

## TURKOLOGY:

### A PRELIMINARY REPORT

The development in modern times of the scientific study of the languages and civilizations called “oriental” (actually those outside western and central Europe) has of necessity been followed by a division of research into disciplines essentially delimited by linguistic boundaries. Thus experts of classical Arabic and of spoken Arab dialects, whether they study these idioms for their own sake, for their spoken or written literature, or even, making use of Arabic texts, to elaborate the history of the peoples of Arabic language, their nations, or their culture, have found themselves tending to work more or less together and to consider themselves under the name of “Arabists” as the artisans of a common science. Likewise, the experts of classical or modern Chinese and of Chinese dialects—linguists, philologists, historians, ethnographers—are conscious of working in the same corps of studies, known as “Sinology.” In both cases the linguistic definition is reinforced by a fairly precise geographical definition; the Arab countries, or China, are easily found

Translated by James H. Labadie.

on the map, and the educated public understands without much difficulty the sphere of interests of the Arabist or the Sinologist.

This is not true of Turkology. The wide dispersion of Turkish languages and dialects, the often nomadic and unstable character of the states founded by the very diverse peoples who speak these languages, the fact that those states which are stable and sedentary are actually of relatively recent vintage—and with profoundly allogenous substrata—all serve to obscure for the uninitiated the definition of a specialty comprehensive enough for those who claim it under the name of Turkologists to be able to study the ethnography of the Yakuts of the Far North in the region of Verkhoyansk, the songs of the Janizaries of Algiers, eighth-century inscriptions in Mongolia, or the particularities of the Judaic tradition among the Karaites of Poland.

The definition of contemporary Turkology is of an exclusively linguistic order. The Turkologist is a researcher who studies, either for themselves or for a direct knowledge of the peoples who speak them, the numerous closely related idioms known for twelve centuries and widespread throughout Eurasia, including some islets in Mediterranean Africa, which are called in the broadest sense the Turkish languages, and of which the simple “Turkish” (that of Turkey) is but one specimen—important, to be sure, but particular.

The ancient history of the peoples who speak such languages (and who may, by convention, be called “Turkish peoples,” although they themselves bore the most diverse names) is still imperfectly known despite the continuous progress of knowledge in the field. It seems certain, however, that they first occupied, before the Christian Era, a vast zone in central Asia, from the region of Lake Baikal to that of Lake Balkhash, in the steppes and wooded hills which extend northward from the desert zone linking the Takla Makan to the Gobi. In succeeding centuries they swarmed from there, as nomadic shepherds and warriors, in all directions: into Mongolia, northern China, the Tarim Basin; into the Asiatic steppes as far as the Caspian Sea, then beyond into the southern plains of Europe before invading Asia Minor, the Balkans, and pushing to the walls of Vienna and into North Africa. There were also the tribes which, adapted to the forest life of the hunter, occupied immense regions in Siberia and pushed as far as the taiga, to the point of the polar ice.

In the course of these migrations the people mingled more or less

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

intimately with the earlier inhabitants of the occupied zones and often adopted their religions, giving rise to great anthropological variety from the most ancient of historical times as well as to a great variety of beliefs and cultures. Even today there are Turkish populations which are shamanist, Buddhist, Moslem, Christian, Jewish, unequal in number, with Islam largely predominant, but with equally authentic traditions and often of great age. There are sedentary Turks and nomadic Turks, shepherds as well as hunters. Leaving aside the Turkish-language minorities that subsist in various Balkan states, and in Cyprus, Iran, Afghanistan, and Kansu Province of China, there are compact national groups of Turkish linguistic tradition, taken in the broad sense, that play an essential role in the following political entities. The Turkish Republic of Europe and Anatolia constitutes an independent state; in the U.S.S.R. there are the Soviet Republics of Azerbaijan, Turkmen, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kirghiz, the Autonomous Republics of Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, and Yakutsh, and the North Altaian Republics of Tuva, Khakass, and Kara-Kalpak; and, in China, the Uigur Autonomous Region of Sinkiang.

Now, despite this geographic and political dispersion, the Turkish languages have maintained a remarkable cohesion. If an exception is made for Chuvash and Yakut, which only informed phoneticians recognize as belonging to the Turkish group (but which have undergone considerable evolution), the various Turkish idioms have remained astonishingly close to one another and a thorough knowledge of one permits rapid access to that of the entire group, as one may pass, for example, from French to the other Romance languages. The "aberrant" Turkish languages themselves, Yakut and Chuvash, can be traced historically without any possible doubt to the Turkish or pre-Turkish linguistic group and, through comparison, provide precious and original information on the prehistory of the other Turkish idioms. This is why linguistic Turkologists are studying them with increasing fervor.

The comparative method is fruitful not only in the linguistic field. In folklore, ethnography, sociology, and religious history it permits the isolation and precision of a great mass of facts common to the various Turkish peoples. For all these reasons Turkology, despite its apparent diversity, conserves a profound organic unity of which contemporary Turkologists are more and more clearly conscious. If a specialist in the history of the Ottoman Turks, for example, wishes to isolate the truly

national elements of certain institutions from local Byzantine traditions or from those proper to Arabic Islam, he will certainly have recourse to comparison with other Turkish facts, external to Turkey, even anterior to the Islamization of the Turks; or, again, the ethnographer who wishes pertinent appreciation of certain Yakut data will seek and find highly significant indications in Altaian or, even in Anatolian Turkish facts; the linguist, from the moment that he is occupied with the history of a given Turkish dialect or seeks its intimate structure, feels the need for the widest possible comparison with other Turkish languages.

Thus there exists a discipline common to all the particular Turkish studies, and it is precisely this which is called "Turkology."

To present a total balance sheet, schematic and provisional as it may be, of the results obtained so far by Turkology in the framework of the human sciences is not an easy task. Its complexity may be guessed from the results our efforts achieve. No mode of exposition can be perfect, but the least imperfect seems to us that which follows the chronological order of the Turkish facts themselves. In this regard, recalling the essential points of the history of the peoples of the Turkish languages will often be useful.

We shall have to observe the greatest caution concerning the earliest times. It is in fact very difficult, earlier than about A.D. 500, to know in which linguistic group to locate such-and-such a people of central Asia mentioned in Chinese, Iranian, or European sources. Thus the powerful Hiung-nu confederation, which played a considerable role, from the third century B.C. to the fourth A.D., in what is today Mongolia and the northern confines of China is well known to us through Chinese reports, on the level of political and military history, without our knowing anything precise about the language or languages spoken by the numerous tribes constituting the confederation. We can at the most, by difficult and risky interpretation, through several "Hiung-nu" words noted by the Chinese of the time (whose pronunciation must be reconstructed), attempt to find anew the form of several nouns and several scraps of sentences and compare them with archaic forms (themselves more or less restored by induction) belonging to the idioms of the various linguistic groups attested to in central Asia, notably to the Turkish group. For example, the same "Hiung-nu" distich of the fourth century A.D., composed of ten syllables noted in Chinese charac-

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

ters, has been interpreted with equal likelihood of accuracy, in three ways quite different in detail, by J. G. Ramstedt (*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXXVIII [1922], 30–31), by A. von Gabain (*Islam*, XXIX [1950], 244–46), and by myself (*Oriens*, I [1948], 208–19). All three agree, however, in considering this fragment to be proto-Turkish. But in this particular case the term “Hiung-nu” itself is ambiguous, for the Chinese called by this name all the peoples of the Hiung-nu confederation (which is quite likely to have included linguistically heterogeneous tribes) and even, at times, all the “Northern Barbarians.” It is thus fallacious to pass judgment as a whole on the linguistic affiliations of the “Hiung-nus,” and to say as many historians have that they were “Turks.” Here, more than anywhere else, hasty simplification is the enemy of scientific truth.

The same caution must be applied to the subject of the Huns of Europe, about whom several Greek or Latin glossaries seem to disclose elements of proto-Turkish vocabulary, but who are otherwise known to have constituted an aggregation of tribes of various origins, some of them Germanic.

Archeology, it should be noted, is, in spite of its priceless discoveries, of no help for the linguistic classification of ancient peoples, so long as it does not exhume texts. It is misleading, although often done, to say that a certain form of sash or arch joined to a certain form of skull denotes a “Turkish” appurtenance, for the good reason that no bone nor any other object (if it does not carry a text) can teach anything about the language of its owner. One must guard absolutely against the confusion of linguistic definitions with the data of material culture or anthropological facts.

In this context the complete inanity of discussions on the original ethnic characteristics of the Turkish peoples should be underscored. It happens very rarely that societies have remained closely confined for a long time, so that their linguistic unification is accompanied to a certain degree, but never absolutely, by anthropological unification. Except for these exceptional cases the idea, unfortunately very widespread, that there are “races” which may correspond to languages is profoundly antiscientific. This is one of those disturbing vestiges of mental primitivism which continue to compromise the development of the human sciences. Modern Turkology, however, is becoming more and more free of this error. It must be emphasized that, from the most ancient times, the descriptions which we have of the diverse peoples of Turkish lan-

guages correspond to highly variable human types. Thus the ancient Turks of Mongolia, of the sixth to eighth centuries A.D., seem to have been not very different from the Mongols of today, while the Kirghiz of the upper Yenesei, certainly of Turkish language, are described by the Chinese as disquietingly hearty, blond, and red-haired fellows with milky skin.

Generally nomadic or seminomadic, the ancient Turkish peoples, as a result of their numerous migrations, mixed continually with other peoples, if only through their constant practice of rape. We cannot, therefore, expect of them any degree of somatic perenniality. It is never by an anthropological criterion that a people may be defined as "Turkish," but only by a linguistic criterion, which is indubitable. The basic originality and continuity of the Turkish linguistic type are, in fact, such that one may determine with certainty, as soon as he possesses sufficiently abundant information, the Turkish or non-Turkish character of a given speech.

It may reasonably be hoped that new discoveries will sooner or later enlighten us on the linguistic appurtenances of the ancient peoples of central Asia and that certain groups will emerge as clearly of Turkish or proto-Turkish language. Meanwhile we consider it wise to count as Turks only those whose language is clearly known to be Turkish in this brief exposé of the results so far attained by Turkology.

The Turkish people, identified beyond question and known with certainty at the earliest date and in the present state of the science of Turkology, is that very one which gave its name to the whole linguistic group. The Chinese, who refer to them frequently in their annals from the sixth century A.D. on, call it "T'u-kiue" (which represents, according to Paul Pelliot, an earlier "Türk-üt," plural in "-T"), and it designates itself in the important epigraphical monuments of the early eighth century which it left behind in Mongolia by the name of "Türük" or of "Türk," this last form being identical with our word "Turk." Etymologically, this word signifies "fully developed, ripe, strong," a laudatory epithet intentionally taken as an ethnic name. To distinguish these Türk from present-day Turks, it has been habitual to designate them with the Chinese transcription, the T'u-kiue.

We have their history in detail, chiefly through the official annals of the emperors of China but also through other sources of which the most interesting are the Byzantine chronicles. They wandered as no-

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

mads in the early years of the sixth century, in the region of the Altai Mountains, and were taken as vassals into the Jen-jen (*Jwen-jwen*) confederation, which occupied all of Mongolia. They considered themselves as the descendants of a mythical human ancestor and a she-wolf. Warrior-shepherds, given to the raising of horses and sheep, living under tents of felt cloth, they were reputed to be skilled in ironwork and armed with lances, swords, and bows. Their military might grew rapidly, so that in the middle of the sixth century they fought their suzerains, the Jen-jen, whom they supplanted at the head of the nomadic and forest-dwelling confederation of the Altai and of Mongolia.

Shortly after the foundation of the new Turkish Empire in 552, which must not be imagined as a sedentary state with clearly delimited boundaries, but as an aggregation of nomadic tribes, conserving a unity of principle under the direction of a sovereign whose chief residence was in northern Mongolia, in the upper basin of the Orkhon (tributary of the Selenga, which flows into Lake Baikal), the aggregation split for all practical purposes into two distinct confederations, the one of the east covering Mongolia, the other of the west stretching first to the Altai Mountains, the steppes of Zungaria, and the Ili Basin, to the south of Lake Balkhash, then militarily imposing its suzerainty over the Iranian-language territories of Bactriana and Sogdiana as far as Samarkand and Bukhara. Around 570, the eastern and the western T'u-kiue (Türk) were thus in contact on the east with China, on the south with Iran, and on the west with the peoples of the Aralo-Caspian steppes, who were themselves in relations with the Byzantine empire. In spite of continuous embroiling struggles, with subdivisions and regroupings, this geographical extension of T'u-kiue sovereignty in central Asia, from China to Europe, was to be more or less continuously maintained until about 740, but with the constant and often determinant intervention of Chinese politics in the internal affairs of the groups of tribes, which at times amounted to a veritable protectorate, as from 630 to 680.

Chinese sources tell us, year by year, of the vicissitudes of the T'u-kiue tribes. We also have, concerning the western T'u-kiue, precious information thanks to the Byzantine embassies at the court of their sovereigns, those of Zemarchus in 568, of Euty chius, of Valentine, of Herodian, of Paul of Cilicia in the following years, and, finally, of Valentine again in 576. Several Iranian sources and various Arab historians, such as Tabari, complete our documentation. But, even more,

we have firsthand information of incomparable value and authenticity, particularly concerning the Türk (T'u-kiue), since they left in Mongolia significant historical inscriptions in ancient Turkish on the funerary steles of their generalissimo Tonyukuk (early eighth century), of their prince Kōl-tegin (died in 731), and of their emperor Bilgä-kagan (died in 734), not to mention several inscriptions of lesser importance.

It may be said without exaggeration that the deciphering of these epigraphical texts (the oldest known Turkish texts) in November and December of 1893 by the great Danish linguist Vilhelm Thomsen changed the entire course of Turkish studies, not only for their history in the high Middle Ages, but also in the field of historical and comparative grammar. This is the greatest success of modern Turkology, and it has, more generally, enabled great progress to be made in the method of reading texts in unknown phonetic writing in a language whose final forms are known.

The graphic system of the Turkish inscriptions of the eighth century, formed of about forty signs, some alphabetical, others syllabic, was completely original and could not be interpreted through the use of any known alphabet. But it was known through a Chinese inscription that one of the steles bore the epitaph of a T'u-kiue prince, brother of the Turkish emperor Bilgä-kagan, and Vilhelm Thomsen was rightly convinced that the notation must be in archaic Turkish. This conviction, joined with clever statistical reasoning on the probable frequency of sounds and combinations of sounds for such a language, led him to identify several groups of Turkish words well known elsewhere, whose comparison led him to determine the phonetic value of the characters which formed them. He thus discovered, little by little, new words with new characters, and soon the whole alphabet held no secrets for him. This great scholar, primarily a specialist in Indo-European linguistics, thus gave to Turkologists the key to the oldest monuments of the Turkish language.

At the same time, and independently, the excellent Russian Turkologist Wilhelm Radloff had succeeded in deciphering the frontispiece of a Uigurian inscription from Mongolia written in the same alphabet, and he would undoubtedly after some time have successfully identified all the characters. It happens in all sciences that certain discoveries reach "maturity," as it were, at a given moment, and that they are revealed almost simultaneously to scholars working apart from each



### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

other, so that several scholars rightfully and in good faith claim to be the father of the same discovery.

Translated soon after by Thomsen and by Radloff, often restudied by Turkologists, who, year after year, improve their interpretation, the ancient Turkish inscriptions of Mongolia clearly reveal the state of the language in the eighth century A.D. and contain a mass of original information concerning the history, the ethnography, the material culture, military art, institutions, and beliefs of the Turks of central Asia at that time.

Written in the same alphabet but in a more archaic form and in part dating from perhaps a century earlier, other Turkish inscriptions, discovered in considerable numbers in the upper Yenesei Basin and seeming to belong to the ancient Kirghiz, are of a much more rudimentary and primitive character, sometimes indicating a "prelogical" mentality. These short funerary texts offer the intense interest of helping us to penetrate directly into the concepts of life and death held by these rude seminomadic mountaineers, still very conservative psychologically, and of disclosing to us the most archaic aspects of the religion spread among the nomads of ancient central Asia. This religion is based on the sky-god (Tengri), who was at the center of a whole body of "animistic" beliefs and practices of mystical sorcery still known today, in forms evolved and various in detail, among the Mongolian, Turkish, and Tungus peoples of the Altai and of Siberia, generally designated by the rather vague term of "shamanism." The funerary steles of the upper Yenesei are also adorned with animal engravings of great beauty which in some respects recall prehistoric rock-inscribed art; human representations are in both cases reduced to schematic outlines.

From all these monuments, to which must be added several inscriptions from more westerly sites such as those of the Talas Valley, it is seen that ancient Turkology derives a rich harvest of original information in such diverse fields as linguistics, political and military history, sociology, psychology, the history of religion, and the history of art, as well as that of material culture, and in a region of the world which was but a short time ago one of the least known, in that period of the high Middle Ages still shrouded by semidarkness in most regions of the earth.

The Tu-kiue Empire began to disintegrate about the year 740, and

after 744 it was replaced in Mongolia by the domination of another people of Turkish language, the Uigurs. Actually, it involved a change in the governing clan rather than a large migration of peoples. In the first twenty years of their new empire, the Uigurs of Mongolia continued the Tu-kiue tradition on all points, and the inscriptions we have from that epoch, in alphabet, language, and in style, strongly resemble those of the Tu-kiue. But in 763 the Uigur emperor, participating in support of the T'ang in the dynastic war which was developing in North China, was strongly affected at Lo-Yang by the preaching of the local Manichean missionaries (Sogdians, no doubt). He decided to adopt their religion and to convert his people to it. Thus the Turks of central Asia belonged for the first time in our knowledge to one of the great international religions, and their theological initiation began with the assimilation of an extremely complex doctrine which attempted a synthesis of the teachings of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Christ, in a sort of gnosis strongly influenced by Greek philosophy. This was a genuine spiritual and cultural revolution, which affected at first only the aristocracy, but which was to end by reaching in three centuries to very large sections of the Uigur population.

The Uigurian Manichean Empire of Mongolia was of short duration. Around 840, other tribes of Turkish language, the Kirghiz of the upper Yenesei, invaded and destroyed it, restoring for a while the old traditional culture of Turkish "shamanism." They were to be conquered and driven out in turn, around 920, by tribes of Mongolian language from the Kitan, and from that date the Turkish languages were to retreat in Mongolia (from which they have today almost entirely disappeared except for the extreme western part), to the profit of Mongolian-speaking peoples. In the thirteenth century this evolution was to be hastened by the constitution of the Mongol Empire of Genghis Khan.

Driven from Mongolia, the Uigurs scattered toward the south and the southwest and found refuge beyond the Gobi in the Chinese cities of Ten-huang and Kan-shu and in the oases of the Tarim Basin (today Chinese Turkestan), Turfan, Pei-t'ing, Hami, Karachar, Kutcha, at the time peopled mainly by populations of Indo-European languages, in large part Buddhist. Mixed with the local populations, the Uigurs soon became the directing element and founded in these cities local principalities grouped into two states, one of Ten-huang and Kan-shu, the other vaster and much more lasting, that of the Tarim Basin, with

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

Turfan as the principal center. The first died out in 1028, invaded by the Tibetan Tanguts; the present-day yellow Uigurs of Kan-shu, numbering several thousands, perpetuate its memory. The second was to endure until the fourteenth century, becoming in the thirteenth the vassal of the Mongol Empire, and then dividing into principalities disturbed by the religious struggles which ended with the triumph of Islam in the fifteenth century. The Turkish populations, today Moslem, of Chinese Turkestan (or Sinkiang), numbering about three millions, a short time ago officially took the name of Uigurs and enjoy an autonomous status in the Chinese People's Republic, in which Sinkiang is henceforth to be known as the Uigur Autonomous Region.

In their contact in these two states with the Chinese, for the most part Buddhists, and with the Buddhist and Christian Indo-Europeans, the Manicheist Uigurs showed themselves to be generally tolerant and manifested a lively interest in all religious and philosophical doctrines, in astrology and the magic arts, and in medicine and the sciences, whether they derived from Iranian, Indian, or Chinese sources. The result of this extraordinary blending of ideas and cultures, accompanying a mixture of Turkish, Indo-European, and even Chinese languages in significant proportions, within a state of Turkish direction in which the Turkish language soon became dominant (along with Kutchean, Sogdian, and Chinese), was the creation of an elevated sedentary and agricultural civilization, rather cosmopolitan, very eclectic, with varied religions and an intense intellectual life. Buddhism became predominant during the eleventh century, but the other religions—Manicheism, Christianity, traditional Chinese cults—had their followers, while the old Turkish shamanism did not disappear entirely from popular beliefs.

In addition to art treasures, the best known of which are the sculptures and paintings of Ten-huang and the frescoes of Turfan and its environs, and in which Chinese, Iranian, and Indo-Buddhic influences are harmoniously combined, the Uigurs left us a considerable body of manuscripts, some, the oldest, in the alphabet of the ancient Turkish inscriptions of Mongolia, but most in a new alphabet called "Uigur" (derived from the Sogdian alphabet, and the prototype of classical Mongol writing), others in various alphabets—Syriac, Sogdian, Manichean, Indian-Brâhmî, even Tibetan. Some were in the Turkish language, but the majority were translations from the Chinese, the Sogdian, the Kutchean, or the Sanskrit. This enormous literature is for the most part religious: Manicheist treatises, Buddhist canons, liturgical

texts, and edifying legends from the two religions, exposés of Chinese doctrines, evangelical commentaries and Nestorian Christian hagiographies. Chinese and Indian magic and medicine also have a large place, as well as divination (an opusculum of about the year 1000, found at Tenuhuang, "Irq Bitig," essentially shamanist); calendars, astronomy, and astrology are represented, developed with precision in rich and numerous texts. There are almost no true historical texts, but the mention of sovereigns, governors, and functionaries found in the religious writings facilitates (with the help of abundant Chinese documents, both local and imperial) the reconstruction of political chronology and organization. Finally, numerous letters of a private nature, often commercial, have been found, as well as contracts yielding precious information on the daily life, the economy, social structure, system of property, and juridical concepts.

All these documents are naturally very important for the study of the Turkish language and for the history, not only of the Uigurs themselves, but of all the peoples of central Asia (including Chinese elements) with whom they were in contact. Uigurian Turkology, besides the interest inherent in it, thus provides interesting information for Sinology and for the Indian, Iranian (notably Sogdian), and Indo-European studies of the Tarim (Kutchean, "Tokharian," etc.).

It is particularly for the history of religion that the Uigurian Turkish documents constitute irreplaceable sources. The Manicheism driven out of Iran and Europe (recall the Albigensians and the Cathars) would be known only in the disfigured form in which its adversaries represented it were it not for the texts left by the Manicheists of central Asia, Sogdians and Uigurs. Certain Uigurian texts provide, in Turkish, enlightenment which can be found nowhere else on the religion of St. Augustine before his conversion to Christianity. Likewise, important Buddhist texts, which have disappeared from the Indian tradition of today, were conserved in Turkish translations from the Sanskrit—often made through a Chinese intermediary which has itself been lost. Finally, certain "apocryphal" gospels and hagiographical works of Nestorian Christianity are known only through Uigurian texts.

Concerning Chinese and Indian magic, medicine, astronomy, and astrology, the Uigurian documents, with their unique contributions, are indispensable for the reconstruction of the history of calendars in Asia. A certain Turkish text, written by a Manicheist Uigur, is the only one bearing a precise comparison between the Sogdian and the Chinese

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

calendars for a given year; the same text, fixing the day of the sun's "exaltation," places before us data growing out of a pre-Ptolemaic Indo-Greek astrology, in which the procession of the equinoxes is purposely not taken into consideration and in which "signs" and constellations, mingled with one another, begin with the star "Alpha Arietis."

Uigurian studies, which are an integral part of Turkology, since they require a profound knowledge of Turkish language and antiquities, are thus increasing in importance in the religious and cultural history of humanity. And much more may be expected from them if we recall that but a small part of the discovered texts has been published to date.

Toward the middle of the eighth century, during the time when, as we have seen, the eastern T'u-kiue were eliminated from the government of Mongolia, the western T'u-kiue also underwent a series of reverses, their tribes first fighting among themselves, then with other Turks, the Karluks, who defeated them. Even in its western portion the Turkish Empire of central Asia was practically dissolved. Now, at this juncture, a new power, coming from Iran, arose in Sogdiana: Arabic Islam, strengthened by the conquest and conversion of Persia. After the battle of the Talas (751), in which the Arabs defeated a Chinese army attempting to maintain the protectorate of the Middle Empire in these regions (a protectorate which leaned largely for support on the local Turkish lords), Arabo-Persian Islam enjoyed definitive dominion over Bukhara and Samarkand and came into permanent contact with the Turkish tribes which were temporarily forced back toward the east.

Thus Islam began to influence the Turks, then very disorganized, and, finally, after two centuries, it won over tribal chiefs who, leaning on its political power, on the strength of its religious expansion, re-grouped into new Islamic states the Turkish nomads situated to the west of the Uigur state. This brought about in the region of Kashgar the formation of the Kara-khanid kingdom, which stretched to the Ili Basin and north to Lake Balkhash and lasted until the beginning of the thirteenth century, having had at least temporary possession of Bukhara and Samarkand. Thus was also formed north of Afghanistan the Ghaznevid kingdom, which even invaded a part of India and succeeded in seizing Punjab, whose conversion to Islam began at this time. Of these two kingdoms, only the first really retained a Turkish national character, and there developed, chiefly in the eleventh century, an orig-

inal Turkish literature in a literary language very near Uigurian (which served more or less as its model), but which underwent the literary influence of Islam and was written sometimes in Uigurian, sometimes in Arabic characters. We have, for example, versions in these two alphabets of the celebrated and lengthy didactic poem "Kutadgu Bilig" (more than six thousand distiches of 11 + 11 syllables), a collection of moral counsels treating a large number of subjects and containing a mass of information on the ideas and the knowledge of Karakhanid society. And it was a Kara-khanid prince at Baghdad, Mahmud of Kashgar, who, from 1072 to 1083, edited and augmented a veritable manual of Turkology, the first known to us, designed to explain to the Arabs the composition, geographical situation, traditions, and customs, as well as the dialects, of the various Turkish populations spread throughout Asia and into eastern Europe. A comparative grammar of dialects and ethnological selections, this work is the principal source of our knowledge of the Turks in the eleventh century; more generally, it is a mine of information on central Asia at that time.

Before we leave the Middle Ages, to be as inclusive as we are able in this already complex exposé of the various fields of Turkology, we must mention some important migrations of Turkish peoples into eastern Europe, as far as the limits of the Byzantine Empire. We can give but a rapid sketch of this vast subject, generally better known to the educated public than is the history of the Turks of central Asia.

The Bulgars, before they were converted to Christianity under the influence of the Slavs, becoming completely Slavic, were a people of Turkish language who, in the seventh century, having apparently come from Asia with the Huns, had formed a powerful kingdom in the northwestern part of the Caucasus, from the Sea of Azov to the Kuban. Certain groups separated from them and, moving northward, installed themselves at the juncture of the Volga and the Kama, constituting Greater Bulgaria, which was to last until the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century. Several tomb inscriptions in Bulgar-Turkish and in Arabic characters remain from these Bulgars of the north, partially Islamized—the Chuvashes of today appearing to be descended from them. Another group of Bulgars who crossed the Danube in 679 conquered a part of the Balkans, mingled with Slavs, embraced Christianity, and founded historical Bulgaria, soon entirely Slavic.

The Khazars, also of Turkish language, dominated the steppes north

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

of the Caspian Sea, the lower Volga Basin, and the region of the Terek from the beginning of the seventh century to the beginning of the eleventh. Merchants and warriors of a high material culture, divided curiously among three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (when they had abandoned the old Turkish cult of Tengri), they enjoyed close relations with the Byzantine Empire.

Turkish too were the Petchenegs (Batchanak) who, coming from the east at the end of the ninth century, occupied the region of the Don and the steppes situated to the north of the Sea of Azov. In the tenth and eleventh centuries they lived as nomads between the lower Dnieper and the mouth of the Danube, invading Thrace several times and warring against the Russians and the Byzantines, who decimated them in 1091 and utterly destroyed them in 1122.

Turkish, finally, were the Kipchak, or Comans, or Polovtzes, who, as eastern neighbors of the Batchanak, harassed them at the end of the eleventh century and after their destruction replaced them in the steppes of the southern Ukraine where they amalgamated, beginning with 1222, with the Genghis Khan Mongols, new invaders of these open regions. In contact with the Byzantines, the Magyars, the Russians, the Arabs, the Mongols, and the other Turks, these Kipchak played an important role in medieval history. Largely Islamized, they produced a literature of which several fragments remain. Kipchak slaves, captured by the Arabs and transported into Egypt, are especially responsible for the founding of the Mameluk dynasty; several dictionaries of their language, annotated in Arabic characters, are in existence. Among the Kipchak there were Christian preachings, both Orthodox and Catholic. For these was established a Kipchak-Coman glossary, written in Latin characters and conserved in Petrarch's library under the name of "Codex Cumanicus" at the end of the thirteenth century. Coman translations from the Latin of Catholic hymns and prayers also exist.

The history of eastern Europe in the Middle Ages could not be written without a knowledge of these Turkish peoples. The history of the Slavs and of the formation of the Russian state in particular are closely connected with that of the Bulgars, the Khazars, the Petchenegs, and the Kipchak-Comans. Turkology therefore plays and will continue to play an important role in the development of medieval historical studies concerning Europe.

There is another group of Turkish tribes that we have not yet men-

tioned, though it too was responsible for raids in Europe from the eleventh century on; these were the Oghuz. We have chosen to speak of them separately because of their unusual history. This group lies at the origin of two powerful successive empires, both destined to have a profound effect on the history of the Old World: first, the Seljuk empire, which, at the end of the eleventh century and during the twelfth, included Iran, Iraq, northwestern Syria, eastern and central Anatolia; later, the Ottoman empire, which, growing rapidly in Anatolia during the fourteenth century, passed over to the Balkans, caused all Christianity to tremble in the fifteenth, destroyed the ancient Roman Empire of the east, conquered Byzantium, dominated the eastern Mediterranean, and became the greatest world power in the sixteenth century: a European power with the Balkans, Hungary, the Crimea, and the Caucasus; Asiatic, with Anatolia, Azerbaijan, Iraq, Syria, and Arabia; African, with Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and Algeria.

These Oghuz (Ghuz or Ghuzz to the Arabs, Uzes to the Byzantines) were, as late as the tenth century, among the most backward of Turkish peoples, similar in many ways to the ancient T'u-kie. For the most part they led a nomadic existence chiefly in what is today the Kazak steppes, north of Lake Balkhash, the Sea of Aral, and the Caspian. Some of them penetrated into southern Russia around the middle of the eleventh century and even into the Balkans (where they were crushed in 1065). But the Kynyk tribe, led by a certain Seljuk, broke away from the other Oghuz tribes and, living as nomads near the lower course of the Syr Darya, were, toward the end of the tenth century, influenced by the Islamic propaganda which supported the Iranian and Moslem state of the Samanids, who were then masters of Transoxiana and were converted to Islam. They entered the service of the Samanids and installed themselves farther south in the region of Bukhara.

The fall of the Samanids and the confusion then reigning in Moslem central Asia permitted these Seljuks, strengthened by new Oghuz elements, to continue their march to the south and to become masters of the Khorasan from 1040 on, under the leadership of Tughril-beg, a great warrior chieftain and able politician. The ambition of the Seljuk chief was not limited to the governorship of northern Iran. Profiting from the doctrinal quarrels between the "orthodox" Moslems (the Sunna or Sunni) grouped around the caliph of Baghdad, and the "heterodox" Persian Shi'á dynasty of the Buyids, he took over all Persia and Iraq in about fifteen years, while the caliph, a religious chief without



### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

any real military power, recognized him in 1058 as his delegate in the temporal power of Islam.

So the Turks became the military and political chiefs of the "orthodox" Moslem world, leaving only religious supremacy to the Arab caliphs. From then on the Seljuk Turks were in charge of the Moslem Holy War against Christianity, particularly against the Byzantine empire. It was in this capacity that Alp Arslan, Tughril-beg's successor, left for the conquest of Armeno-Byzantine Anatolia. In 1071 at Malazkert, in Armenia, he fought the Byzantine Emperor Romanus Diogenes and took him prisoner, thus opening up eastern and central Anatolia to Turkish invasion. A large number of Oghuz clans came from Turkestan at the call of their conquering brethren, the Seljuks, and enlisted in the army of Islam in order to occupy the newly conquered lands and to prepare new assaults against the Christian world. In this way was Asia Minor Islamicized and Turkicized at the end of the eleventh century. In the same way, the Oghuz flocked to the Khorasan and the Kharezm, beyond the Amu Darya, which became an integral part of the Seljuk state. They were converted to Islam but remained entirely nomadic, today's Turkmens being their descendants. There was also an important Oghuz population to the northwest of Seljuk Iran, in all of Azerbaijan. Thus were formed the three principle zones of the Oghuz Turkish languages, still observable today: the Turkey of Anatolia, Azerbaijan, and Turkmenistan.

In the rest of Iran and in Iraq "Turkification" was less strong; most of the Turks of Persia adopted the ways of Iran, and those of Iraq became Arabs. The Seljuk sovereigns themselves progressively lost their Turkish character and adhered to Arabo-Persian culture; their official language was Persian and was to remain so until the last quarter of the thirteenth century, even in Anatolia, where Persian was spoken in the cities and Turkish in the rural regions.

The history of the Seljuks is rather confused because of their various divisions. We shall limit ourselves to noting one other Turkish dynasty (Oghuz, too, in all likelihood)—that of the shahs of Kharezm, which was to supplant the Seljuks in Persia beginning with the end of the twelfth century. The Arab caliphs of Iraq were to disengage themselves from Seljuk "protection," so that in the thirteenth century only the Seljuks of Anatolia remained, with Konya as their principal center. After the sack of Baghdad in 1259 by the Genghis Khan Mongols of Hülägü, this last Seljuk sultanate fell for all practical purposes under

the Mongols of Persia, setting off dynastic struggles which finally destroyed it in 1302. Turkish Anatolia was divided into feudal Moslem states which fought numerous wars. These "Beyliks," in which Turkish generally became the official language, had a certain cultural and linguistic unity; it was then that the written Turkish language was developed, using Arabic characters, from which was to come classical Ottoman in the fifteenth century, the time of the unification of Turkey by the Ottomans.

The history of the Seljuks and the Beyliks of Anatolia, from the middle of the eleventh century to the end of the fourteenth, concerns in the first place the study of the Moslem world, but it is also of very great interest for the history of Christian Europe, since it was against the Turks of Anatolia, Seljuks or not, that the Byzantines and the Crusaders chiefly struggled. The great ferment of ideas and cultures which accompanied the Crusades brought Europe into contact principally with the Moslem Turks (among whom must also be counted, from the middle of the thirteenth century, the Egyptian Mameluks, mostly Kipchaks). Recourse to information which, by the direct study of Turkish texts and the comparative examination of Turkish facts of the time, only Turkology can assure is an evident necessity for all historians of Islam and Christianity in the eleventh through the fourteenth centuries.

In this realm of pre-Ottoman history, Turkish studies are rapidly expanding. New texts are published, very precise monographs are produced, and historians and philologists collaborate closely for the advancement of knowledge. Progress is rapid enough to justify hopes for new syntheses at an early date.

With the Ottomans (or Osmanlis) we approach a subject much more widely known. The history of their immense empire, Turkish and Islamic successor to the Roman Empire of the east, dominates the history of all Europe and the Mediterranean world beginning with the fifteenth century. The very decadence of this state commanded the attention of European politics in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the famous "question of the Orient," whose difficulties, alas, have yet to be entirely resolved!

Another fact of prime importance, the accession of the Ottoman sultans beginning with Selim I (1467-1520), conqueror of Egypt and Arabia, to the title of caliph, Commander of the Believers, made of them not only the greatest of temporal sovereigns but also the supreme

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

spiritual leaders of "orthodox" (Sunnite) Islam, so that, until the suppression of the caliphate by the new Republic of Turkey in 1924, the Ottoman Turks were to play a leading role in the evolution of the Moslem world in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa. To Europeans, "Turkish" was for a long time to be synonymous with "Moslem."

We cannot trace the history of the Ottoman Empire here. We shall simply recall, to underline its enormous importance in the world, the names of the countries which played a more or less lasting part in the empire. In Europe they were European Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, most of Yugoslavia and Hungary, Cyprus, the Crimea, a part of the Caucasus, and Bessarabia; in Asia, Asiatic Turkey, Caucasian and Iranian Azerbaijan, Iraq, Jordan, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, all of Arabia; and in Africa, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and a part of the Sudan (its links with Morocco were rather theoretical and of a religious order). Besides the peoples who today form the majority in the nations just mentioned, there were, within the Ottoman Empire, very active minorities of Armenians, Judeo-Spaniards, Kurds, Cherkesses, Lazes, Georgians, and others.

Thus there is no need to stress the considerable role of Ottoman studies in the history of humanity, especially in that of Europe and the Mediterranean world, from the fifteenth century to the present. They form an integral part of Turkology (within which they figure as a branch of the utmost importance, sometimes called "Osmanology"). It was, for example, an event of Ottoman history—the taking of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmet II in 1453—which historians traditionally fixed as the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times. An arbitrary and artificial decision, to be sure, but characteristic of the fascination exerted over European minds by the prodigious fortunes of the Ottoman Empire.

Ottoman studies, in Turkey and in Europe, are contemporaneous with the empire itself. Their difficulty lies less in research than in the critical selection from the innumerable available resources. The archives are crushing in volume, not only at Istanbul, but in the great centers of the old empire and in the capitals and large cities of Europe which had continuous commercial and political relations with the empire. Methodical classification has been undertaken for only about forty years, notably in Turkey itself, and this task alone may occupy generations of archivist-paleographers, since Turkish, Arab, Persian, and European historical manuscripts have been preserved by the hundreds.

The great syntheses made so far have dealt especially with political and military history, such as the monumental *History of the Ottoman Empire*, in eighteen octavo volumes, by the Baron von Hammer, which ends with the year 1774. A dozen or more large works in various languages, written from the eighteenth century down to the present, might also be cited. In recent times more research has been devoted to economic and social history, which had been neglected. Important documents in this field have already appeared in Turkey and in Europe, and numerous works in progress will certainly bring much new information concerning practically all the Mediterranean countries.

For the history of ideas and of religions, especially for that of Moslem doctrine and mysticism, Ottoman sources and facts are of prime importance, and many specialists use them in their works. In particular, the somewhat esoteric mystical sects of Turkish Islam in the Ottoman Empire are becoming better and better known.

The Ottomans left numerous monuments of great artistic and technical value in the field of architecture, and the study of Turkish documents concerning them is leading to a more complete knowledge of their history and a better understanding of the uses to which they were put. With the works and objects remaining to us from the Ottoman Turks, historians of art and antiquaries have at their disposal a body of material of inestimable value, the appreciation of which can be increased through the reading of the texts.

Ottoman literature, scholarly and popular, religious and profane, lyrical and scientific, in verse and in prose, is one of the greatest of oriental literatures, often in its quality, always in its abundance and in the variety of its many genre. Numerous scholars have devoted their attention to the study of this literature, which requires, in addition to a knowledge of Turkish, a profound understanding of Arabic and of Persian, the Ottomans' chief languages of culture.

Finally, the Ottoman language, the richest and most elaborate of all Turkish languages, has already been and will continue to be the subject of considerable works of grammar and lexicology, of which we shall speak further in our description of the state of Turkish linguistic studies in general.

It would be perhaps graceless of us to stress further the importance of Ottoman Turkology in the historical and philological sciences and in the whole body of the human sciences.

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

The brilliance of the Ottoman Empire must not make us forget that other Turkish states, farther north or east, were its contemporaries in Eurasia and that, very interesting in themselves, they are of interest also for the history of the Russian state, whose importance needs no comment here.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the steppes of Ukraine and of today's southern Russia were mainly occupied by nomadic Turks, the Kipchak-Comans (or Polovtzes) as far as the Ural River, and by the Oghuz-Turkmens beyond, in the Aralo-Caspian zone. There was also, on the middle Volga and the lower Kama, a sedentary and commercial Turkish state including the cities of Suvar and Bulgar in Greater Bulgaria. Turkmens and Greater Bulgars were partially Islamicized, but the old Turkish religion of the sky-god, Tengri, and shamanism were still dominant among the Kipchak (some of whom, however, had been successfully touched by Christian or Moslem preachings).

From 1220 to 1240 these Turks were all submerged by the great Mongolian invasion of Genghis Khan which destroyed the state of Greater Bulgaria and dragged along with the Mongolian forces the masses of the Kipchak and a part of the Oghuz. At the same time, all the Turks of central Asia were amalgamated into the Mongolian confederation. Among the nomadic Turks not yet Islamicized, as among most of the Kipchak and the Mongolians, there were essential affinities: the same sort of pastoral and warrior life, the same religion of Tengri, and the same "shamanic" sorcery, almost the same tribal structure. They differed chiefly in language, though Turkish and Mongolian speech, in contact for centuries in the region of Lake Baikal and its tributaries, had a very similar structure and a great body of common vocabulary. The Turko-Mongol fusion thus took place rapidly, and, since the politically dominant Mongols were numerically a small minority except in Mongolia itself, the Turkish element predominated from the Altai Mountains to the European steppes. The Mongol princes themselves, descendants of Genghis Khan, soon adopted Turkish ways. Thus in dynasties of Mongol origin true Turkish states were constituted in central Asia and in the Russo-Ukrainian steppes. They were an important fact, these states lying adjacent on the south to regions which had been profoundly Islamicized, and which included from their beginnings dynamic Moslem minorities, and were soon won over by Islam.

After the terrible Mongol campaigns of 1236-42 which ravaged the Russian principalities of Poland, Hungary, and the Danubian zone of

the Balkans, and during which took place the sack of Riazan, Kolomna, Moscow, Vladimir, Sudzal, Rostov, Yaroslav, Tver, Chernigov, Kiev, Sandomierz, Cracow, Pest, and even Cattaro on the Adriatic, the Russian principalities, except for the powerful state of Novgorod in the north, saved from invasion by a hair's breadth, were then reduced to recognition of Mongol suzerainty, which was accompanied by heavy monetary claims and frequent intervention in their affairs.

The Mongols evacuated Hungary in 1243, but they remained in the Russian steppes, supported by the Turkish Kipchak element, and constituted a state, the Kipchak Khanate, also called the Golden Horde, from the Dnieper to the Ural and even, in Siberia, to the Irtysh and the Ob. At the same time they organized to the south and east, from the Amu Darya to the Altai and the region of Turfan, in the Jagatai Khanate, the populations, largely Turkish, of this vast zone which included Transoxiana, with Bukhara and Samarkand, the Ferghana, Kashgari, the region of the Ili, and the country of the Uigurs.

The Kipchak and Jagatai khanates, essentially Turkish and Moslem under the Genghis-khanid dynasties, suffered from the characteristic instability of the Turko-Mongol states of the steppes, with quarrels of succession and breaking up of territory. Both of them, however, had nevertheless a certain linguistic and cultural unity with lasting results, since even today the Turkish peoples who formed part of the Kipchak Khanate, Tatars of the Crimea, Karaites (of Judaic religion), Karachai, Balkars, Kumuks, Tatars of Astrakhan and Kazan, Bashkir, Tatars of western Siberia, of Tobol, and of Baraba, speak languages related to Kipchak-Coman which form a homogeneous dialectal group, while those which belonged to the Jagatai Khanate, Üzbeks and Turkish-Uigurs of Sin-kiang, speak languages of another group which is closer to the Iranian and derives from the great literary language of the Khanate (called for that reason Jagatai) and also called "oriental Turkish," which produced considerable writings as late as the nineteenth century.

The history of the formation of the Russian state is largely that of the relationships between Russians and Tatars (a generic term, Mongol in origin, given by the Russians to the Turks of the Kipchak Khanate or the Golden Horde). From the middle of the thirteenth century to the last quarter of the fifteenth, Russian principalities remained generally under the strict vassalage of the khans of the Golden Horde, despite revolts, the most lasting of which was directed by Muscovy from 1370 to

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

1382 and ended in the almost complete destruction of Moscow. And it was Muscovy under Ivan III (the Great), who, a century later, was to head a national resistance, this time victorious, and to free Russia definitively from the Tatar yoke in 1480. The struggle against the Turkish-Tatars of the Kipchak Khanate (or Golden Horde) counted a great deal in the awakening of a powerful national Russian feeling and in the crystallization about Muscovy of the modern Russian state, with all its consequences in world history. This struggle was, however, accompanied, despite religious differences (Christians against Moslems), by a certain cultural interpenetration. The very interesting study of this subject is one of the numerous inquiries common to Slavistics and Turkology.

The development of Russia was facilitated by the progressive dismembering of the khanate of the Golden Horde, from which were successively detached the khanate of the Crimea, from the Dnieper to the Don and the Kuban (a vassal of the Ottoman Empire after 1475) in 1430; the khanate of Kazan (independent until the middle of the sixteenth century) in 1437; the khanate of Kasimov (immediately subject to Muscovy) in 1452; the khanate of Astrakhan (independent until 1554) in 1468. The dissolution of the Golden Horde was complete. It disappeared early in the sixteenth century. Of the territories it had embraced, all except the Crimea, which became Ottoman, were absorbed by Russia under Ivan IV (the Terrible) (1533–84): Kazan in 1552, Astrakhan in 1556, and Tatar Siberia (which had constituted a khanate in Siberia) beginning in 1581. The destruction of this last Turkish khanate, the remains of the Golden Horde, opened to the Russians the conquest of Siberia, an event of great consequence.

The Jagatai Khanate had a most eventful history. Beginning in 1370 it was absorbed by the Turko-Mongol empire of Tamerlane (which fell into anarchy shortly after the death of its founder in 1405), was split into rival khanates, regained its unity in the last quarter of the fifteenth century under the Jagatai Yunus, and lost it again during the sixteenth century, when it yielded to new Moslem Turkish states. But on the cultural level it conserved a certain national cohesion, maintained by a common literary language, Jagatai, whose literature flourished from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries and continued to the end of the nineteenth. The khanates formed from it retained their independence until the early nineteenth century, when they were annexed in their turn by Russia.

Just as the common struggle of the Russian principalities against the Turkish-Tatars of the Golden Horde from the middle of the thirteenth century to the end of the fifteenth had contributed greatly to the national unity of Russia, so was the absorption of Turkish nations to lead to the enormous and rapid growth of the Russian state in the centuries to follow. Russian expansion in Siberia, which, at the end of the sixteenth century, followed the destruction of the last khanate remaining from the Golden Horde, continued in the seventeenth century to the Pacific Ocean and the Arctic Circle, with its southern limit approximately at the fiftieth parallel, at which the region of Lake Baikal was completely absorbed. Among other Siberian peoples, the Russian state absorbed the Tatars of Siberia as far as Yeniseisk (1619) and Krasnoyarsk (1628), and another people of Turkish language very interesting to linguists and ethnographers, the Yakuts of the Far North, from the one hundredth to the one hundred and sixtieth parallel: Yakutsk was founded in 1632, Verkhoyansk ("Frigid Pole") in 1638.

In the eighteenth century Russia expanded mainly in Europe: a notable accession was the Turkish Khanate of the Crimea in 1783, taken from the Ottoman Empire. In Siberia, however, she extended her conquests to the south, between the Irtysh and the upper basin of the Yenisei, as far as the fiftieth parallel; there she absorbed new Turkish groups: the Oirots of the Altai, the Chors, Tatars of Abakan (today's Khakass), Karagasses, and Tuba (or Tuva) of the west. The eastern part of the Tannu-Tuva was to become a Russian protectorate in 1912.

In the nineteenth century Russian expansion became intensified in central Asia and in the Caucasus, and the Turkish khanates derived from the Jagatai Khanate were absorbed one by one. This had been at first a very curious confederation of nomadic tribes which must recall the old nomadic empires of central Asia, such as that of the Kazak (also called "Kazak-Kirghiz," although distinct from the true Kirghiz). The Turkish word *kazak* (or *kazakh*) means "free-shooter, adventurer, irregular"; in Russian it designates the "Cossacks," who lived on the margin of sedentary Slavic society. The Kazaks were originally irregulars who, beginning in 1465, refused obedience to the Uzbek Khanate (successor to the Jagatai Khanate) and were determined to lead independently a purely nomadic life in the immense steppes which even today constitute Kazakstan. Their movement was successful, and they soon became numerous: more than two million at the end of the eighteenth century, between three and four million at the end of the



### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

nineteenth. Russian penetration into the Kazak country began with the establishment of outposts in southern Siberia and was at once political, economic, and military. The Kazak steppes were finally occupied and annexed, up to the Sea of Aral and the Tsu River, between 1801 and 1855.

Russian expansion continued to the south, from 1856 to 1900, encircling the countries of the true Kirghiz (present-day Kirghizistan, in which this people settled en masse in the eighteenth century, driven from the upper Yenisei by joint Russian and Chinese pressure); the Uzbek (or Özbek) khanates of Khokanda, of Bukhara, and of Khiva, the first annexed in 1865, the second and third becoming protectorates in 1868 and 1873, respectively; and, finally, the entire Turkmen steppes as far as the frontiers of Iran and Afghanistan. Thus the absorption of the territories of the old Jagatai Khanate by the Russian state was accomplished.

The Soviet Union of today has conserved these territories inherited from the empire of the tsars, and the various nationalities of Turkish languages, which have received special political and cultural statutes, play an important part in the life of the country. Turkological studies (linguistic, historical, and ethnographic) are, as we have seen, very precious for the knowledge of the old Russian Empire and the contemporary U.S.S.R. None is more aware of this than the Soviets themselves, Russian or not, who have assigned to Turkology a significant place in that part of Russian scientific programs concerned with the human sciences.

To conclude this very rapid sketch of the historical destinies of the various peoples of Turkish languages in modern times and in our own day we must—while mentioning the existence of an important Turkish minority in northwestern Iran, in Iranian Azerbaijan (principal city: Tabriz), and of various Turkish tribes in northern Afghanistan—recall the following facts. The Turks of the Tarim Basin and of Kashgarī, some of them descended from the ancient Uigurs, more and more Islamized during the fourteenth century and entirely converted around 1500, were then subjected to the power of the theocratic dynasty of the Khôdja, fanatical Moslem despots, extremely orthodox, and finally subjects of the Chinese Empire under the Manchu dynasty, after a short war of conquest (1757–59). Thus was founded in their territories a new Chinese province, Sinkiang (“New March”), in which the Chi-

nese became very numerous especially in the cities but which has kept on the Turkish side its national traits, its language, and its Islamic religion. This today forms the Uigur Autonomous Region in the Chinese People's Republic, where its economic importance is increasing and where the Turkish language (neo-Uigur) is official, along with Chinese.

Let us recall also that India, after undergoing numerous invasions by Turko-Mongol peoples from the northwest for several centuries, was in large part conquered between 1525 and 1530 by Sultan Baber, who formed the empire of the Grand Mogul. A descendant of Tamerlane, likewise claiming to continue the tradition of the Mongol empire, Baber was, like his great ancestor, Turkish in language and in culture: his remarkable poetry and his autobiography (the "Baber-nameh") are written in Jagatai Turkish and are among the great works of Turkish literature. His successors yielded to Persian culture and to the local customs of India, while remaining Moslems, but Turkish influence was far from negligible in their empire until the British conquest of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. So Turkology is not without interest in the study of the languages, the history, and the culture of a part of present-day India and all of Pakistan.

Basic for the history of the Ottoman Empire and of central Asia, of great importance for that of Russia and the U.S.S.R., useful for that of Iran, Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, and China, Turkological studies thus cover an immense domain and call for a wide development as principal disciplines or as auxiliary sources of information in the framework of the historical sciences.

It is our hope that the too rapid journey we have just taken through many centuries and countries will have made the reader feel the weight that Turkish facts have carried and still carry in the history of humanity. The variety of these facts tends to be disconcerting, in whatever field one may envisage. Politically, we have seen that the Turkish peoples have formed large numbers of states varying widely in structure. Anthropologically, they have had and still have extremely heterogeneous types, from almost pure Mongolian to Nordic European, with infinite somatic varieties. Their ways of life, sedentary or nomadic, their levels of culture, very high or quite low, show the same disparity. On the religious level there are Turkish peoples who are "Tengrists" and "shamanists" (such as the ancient Turks of Mongolia or certain

### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

Altaians and Yakuts of today); others, Manicheists (the Uigurs of the ninth and tenth centuries); others, Buddhists (many Uigurs of Turfan from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, or today's Yellow Uigurs of Kan-su); others, Jewish (a part of the Khazars, or the modern Karaites of Poland, Lithuania, and the Crimea); others, Christians of various rites (Nestorians, as certain thirteenth-century Uigurs; orthodox, as the Gagauzes of the Dobrudja or the Caramanians of Asia Minor; Catholics, as certain thirteenth-century Comans); still others, and the majority, Moslems (Sunnites, as most of the Ottomans and Turkestani, or Shi'ites, as many Turks of Azerbaijan), founders of numerous Islamic sects.

This variety of beliefs and cultures is reflected in the systems of writing that have served the Turkish languages: special characters for the Inscriptions of the Orkhon and the Yenesei, the Uigur, Sogdian, Manichean, Syriac, Tibetan, Indian-Brahmî alphabets, Chinese transcriptions of certain Sino-Uigur dictionaries, the Hebraic, Greek-Armenian, Latin, Cyrillic, and Arabic alphabets. Even today three alphabets are officially used for Turkish languages: the Latin in Turkey, the Cyrillic in the U.S.S.R., the Arabic in Sinkiang. The Turkologist, it will be recognized, must be accustomed to reading a large number of writing systems in various characters.

And yet the languages of all these peoples, set down in these many alphabets, are all Turkish languages, closely related to each other despite their large number—today, a full score of principal dialects can be counted. They all, even the “aberrant” Yakut and Chuvash, may be traced to a common prototype of which the ancient Turkish of the Inscriptions, though itself already quite highly evolved, is not so far removed. For the linguist, accustomed to phonetic correspondences and morphological or semantic evolutions, it is easy to pass from one ancient or modern Turkish dialect to another, only the Yakut and the Chuvash requiring a particular effort. It is just this which makes for the unity of Turkology, as we have already stressed. The Turkish fact is, above all else, a linguistic fact; Turkish cohesion is, above all, linguistic cohesion.

The study of Turkish languages and dialects is thus the basis of Turkology, not only for the linguist and the philologist, which goes without saying, but even for the historian or the ethnographer. This is

why it seems to us useful to give here an idea of the present state of knowledge in the field of Turkish linguistics.

Materials are not lacking. For the most ancient periods, beginning with the sixth century, we have notations of Turkish words made by Chinese and Byzantine historians. The first of these pose very delicate problems of phonetic reconstruction, since one must attempt not only to re-establish the ancient pronunciation of Chinese but also to identify the different (and necessarily approximate) systems of transcription adopted in China to render as well as possible a language whose phonology is entirely foreign to that of the Chinese. The second are more easily accessible, and a vast collection, with detailed references, exists in the "Byzantino-Turcica" of Moravcsik, an almost exhaustive work.

For more than twelve centuries, beginning about the year 700, and without interruption, we have a constantly increasing number of Turkish texts themselves. First, the Inscriptions of Mongolia and of the Yenesei, studied by Thomsen and Radloff, and from which much remains to be drawn. Then, beginning with the tenth century, there is the enormous Uigur literature. In the eleventh century there are the first texts written by the Moslem Turks in Arabic characters and, notably, the marvelous *Divan* of Kashgarî (Mahmud de Kashgar), a comparative manual of Turkish dialects for the use of the Arabs, and the vast didactic poem, the *Kutadgu Bilig*, of which copies exist in both Arabic and Uigur alphabets. In the twelfth century there is the same duality of writing among the Moslem Turks, with the religious poems of Edib Ahmed (Aybet-ül-Hakayik, Uigur) and of Ahmet Yesevî (*Divan-i Hikmet*, Arabic). In the thirteenth century, while in the east of the Turkish domain the Uigur literature itself, especially Buddhist but also Christian, is in full production, the Islamized Turks of Turkestan and Anatolia, among whom the Arabic alphabet is henceforth dominant, also undertake a literary activity of impressive proportions, especially the religious, and make rapid progress in the perfecting of two great written languages whose vocabulary underwent Arabo-Persian influence and which were to become in succeeding centuries Ottoman Turkish in Turkey and oriental Turkish, or Jagatai, in Turkestan.

From the fourteenth century to the end of the nineteenth these two literary languages, both because of their importance the object of extensive studies by Arab and Persian grammarians and lexicographers, then by Europeans (the latter very active in the seventeenth century in the Ottoman field, with Hieronymus Megiser, André du Ryer, and Mesg-

## *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

nien, alias Meninski), became great classical languages whose production is enormous. The body of Jagatai literature, and even more the Ottoman, occupies a large place in the principal libraries of Europe (notably in Paris) and of all the Moslem countries; the Jagatai collections of Istanbul are very rich, and the Ottoman collections of the numerous libraries throughout Turkey are practically inexhaustible. Nor should we forget the documents of Ottoman archives heaped by the thousands in all the chancelleries of Europe, Asia, and North Africa.

And we also possess, from 1300 to 1900, numerous documents on other and less favored Turkish languages: on the Coman-Kipchak of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with the Codex Cumanicus and the manuscripts of Egypt in the Mameluk era; on the Yakut since the end of the seventeenth century (notes taken by N. Witsen); on the Chuvash since the same time (earliest grammar, in Russian, by the Archbishop Benjamin, published in 1769); on the Karaites of Poland and Lithuania, in Hebrew characters, from the early eighteenth century; and others.

During the nineteenth century and down to the present day, numerous Turkish dialects which had previously existed only in oral form were noted down, chiefly by Russian scholars, in Turkestan and Siberia, and an admirable dictionary collecting all these notations in a first state was published by W. Radloff (*Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialekte* [4 vols.; St. Petersburg, 1893-1911]). In the U.S.S.R. the various national groups of Turkish language are creating their own literatures, based on the spoken dialects phonetically transcribed. Books, newspapers, and dictionaries are being published in constantly increasing numbers in the following Turkish languages (and the list is not exhaustive): Chuvash, Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, Crimea Tatar, Nogai, Kumuk, Karachai, Balkar, Kazak, Kirghiz, Kara-kalpak, Turkmen, Azerbaijanli, Uzbek, Altaian, Khakass (Chor and Abakan Tatar), Tuva (Soïot), Yakut; all these languages are now noted in the Cyrillic alphabet. In China similar work is under way, and at this moment a printed literature in neo-Uigur is developing, and even in Kazak and Kirghiz (phonetic notation in Arabic characters diacritically marked); the dialect of the Yellow Uigurs of Kan-su has also been set down. In Turkey, where, since the founding of the republic, the Latin (phonetic) alphabet has replaced Arabic characters (1928), a great effort is being made, notably by the Linguistic Society (Dil Kurumu) and by the entire teaching body from village schoolmaster to university professor,

to set down all the local dialects of Anatolia and European Turkey. A very rich dictionary, *Söz Derleme Dergisi* (three volumes with appendixes) has already been published; at the same time ancient texts are being continually republished, and vast works of Ottoman lexicography are pursued (as, for example, the four large volumes already published of the *Tanıklarıyla Tarama Söz-lügü*).

Materials, then, are not lacking for linguistic Turkologists. Therefore theoretical, grammatical, and lexicographical studies are multiplying. The earliest scientific grammar of a Turkish language developed according to the methods of modern linguistics and satisfactorily complete is Jean Deny's masterly *Grammaire de la langue Turque, dialecte osmanli* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1921), over twelve hundred pages, rich in historical and comparative developments, which remains a standard reference work for Turkologists. Excellent works have been published since then (notably for old Turkish and Uigur, in 1941, the *Altürkische Grammatik* of A. von Gabain [Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1950]); and the number, like the variety, of works of quality is such that we now have the necessary means for the elaboration of a work of synthesis giving a precise and comparative view, not exhaustive, but sufficiently complete, of the whole body of Turkish linguistic facts.

The need for such a work is being felt more and more, for linguists, historians, and ethnographers and, more generally, for Orientalists, philologists, psychologists, specialists or not, of a part of the Turkish field, who wish to acquire, for their works or for their personal culture, a clear and precise knowledge of the essential traits of the various Turkish languages, ancient and modern, as well as of the profound and reasoned feeling of what constitutes their unity.

This work can no longer be that of a single scholar (were he a genius destined to live a hundred years) because of the extreme complexity of the subject, of which we hope we have given some idea, and because of the considerable body of publications in all sorts of languages which directly or indirectly concern it. Here collaboration is perhaps more necessary than in any other field, and this collaboration must of necessity be international, as no country can today claim to be able to assemble an entire team of specialists in all the languages and all the cultures involved.

Therefore, on the initiative of the International Union of Orientalists, the International Council of Philosophy and the Human Sciences (CIPSH) decided to underwrite, with the aid of subsidies and the help

## *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

of UNESCO, the publication of an international compendium of Turkology, including the ensemble of Turkish facts ancient and modern, the *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, under the direction of Messrs. Jean Deny, Kaare Grönbech, Helmuth Scheel, and Zeki Velidi Togan. In preparation for several years by a commission of linguists presided over by Jean Deny, the first volume of this vast Turkological synthesis, devoted to linguistics (the following volumes to be devoted to literature and history), will appear at the end of this year, published by Franz Steiner of Wiesbaden.

It will include a general introduction, an exposé of the common structure and tendencies of the Turkish languages, then four parts:

- I. *Old Turkish: Turkish of the Inscriptions, Uigur;*
- II. *Middle Turkish:*
  - a) *Occidental:* Coman, Kipchak;
  - b) *Oriental:* Kara-khanid, Kharezmi Turkish, Jagatai;
- III. *Modern Turkish:*
  - a) *Southern Group:* pre-Ottoman, Ottoman, Ottoman dialects (Anatolia and Rumelia, Gagauz, Crimean Ottoman); Azerbaijani; Turkmen;
  - b) *Western Group:* modern Coman, Karaite, Karachai, Balkar, Crimean Tatar, Kumuk; Kazan Tatar, Bashkir;
  - c) *Central Group:* Kazak, Kara-kalpak, Nogai, Kirghiz;
  - d) *Eastern Group:* Uzbek, neo-Uigur, Yellow Uigur;
  - e) *Northern Group:* Altaian, Chor, and Abakan Tatar, Karagass and Soiot (Tuva); Yakut;
- IV. *Turkish-Bulgarian:* Turkish-Bulgarian of the Danube and the Volga (preceded by a discussion on the language of the European Huns); Chuvash.

The whole will be followed by a copious index and a large map of the Turkish linguistic regions of today, which may be purchased separately. The articles are presented according to the authors' choice in English, German, or French. Samples of each language follow the monographs devoted to them, and an abundant bibliography is to be provided, chapter by chapter.

Thus the present state of knowledge in the vast domain of Turkish linguistics will be clearly shown. Thus will be forged the working instrument so sorely needed by students, researchers, and even by experienced Turkologists, since none of them is a universal genius.

In terminating this rapid exposé, in which we hope we have enabled the reader to situate Turkology better in the ensemble of orientalist

disciplines and to appreciate its importance, there remains the question of whether the Turkish linguistic group is isolated from other groups of languages or of whether it can be related to some of them.

If there is one linguistic family which offers striking similarities with the Turkish languages, it is that of the Mongolian languages. The structure of the word (neither prefixes nor infixes, but only suffixes which may occur in series), the vocalic harmony (the timbre of a vowel in a word, in a non-initial syllable, is conditioned by that of the preceding vowel), and the syntax (of position, with the determinant preceding the determined, the complement preceding the completed element) are the same except for a few details; there is not only a large fund of common vocabulary but also many suffixes (of derivation or desinential) which go back to a common archetype. This is why many linguists consider the Turkish and the Mongolian languages to be related and to come from the same prehistoric language ("Turko-Mongol"). However, there are wide divergences in many elements of the basic vocabulary (as, for example, in the names of numbers), which cause some scholars to hesitate to adopt this hypothesis. Be that as it may, the two linguistic groups are closely linked historically, even if they do not have a common original parent; Mongolian abounds in words from the Turkish (Uigur), which was one of the diplomatic languages of the Mongol Empire in the thirteenth century, and there is also a great mass of words and suffixes which in both groups are derived, much earlier, from a common source. Turkology is thus an almost necessary complement to Mongolistics. And this is true not only for linguistics but also for history, since the Turkish and Mongolian peoples have been in close contact from time immemorial.

Even more complex is the problem of the relations among Turkish, Mongolian, and Tungus. The Tungus languages (including Manchu), spread over northeastern Asia, have the same basic structure as Turkish and Mongolian. In the three groups are also found words and suffixes of the same origin, and hence the hypothesis that all three are derived from the same very ancient language and that they constitute a linguistic family often called "Altaic" despite the impropriety of the term (which is properly related only to the Altai Mountains). But the divergences remain considerable between the Tungus and Mongolian languages, more so between the Tungus and the Turkish, so that the "Altaic" hypothesis should be considered with a great deal of caution. It offers, however, an undeniable interest as a working hypothesis, and



### *Turkology: A Preliminary Report*

we may, in this difficult and almost unexplored field of comparatism, hope for increasingly numerous discoveries which will weaken or strengthen it. Some scholars wish to add Korean or even Ainu or Japanese to this hypothetical "common Altaic"; but the indexes on which they attempt to base this idea are still too few to be very convincing. The question remains open.

In another direction, toward the west, the group of Finno-Ugrian languages (Finnish, Hungarian, languages of the Ural region), to which Samoyed is attached, also presents striking affinities with the Turkish group and, to a lesser degree, with the Mongolian and Tungus groups: formation of words by cumulable suffixes, with vocalic harmony, syntax of position with the determinant (or the complement) before the determined (or the completed), and common elements in vocabulary and in suffixes. Hence comes the old hypothesis of a vast "Uralo-Altaic" linguistic community in northern and central Eurasia, in very ancient times, in a distant prehistoric period. This daring and attractive hypothesis, after a period of relative eclipse, has recently taken on new life. It is greeted with skepticism by many specialists but is favored by certain others equally eminent. The problem is still far from solution but is exceptionally interesting. The chief difficulty lies in discriminating between the common elements which are derived from borrowings between one group and another, or between two groups and a third, and those which might be explained by common origins.

Finally, in the presence of structural similarities and certain striking convergences, and in the framework of a very plausible hypothesis, of a movement of people from Asia to the American continent, research is being undertaken on possible relationships between certain American languages and the "Altaic" languages. Professor Georges Dumézil has just made some very interesting comparisons, notably on the names of numbers, between Turkish and Quechua.

To elucidate these questions, of immense importance for the pre-history of Eurasia, long and patient research will be required, in which Turkology will play a very important role by reason of the central position of the Turkish group in relation to the whole body of idioms in question.

Whether in the field of history or in that of linguistics, Turkology thus occupies a remarkable position. The same holds true for ethnog-

raphy: the variety of geographical situations and of forms of material and ideological culture observed in Turkish societies poses innumerable ethnographical problems, the exploration of which has already begun and will certainly be continued.

Generally speaking, however interesting and important the results already achieved by Turkology, they are as nothing compared to the promises held forth by this relatively new discipline, approaching a period of full scientific expansion, which will become more and more conscious of its unity and of the particular mission which it is to carry out in the great collective effort toward the understanding of man.