ayal led the panel. Ali Birinci was the first speaker of the closing session. Birinci, referring to Kafadar's keynote address, noted that it is crucial to consider poetry within the framework of ego-documents because poetry is the map of the human soul. He added that historians should be cautious when using memoirs as historical sources by underling the issue of subjectivity and selective memory. Birinci also suggested another concept that could be used in place of the concept of *ben-anlatısı: benlik-edebiyatı* (self-literature). İsmail Kara started his presentation by saying that the papers presented in this symposium not only focused on ego-documents but also on the issue that all texts can be read as a kind of ego-document. In his presentation, Kara talked about the severe break and change that occurred in the Sufi biography writings during the 19th century, particularly in connection with the modernization movements in the Islamic world. Kara examined the emergence of a modern biography writing style through the biographies of Osman Selahaddin Dede (d. 1887) and Mehmed Celaledin Dede (d. 1908) found in *Yenikapı Mevlevîhânesi* written by İhtifalci Mehmed Ziya Bey (d. 1930). He also examined the autobiography found at the end of *Kitâb-ı Mâ-Hazar Şerh alâ Pend-i Attâr* written by Murad Molla Lodge's sheik in 1844. Ali Akyıldız was the last speaker of the closing session. He stated that *tabakât* and *terâcim-i ahvâl* literature is related to autobiography. He explained his point through the biographical works of Hüseyin Vassaf (d. 1929) and İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal (d. 1957), who collected autobiographical information directly from the people they were writing about.

For three days, a wide range of known and unknown texts that fit the definition of ego-document were introduced and discussed. Thus, the symposium was successful in opening the path toward creating an inventory of Ottoman ego-documents. Selim Karahasanoğlu stated at the closing that an Ottoman ego-document meeting will be held in Skopje in 2024 as a continuation of the symposium.