

Notes on the Development of Turkish and Oriental Studies in the German Speaking Lands¹

Christoph HERZOG*

HISTORICALLY, the academic fields of Turkology and Turkish studies² have emerged as a part of a discipline that will be termed here “Oriental studies.”³ For the past decade, an upsurge of interest in the history of Oriental studies in Germany has been experienced.⁴ Because of the overarching character of Oriental studies, the tendency has been to treat them together. In fact, it would be hardly imaginable to delineate the field of Turkish studies without taking into account the general background of Oriental studies.⁵

The Birth of Turkish Studies out of Orientalist Philology

In the first decades of the 19th century an evident, if undramatic, upswing of interest in Oriental themes occurred in German cultural production. In translations, travelogues, poetry, novels, but also in the opera, the imagination of the Oriental was reproduced for

* Prof., Turkish Studies at the University of Bamberg, Germany.

1 Special thanks to Wayne Brittenden, Werner Ende, Barbara Henning and Klaus Kreiser for help with this article. Of course, any remaining errors are still mine.

2 Both expressions can be used synonymously, but there is a tendency to confine the term “Turkish studies” to the study of Turkey and its history, including the Ottoman Empire. The expression “Turkic studies” refers to the purely linguistic field of study of the Turkic languages. In German no equivalent of this term exists.

3 The German term “Orientalische Studien” was used already in the 1830s, while the word “Orientalistik” seems to have been coined only at the end of the 19th century; cf. Sabine Mangold, *Eine “weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft - Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2004), 12 ns. 5 and 6.

4 Cf. Ludmila Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten. Deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); Mangold, *Wissenschaft* (2004); Andrea Polaschegg, *Der andere Orientalismus. Regeln deutsch-morgenländischer Imagination im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin - New York: De Gruyter, 2005); Ekkehard Ellinger, *Deutsche Orientalistik zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus 1933-1945* (Edingen - Neckarhausen: deux mondes, 2006); Ludmila Hanisch, “Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft”, in *Kulturwissenschaften und Nationalsozialismus*, eds. Jürgen Elvert & Jürgen Nielsen-Sikora (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 503-525; Ursula Wokoec, *German Orientalism. The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945* (New York etc.: Routledge, 2009); Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship* (Washington, DC etc.: German Historical Institute, 2009). Still of importance is the “classical” study by Johann Fück: *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955).

5 The term “Oriental studies” may be used in a wider sense including practically all Asian and African languages and in a more narrow sense including only the Near and Middle Eastern languages and cultures.

and consumed by an increasing number of people from the emerging middle classes.⁶ These developments coincided with the emergence of Oriental studies as an academic discipline at German universities.

The development and academic institutionalization of this new discipline in Germany was characterized by a process of professionalization marked, above all, by its “philologization” but also by the subsequent influence of historicism in the later decades of the century. It also reflected the political situation in Germany, the lack of a single cultural and political center as well as the increasing Prussian hegemony. When we have spoken of German and Germany so far, it should be remembered that there is an important consideration: The country as a state within the so-called lesser German solution (*kleindeutsche Lösung*) led by Prussia but excluding the Hapsburg Empire (that had become Austria-Hungary by the *Ausgleich* of 1867, following its defeat in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866) came into existence only after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870/71. Before that date, Vienna was in every sense as German as was Berlin.

If there is a symbolic point zero (such points are always virtual, of course) for the modern history of Turkish studies in the German speaking lands, it may be considered to coincide with the birth of modern Oriental studies in Germany in general: the person and the scientific program of the French Orientalist Silvestre de Sacy (1758-1838).

De Sacy, who had held the chair for Arabic at the newly founded *Ecole spéciale des langues orientales vivantes* in Paris since 1795 and moved to the *Collège de France* in 1806, was primarily an Arabist, of course, with a strong interest in Iranian studies. The concept of this school was revolutionary in a double sense. Not only was it a byproduct of the French Revolution, but it also represented an early institutional model for the detachment of Oriental studies from the context of theological bible exegesis – a process that was fundamental for the development of Oriental studies in Europe in the 19th century. On the other hand, the *Ecole spéciale* was conceived as a service bureau that was to provide interpreters, translations and memoranda for the foreign and colonial politics of the French governments.⁷

De Sacy’s interests were not purely practical, however, and his focus remained with written language, grammar and texts. His knowledge, his method and his didactic pre-occupation and ability made him the recognized avant-gardist of Oriental studies of the time and attracted large numbers of students from all over Europe, some of them sent by their governments. Thus, he became the teacher of many important German Orientalists,⁸ most notably Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801-1888) who, in the words

6 Ludwig Ammann, *Östliche Spiegel. Ansichten vom Orient im Zeitalter seiner Entdeckung durch den deutschen Leser, 1800-1850* (Hildesheim etc.: Olms 1989); Raymond Schwab, *The Oriental Renaissance. Europe’s Discovery of India and the East, 1680-1880*, transl. Gene Patterson-Black and Victor Reinking, foreword by Edward Said (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1984) and Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Entzauberung Asiens. Europa und die asiatischen Reiche im 18. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed., (München: C. H. Beck, 2010).

7 Füick, *Studien*, 141-142 and Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 38-39.

8 Among those sent were the famous linguist Franz Bopp (1891-1867), the Protestant theologian Friedrich Steudel (1779-1837), the Orientalist Julius Mohl (1800-1876), who, however, choose to remain in Paris and later became a professor for Persian at the *Collège de France* in 1847, the Iranist Johann August Vullers (1803-1880), who in 1833 became professor in Gießen. Others included Wilhelm Freytag (1788-1961),

of the German Arabist and Islamicist Rudi Paret (1901-1983), “branched off the Parisian school of Arabists to Leipzig”⁹ and was to play there a somewhat similar role to his idol de Sacy in Paris, having numerous influential disciples and playing a major role in the consolidation of a philological paradigm of Oriental studies. Fleischer was also instrumental in the foundation of the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* in 1845 that was explicitly modeled after the *Société asiatique*, co-founded in 1821 by de Sacy who acted as its secretary.¹⁰

Finally, it was also Fleischer who seems to have heavily contributed to the idealization of de Sacy’s image¹¹ as the primary source of methodological inspiration for German Oriental studies, making him one of the most important points of reference for German Orientalists writing about the history of their discipline.¹² However, contrary to Fleischer’s contentions, de Sacy was not the only source of inspiration for the new discipline. It was also heavily influenced by classical philology. Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866), who, thanks to his linguistic and literary genius, remained an acknowledged figure in Oriental studies, had even attained the habilitation in classical philology at the University of Jena in 1811. Fleischer himself had been attending classes of the classical philologist Gottfried Hermann (1784-1848) during his studies in Leipzig. Hermann, in a famous controversy with his colleague August Boekh (1785-1867), who represented the historical-antiquarian philology of objects- or reality-oriented philology (*Real- or Sachphilologie*), was the leader of the critics advocating a methodologically more restricted or controlled approach that is known as the grammatical-critical text philology (*Wortphilologie*).¹³ Fleischer’s strict adherence to de Sacy amounted in some respect

author of the *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, Gustav Flügel (1802-1870), who translated the *Keşf ül-zünun* into Latin and worked on the Quran, Johann Gottfried Ludwig Kosegarten (1792-1860), professor first in Jena, then in Greifswald, the Orientalist Justus Olshausen (1800-1882), later professor in Kiel and Königsberg, the Protestant theologian Eduard Reuß (1804-1882), since 1834 professor of theology in Strasbourg, Karl Friedrich Neumann (1793-1870), from 1832 until his politically motivated suspension in 1852 professor in Munich, the theologian, Orientalist and numismatist Johann Gustav Stickel (1805-1896), 1838 professor in Göttingen and later in Jena, the Orientalist Marcus Joseph Müller (1809-1874), professor in Munich and the Catholic theologian Joseph Franz von Allioli (1793-1873), professor in Landshut and Munich. Cf. Fück, *Studien*, 156-157.

9 Rudi Paret, *Arabistik und Islamkunde an deutschen Universitäten. Deutsche Orientalistik seit Theodor Nöldeke* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1966), 8.

10 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 176-179.

11 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 42 and 66-68. Hartwig Derenbourg (1844-1908), a student of Fleischer (cf. Fück, *Studien*, 250), penned a rather eulogistic description of de Sacy; cf. Hartwig Derenbourg, “Silvestre de Sacy. Une esquisse biographique”, *Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 3 (1887), i-xxviii. See also Fück, *Studien*, 140 and 151. A more critical evaluation of his work and character is given by Schwab, *Oriental Renaissance*, 295-298.

12 One should not, however, underestimate de Sacy’s impact. Rückert wrote in a study guide for prospective students that “one must not learn Arabic with other books than those by de Sacy.” Quoted in Hartmut Bobzin, “Über Friedrich Rückerts arabistischen Nachlaß”, in *Orientalische Philologie und arabische Linguistik*, ed. Wolfgang Reuschel (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1990), 29.

13 Cf. “Böckh-Hermann dispute (CT)”, in *Brill’s New Pauly* (Leiden etc.: Brill, 2006). (Claudia Ungefehr-Kortus).

to an advocacy of *Wortphilologie* over *Realphilologie*.¹⁴ Going one step further, one may draw a parallel between the two schools of *Realphilologie* and *Sachphilologie* and the two schools that dominated Oriental studies in Germany since the 1830s.¹⁵ One is known as the Leipzig school with the accurate philologist Fleischer at its head, the other as the Göttingen school represented by Fleischer's more historically and theologically-inclined colleague Heinrich Ewald (1803-1875).¹⁶ Ewald, to be sure, was also an advocate of philology, but was more open to speculative thinking. Described as politically uncompromising (in 1837 he belonged to the famous "Göttingen Seven", in 1867 he refused to recognize the Prussian annexation of the Kingdom of Hanover by Prussia) and self-opinionated, he nevertheless appears to have been an imposing and inspiring teacher. Interestingly, two of his disciples, who, as accomplished scholars, still recognized their intellectual obligations to their teacher, were subsequently regarded as the most important German Orientalists of the late 19th /early 20th century: Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) and Theodor Nöldeke (1836-1930).¹⁷ Both were clearly more than philologists and their celebrated works reflected the increasing influence of historicism on the intellectual life in Germany.

Conventional wisdom holds that the process of professionalization of the Oriental studies in Germany was a process of emancipation from theology, with the Oriental studies in Paris serving as a model that was much envied by the German Orientalists. They were required to deliver teaching and researching services to the faculties of theology, if not forced to make their living by becoming outright theologians. While there is some truth in this narrative, the whole story seems much more complicated. However ambivalently they may have been felt, the ties between Oriental studies and theology remained close throughout the 19th century, loosening only in its second half and at some universities like Kiel even later. Orientalists continued to recruit their not too many followers among students of theology. For example, when in Leipzig in the summer term of 1836 the two professors of theology finished their lectures before the end of the semester, their students immediately left so that Fleischer's classes too remained deserted. As a consequence he preferred to follow the example of his theologian colleagues.¹⁸ Approximately two thirds of his students were enrolled for theology. Until 1840 Fleischer still had to offer some theological lectures. In 1936 two of his theological classes were attended by between thirty and over hundred students. In his courses on Arabic, the number of students varied between two and eight.¹⁹ Oriental studies were regarded as a kind of academic luxury. As a consequence, the number of Orientalists

14 Cf. Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 92.

15 This is, however, contradicted by Carl Brockelmann, "Die morgenländischen Studien in Deutschland", *ZDMG* 76 (1922), 10.

16 Holger Preißler, "Deutsche Orientalisten und die Öffentlichkeit um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts", in *Akten des 27. Deutschen Orientalistentages (Bonn - 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1998). Norm und Abweichung*, eds. Stefan Wild & Hartmut Schild (Würzburg: Ergon, 2001), 778.

17 Cf. Littmann, *Beitrag*, 2-3; Fück, *Studien*, 167; Holger Preißler, "Die Anfänge der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft", *ZDMG* 145 (1995), 258.

18 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 153-154, see also *ibid.*, 64-64.

19 Preißler, "Deutsche Orientalisten", 778f.

teaching at German universities remained modest. In 1845 they were around twenty.²⁰ In addition employment opportunities for graduates of non-Biblical Oriental studies were rather limited. The colonial field was non-existent in Germany and teachers in Oriental languages were in demand only for academic theological exegesis, while the academic positions available for pure Orientalists remained too few to offer a viable alternative for the planning of an academic career. Not only their students, the Orientalists too remained connected to theology. The application of philological methods did not make for a sharp divide, because the theologians too had begun at a very early date to arm themselves with the methodological finesses provided by de Sacy. It must be remembered that significant numbers of his German disciples were actually theologians. On the other hand, there remained, of course, a significant overlap of research interests, even if in the course of time the Orientalists increasingly distanced themselves from the Christian orthodoxy. A case in point is the famous theologian and later Orientalist Julius Wellhausen. An earlier example is provided by the Orientalist professor in Bonn, Johann Gildemeister (1812-1890). Together with his colleague Heinrich von Sybel (1817-1895), he published in 1844 a study refuting the authenticity of the Holy coat of Trier, a relic conserved in the town's cathedral and considered to contain parts of the seamless robe of Jesus. The small treatise created considerable annoyance among orthodox Catholics so that a relative of his, who had the misfortune to bear the same name as the heretic Orientalist, was mistakingly beaten up in Cologne.²¹ But there are also examples of Orientalists getting on well with Christian orthodoxy, e.g. Gustav Bickell (1838-1906) at the University of Munster who converted to Roman Catholicism and became a priest in 1867, or Jakob Ecker (1851-1912) who taught Arabic in Munster before he became professor for "exegesis of the Old Testament" in Trier.²²

The social process of professionalization and institutional consolidation of an academic discipline also involves the exclusion of amateurs and aficionados. It is on this line that Sabine Mangold has interpreted the controversy between Fleischer (and several other Orientalists) and the famous Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856).²³ While her observations on the consolidation and "philologization" of Oriental studies are basically convincing, it would appear that her argument is somewhat overstretched in the case of the criticism launched against Hammer in the mid-1830s. Hammer-Purgstall, as is well-known, was a graduate of the Oriental academy in Vienna founded by Maria Theresa in 1754. As an institution, the academy served the purpose to provide the know-how required for the diplomatic and economic contacts with the Ottoman Empire. However, Hammer's career within the service of the Hapsburg Empire was not his first interest. Of the huge oeuvre that remains, only his path-breaking *History of the*

²⁰ Preißler, "Deutsche Orientalisten", 778.

²¹ Enno Littmann, *Der deutsche Beitrag zur Wissenschaft vom Orient*, (Stuttgart, Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1942), 6.

²² Peter Heine, *Geschichte der Arabistik und Islamkunde in Münster* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974), 14-15. Heine concludes that in Munster, Oriental studies were closely connected to theology; *ibid.* 17.

²³ Cf. Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 78-91.

*Ottoman Empire*²⁴ has retained some scholarly importance, despite all the justified criticism that has been launched against this magnum opus.²⁵ Already during his lifetime, his work was severely criticized. After a major conflict with the philologist Heinrich Friedrich von Diez (1794-1876) in the second decade of the 19th century, it was especially in 1835 that he came under fierce attack. In this year he published a translation of the *Aṭwāk al-dhahab* by al-Zamakhsharī (1075-1144) as “a new year’s gift” dedicated “to all Orientalists by their fellow the translator.”²⁶ This work appeared seriously flawed in the eyes of the younger generation of Arabists and attracted several critical reactions, e. g. by Heinrich Ewald and Gotthold Weil (1882-1960) and a particularly harsh one by Fleischer, who at the time was a young designated professor in Leipzig. Weil and Fleischer reacted both by presenting their own translations of al-Zamakhsharī’s text. It is true that the criticism added by Fleischer was biting. Nevertheless, Hammer-Purgstall remained an acknowledged personality in the community of the Orientalists. This became clear when Fleischer and his colleagues prepared for the founding of the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft*, and Fleischer himself wrote a letter to Hammer inviting him not only to the inaugural meeting but obviously even clearly hinting that he might be offered the presidency of the association. For personal reasons, Hammer-Purgstall politely declined the invitation, and the conciliatory tone of his answer was in turn acknowledged by his former adversary.²⁷ Moreover, Hammer was on friendly terms with de Sacy, whom he had met in Paris and whose help in restoring the manuscripts removed to Paris after the Napoleonic occupation of Vienna Hammer prompted to be amply remunerated.²⁸ De Sacy, on the other hand, mildly but unmistakably took the side of Weil and Fleischer and criticized Hammer in an article published in the *Journal des Savants* in 1836 where he compared the three German translations of al-Zamakhsharī’s book.²⁹

What Hammer shared with some of the younger generation of contemporary professional Orientalists -but not with all, as we have seen- was the conviction that Oriental studies were a field in their own right and independent from the tutelage of theology. What separated him from them was not so much the fact that he was an aficionado without an academic position -the work of other such “amateurs” like Gustav Flügel or

24 For bibliographical details about this work, different editions and translations cf. Klaus Kreiser, “Osmanisches Reich”, in *Historische Bücherkunde Südosteuropa*, vol. 2, part 1: *Osmanisches Reich, Makedonien, Albanien*, eds. Mathias Bernrath & Karl Nehring (München: Oldenbourg, 1988), 131-133.

25 For a critical appraisal by Klaus Kreiser in the context of his criticism of Shaw’s Ottoman history cf. “Clio’s Poor Relation: Betrachtungen zur osmanischen Historiographie von Hammer-Purgstall bis Stanford Shaw”, in *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683-1789: Entspannung und Austausch*, eds. Gernot Heiss & Grete Klingenstein (Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1983), 24-43.

26 Joseph von Hammer, *Samachshari’s Goldene Halsbänder. Als Neujahrsgeschenk arabisch und deutsch* (Vienna: A. Strauß’s Witwe, 1835). On Zamakhsharī cf. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, vol. 11, “al-Zamakhsharī”, 432-434 (C.H.M. Versteegh) and *ibid.* Supplement vol. 12, 840-841 (W. Madelung).

27 Cf. Preißler, *Anfänge*, 273 n. 102 and Hildegard Solbrig, *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe. “Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug”* (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973), 81.

28 Solbrig, *Hammer-Purgstall*, 282.

29 Quoted in Konstantin Schlotmann, *Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. Ein kritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte neuerer deutscher Wissenschaft* (Zürich: Meyer & Zeller, 1857), 43-44.

Theodor Zenker (1811-1884) is still acclaimed in Fück's synthesis³⁰ - but his philological sloppiness. It was only after Hammer-Purgstall's death that he was finally relegated from the ranks of academic and professional Orientalists. In 1857 the theologian and Orientalist Constantin Schlottmann (1819-1887)³¹ - at that time professor for theology in Zürich - published a lengthy obituary,³² in which he set the tone for the critique of Hammer that can still be found in Johann Fück's influential book on Arabic studies in Europe written in 1955. But although Hammer-Purgstall's philological and methodological shortcomings are severely criticized, his importance within the history of the discipline is recognized. It is worth noting at this point that although the criticism against Hammer was launched in the name of philology, it was in many instances directed against undeniable errors of translation that would have to be criticized regardless of more specific philological concerns.³³

The Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft

On October 2, 1845 the German Association for Oriental Studies was founded under the name of the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* (henceforth: DMG).³⁴ As has been mentioned, it was modeled above all after the *Société Asiatique* in Paris (1821), but the German Orientalists were also aware of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland in London (1823) and the American Oriental Society in Boston (1842). These Orientalist associations formed individual networks but were also interconnected. The statutes of the DMG stipulated explicitly that not only Germans but also foreigners were eligible for membership.³⁵ Despite national overtones, Oriental studies were a highly international affair. Following its models in France, Great Britain and the USA, the DMG published its own periodical as was regulated in article 11 of its statutes. In 1847 the first issue of this periodical was published under the title *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (henceforth: ZDMG). The DMG remained relatively small. In 1845 it comprised 54 members; in 1914 it had 442. Between the years 1845 and 1914, 1,556 persons became members. About 40 % were academics teaching at a university, roughly half of them in Oriental studies or one of its branches.³⁶ Although academic professional Orientalists increasingly dominated the association, the contribution of the aficionados remained considerable. Some of them were at least "semi-professionals" in the sense that they were able to contribute research in the philological paradigm and either had a longtime personal experience of living in the Near East or had been studying Oriental languages at university without, however, being willing or able to pursue academic careers. This can be illustrated in the cases of five members (two of them corresponding members) of the DMG who were

30 Cf. Fück, *Studien*, 147 and 245.

31 On him cf. "Schlottmann, Constantin", in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 31 (1890), 561-567 (C. Siegfried).

32 Schlottmann, *Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall*.

33 Cf. Kreiser's comments on this issue in "Clio's Poor Relation", 25-28.

34 On the DMG cf. Preißler, *Anfänge*, 241-327; Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 176-225.

35 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 179.

36 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 194.

active consuls in the Ottoman Empire: Andreas David Mordtmann, Johann Gottfried Wetzstein, Georg Rosen, Ernst Otto Blau and Johann Heinrich Mordtmann, a son of the first named. All five of them contributed to the ZDMG (among other periodicals) but were not professional academics, although all of them had earned a doctorate in Oriental studies.

David Andreas Mordtmann (1811-1879)³⁷ was born in Hamburg and grew up in financially distressed conditions. For economic reasons, he was not even able to finish his secondary education, thus being a largely self-taught Orientalist when he published a translation of İştakhrî's *Geography*³⁸ in 1845 that earned him an honorary doctorate from the University of Kiel. Aided by his patron Karl Sieveking (1787-1847), he was sent to Constantinople as an employee of the Hanseatic and the Spanish embassies, but soon became Hanseatic chargé d'affaires, until in 1859 the embassy was closed and its function turned over to Prussia. Thereafter, Mordtmann, who had become a protégé of Münif Paşa, was employed as an Ottoman official at the newly founded commercial court until his dismissal by Mahmud Nedim Paşa in 1871. After that, he acted for a short time as the director of the pro-German periodical *Phare du Bosphore* in 1872/73, but in general dedicated himself to his studies, before he accepted a teaching position at the *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* in 1877. He died in Istanbul in 1880. His publications comprised contributions to the themes of geography, epigraphics, Byzantine and Ottoman histories, Pahlavi numismatics, as well as essays on the contemporary politics of the Ottoman Empire. His historical study on the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople was translated into Greek in the following year and reprinted in 1879. An edition with supplementary remarks seems to have been published in 1909.³⁹ Apparently, the popularity of the book in Greece was due more to its author's sympathy for the heroic Byzantine effort to defend their city than to the rendering of an especially negative image of "the Turks." Nevertheless, Mordtmann, although temperate in his style, remained here within the European paradigm that viewed the Turks as Barbarians from Asia who were threatening European culture.⁴⁰ On the other hand, he put the Byzantine Empire into a context of world history, comparing it not only to the Roman Empire in the west, but also to the Abbasid caliphate, thereby attributing the fall of these empires to their common inability to effectively centralize their administrations and to overcome the geopolitical obstacles to the unity of their empires.⁴¹ He also contradicted the historiographical topos of the cultural revival that Europe had experienced through the migra-

37 Cf. Franz Babinger, "Andreas David Mordtmann's Leben und Schriften", in Mordtmann, A.D. d.Ä.: *Anatolien. Skizzen und Reisebriefe aus Kleinasien (1850-1959)*, ed. Franz Babinger (Osnabrück: Biblio, 1972), vii-xxxii.

38 *Das Buch der Länder von Schech Ebu Ishak el Farsi el Isztachri*. Aus dem Arabischen übersetzt von A.D. Mordtmann. Nebst einem Vorworte von Prof. C. Ritter (Hamburg: Rauhes Haus, 1845). On İştakhrî and his *Kitâb al-masâlik wa-l-mamâlik* cf. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. vol. 4, 222-223 (A. Miquel).

39 *Belagerung und Eroberung Konstantinopels durch die Türken im Jahre 1453. Nach den Originalquellen bearbeitet* (Stuttgart - Augsburg: Cotta, 1858). For the Greek editions cf. Babinger, "Mordtmann", xviii-xix; *ibid.* n.1. and Semavi Eyice's remarks in id. "Mordtmann, Andreas David (Baba)", in *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5, 489.

40 Cf. Mordtmann, *Belagerung*, 1, 96.

41 *Ibid.*, 107-108.

tion of Byzantine scholars and the transfer of ancient Greek manuscripts.⁴² His anonymously published collection of essays on the Ottoman Empire between the Crimean war and the war of 1877/78⁴³ is counted as “one of the most important accounts from a European view” of that time.⁴⁴ Mordtmann’s notes of his travels in Anatolia between 1855 and 1859 published in the German periodical *Das Ausland* have been collected and annotated in 1925 by the Ottomanist Franz Babinger (1891-1967) and have been reprinted since.⁴⁵

Prussia sent some Orientalists as consuls to the Near East. But they were in most cases unpaid, thus in the case of Johann Gottfried Wetzstein (1815-1905).⁴⁶ He had been a student of Fleischer and, after his habilitation in 1846, became unsalaried lecturer (*Privatdozent*) at the university in Berlin before he decided -obviously for personal reasons- to apply for the position of a Prussian consul in Damascus, where he lived more than twelve years. Some time after the end of his appointment as consul, he returned to Berlin and took up teaching again as unsalaried lecturer before he dedicated himself to his private studies. As a consul in Damascus, he was involved in various agrarian and speculative businesses, but was commercially more successful as a dealer of Oriental manuscripts.⁴⁷ He published both popular and scholarly articles and became most renowned as a researcher of the geography and ethnology of greater Syria.⁴⁸

Georg Rosen (1821–1891),⁴⁹ the father of the Orientalist and later German foreign minister Friedrich Rosen (1856-1936), studied Oriental languages (Sanskrit, Persian, Armenian, Arabic) with Bopp, Rückert and Heinrich Petermann (1801-1876) in Berlin and with Fleischer in Leipzig. On recommendation of Alexander von Humboldt, he joined an ethnographic-linguistic expedition to the Caucasus and became friends with Friedrich von Bodenstedt (1819-1892) in Tiflis. In 1844 he became dragoman of the Prussian embassy in Constantinople, 1852-1867 he was Prussian consul in Jerusalem, after that consul-general of the North German Confederation (and then of the German Empire) in Belgrade. In 1875 he returned to his native city in Germany and lived as a

42 *Ibid.*, 106-107. This topos was reiterated (and probably introduced into late Ottoman discourse) by Ahmed Midhat; cf. Michael Ursinus, “Klassisches Altertum und Europäisches Mittelalter im Urteil spätosmanischer Geschichtsschreiber”, *Zeitschrift für Türkeistudien* 2 (1989), 76.

43 *Sambul und das moderne Türkentum. Politische, sociale und biographische Bilder. Von einem Osmanen.* 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker, 1877-1878). A Turkish translation is *İstanbul ve Yeni Osmanlılar*, transl. Gertraude Songu-Habermann, preface Erol Üyepazarı (Istanbul: Pera Yayıncılık, 1999).

44 Kreiser, “Osmanisches Reich”, 121, no. 542.

45 Mordtmann, A.D. d.Ä. *Anatolien. Skizzen und Reisebriefe aus Kleinasien (1850-1959)*, ed. Franz Babinger (Osnabrück: Biblio, 1972), vii-xxxi.

46 Ingeborg Huhn, *Der Orientalist Johann Gottfried Wetzstein als preußischer Konsul in Damaskus (1849-1861) dargestellt nach seinen hinterlassenen Papieren* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1989), 36, 48-49 and 328. For a short biographical note cf. Enno Littmann, *Ein Jahrhundert Orientalistik. Lebensbilder aus der Feder von Enno Littmann und Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*, eds. Rudi Paret & Anton Schall (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957), 11-13.

47 Huhn, *Orientalist*, 1-7 and 54-57.

48 A list of his publications in Hans-Jürgen Zobel, “Johann Gottfried Wetzsteins Schrifttum”, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 82 (1966), 233-238.

49 “Rosen, Georg Friedrich Wilhelm (eigentlich Ballhorn)”, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1997), 51-52 (Gregor Pelger). Georg Rosen was also the half-brother of the Sanskritist Friedrich Rosen (1805-1837).

private scholar. Most known among his many works is probably his translation of the Turkish version of the *Tuti name* in 1858, which has been reprinted several times since. He has, however, also written a notable two volume history of the Ottoman Empire from 1826 to 1856,⁵⁰ linguistic studies on the Laz and the Ossetic languages, published translations of Bulgarian folk tales and of the Turkish version of an early 19th century travelogue from Cairo to Sudan.⁵¹

Ernst Otto Blau (1828-1879) studied philosophy, theology and Oriental studies in Halle and Leipzig. In 1852 he entered the Prussian foreign service and was sent first to Constantinople and then on various missions in Anatolia and Persia, before he became consul in Trabzon in 1858. In 1861 he was sent on a mission of economic exploration to Herzegovina and Montenegro, and subsequently became consul of the newly established Prussian consulate in Bosnia-Herzegovina. After having been transferred as consul-general to Odessa in 1878, he committed suicide in 1879.⁵² In 1873 he had sold his rich collection of Oriental coins to the library of the University of Leipzig.⁵³ Besides numismatics and botany,⁵⁴ he wrote about topics ranging from the translation of an Arabic chronicle of the sultans of Bornu⁵⁵ to a study of the tribes in Arabia during the 6th century⁵⁶ and an overview on the contemporary economic geography of Persia.⁵⁷ Concerning the Ottoman Empire, he published two monographs, *Bosnisch-türkische Sprachdenkmäler* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1868, dedicated to Vámbéry) on what today would be a field of contact linguistics and his travelogue *Reisen in Bosnien und der Hertzegovina* (Leipzig: Dietrich Reimer, 1877; reprinted in 2006).

Johann Heinrich Mordtmann (1852-1932),⁵⁸ the youngest son of Andreas Mordtmann, belonged to a significantly younger generation than the men mentioned

50 *Geschichte der Türkei von dem Siege der Reform im Jahre 1826 bis zum Pariser Tractat vom Jahre 1856*. 2 vols. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1866-1867) (Staatengeschichte der neuesten Zeit vols. 11 and 12). Obviously not an Orientalist was the author of an earlier book on the Ottoman reform period used by Rosen, the Prussian jurist and diplomat Friedrich Christoph von Eichmann (1826-1875), who became legation councillor in Constantinople in 1855. On his book F. Eichmann, *Die Reformen des Osmanischen Reiches mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Verhältnisses der Christen des Orients zur türkischen Herrschaft* (Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung, 1858) cf. Kreiser, "Osmanisches Reich", 120-121, no. 540.

51 *Das Buch des Sudan oder Reisen des Scheich Zain el Abidin in Nigritien*. Leipzig: Friedr. Christ. Wilhelm Vogel, 1847. The Ottoman-Turkish translation of the Arab original appeared as Muhammad Ali bin Zeynülabidin, *Tercüme risale-i Sudan* (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ceridet ül-havadis, 1262) [Özege no. 20660].

52 On him cf. "Blau, Ernst Otto", in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 47 (1903), 12-14 (Viktor Hantzsch); Paul Blau, *Leben und Wirken eines Auslandsdeutschen im vorigen Jahrhundert: Erinnerungen an Dr. Otto Blau* (Sächsische Verl.-Ges., 1928) [containing also short appraisals of his scholarly work by other authors and a bibliography of his publications]; Stefan Heidemann & Christoph Mackert, "Staatsbulletins auf Münzen. Numismatische Dokumente aus dem Orient stehen nach 60 Jahren wieder der Forschung zur Verfügung", [*Universität Leipzig* 7 (Dez. 2003)], 40-41.

53 Heidemann & Mackert, "Staatsbulletins", 39-41.

54 Cf. R. Vasner & A. Zograph, "Dr. Otto Blau als Münzforscher", in Blau, *Leben*, 139-145; and K. Maly, "Die Bedeutung Dr. Otto Blaus für die floristische Erforschung Bosniens und der Hertzegovina", in *ibid.*, 146-158.

55 "Chronik der Sultâne von Bornu", *ZDMG* 6 (1852), 305-330.

56 "Arabien im sechsten Jahrhundert. Eine ethnographische Skizze", *ZDMG* 23 (1869), 559-952.

57 *Commercielle Zustände Persiens. Aus den Erfahrungen einer Reise im Sommer 1857* (Berlin: Decker, 1858).

58 Cf. Hans Georg Majer, "Mordtmann, Johann Heinrich", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1997), 93-94 and Franz Babinger, "J.H. Mordtmann zum Gedächtnis", (Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1933).

above. Born in Pera, he spent a significant time of his life in the Ottoman Empire, although he was sent to Germany for education and studied in Bonn, Leipzig (with Fleischer) and Berlin, obtaining his Ph.D. in 1874 with a study on epigraphy. After that he worked as a dragoman, consul and consul-general in Salonica, Constantinople and Izmir. From 1910 he taught classes at the *Dariülfünun* in Istanbul. At the end of the First World War, he had to leave Istanbul and finally came to Berlin, where he taught at the Oriental Institute of the university. He worked on Greek Byzantine and ancient South-Arabian epigraphy but was also a capacity in Ottoman studies, where Hans Georg Majer counts him together with Georg Jacob (1862-1937) and Friedrich von Kraelitz Greifenhorst (1876-1932) as one of the founding fathers of Ottoman diplomatics. Mordtmann contributed to the ZDMG as well as to several other scholarly periodicals and wrote over sixty articles for the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.⁵⁹

The Differentiation of Oriental Languages Studies

The process of consolidation of Oriental studies involved also a development of linguistic specialization, although the number of languages covered by academic Orientalists continued to be amazing. Sometimes the requirements of the universities brought together very different cultures and languages: Karl Friedrich Neumann, who became professor in Munich in 1833, had to teach both the Chinese and Armenian languages.⁶⁰ As Ursula Wokoeck put it: “The object of study was not the Orient, but Oriental languages.”⁶¹ However, after 1850 the general tendency towards specialization in Oriental studies began to gain the upper hand. Johannes Gildemeister (1812-1890), who was a disciple of Wilhelm Freytag in Bonn, is counted among the last to teach both Sanskrit and the Semitic languages.⁶² After 1875 the study of Assyriology became academically established in Germany.⁶³ Around 1900 the chairs of Oriental studies in Germany were differentiated into those for Semitic and those for Indo-European languages.⁶⁴ In 1895 Jean Pierre Adolphe Erman (1854-1937), who held the chair for Egyptology at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University in Berlin, wrote at the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the German association for Oriental Studies, the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft*: “The times have changed since 1845 [...] When the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* was founded there still existed a single field of Oriental studies as such (*eine ‘morgenländische Wissenschaft’ als solche*)

59 A list of his publications in Babinger, “J.H. Mordtmann”, 7-16.

60 “Neumann (bis 1818 Bamberger), Karl Friedrich”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 14 (1985), 147-148 (Harald Dickerhof).

61 Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 116.

62 Fück, *Studien*, 173. For a detailed discussion of the process of differentiation cf. Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 117-145.

63 Cf. Johannes Renger, “Die Altorientalistik als philologische und historische Disziplin an den deutschen Universitäten des 19. Jahrhunderts”, in *Der Orient in akademischer Optik. Beiträge zur Genese einer Wissenschaftsdisziplin*, ed. Ludmila Hanisch (Halle: OWZ Halle, 2006), 43-62 and Suzanne L. Marchand, “Philhellenismus und Furor orientalis”, in *Der Orient in akademischer Optik*, 31-41.

64 Ludmila Hanisch, “Einführung”, in id. ed., *Islamkunde und Islamwissenschaft im Deutschen Kaiserreich. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Carl Heinrich Becker und Martin Hartmann (1900-1918)* (Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1992), 11.

and the same scholars were doing research in fields today appearing to us as thoroughly separated from each other. That has changed; the branches of the Oriental studies have developed into autonomous disciplines and the bond that holds them together is increasingly loosened.”⁶⁵

The problem with Turkish was that it did not truly find its place within the differentiating disciplinary landscape. It remained what it had been before: an additional expertise of Orientalist philologists, studied and researched mostly casually. Almost every notable Orientalist had learned Turkish at some point of his studies and many remained interested in Turkish studies in their later careers, but few chose it as their main field of interest. Even today Turkology and Turkish studies in Germany have remained entangled institutionally within the broad field of Oriental (or Islamic) studies. In addition to this historical development, it is true that there are also reasons on the “object level.” It would be difficult to detach Turkish history from the history of the Ottoman Empire, which belongs into the historical framework of Middle Eastern history. That it is also part of European history is, from a post-historicist perspective, rarely denied anymore but has had no institutional consequences at German universities.

The “philologization” of Oriental studies may have contributed its share to the causes of this negligence, at least it fitted its basic paradigm. Philologization did not only have the implication of precedence of philology over history and geography, or generally over what has been termed the “Islamic realia” (*islamische Realien*). It also implied a substantiation of the hierarchy of the three classic languages and their literatures with Arabic being ranked above Persian and Persian above Turkish in analogy to the general philological precedence of the ancient and “uncorrupted” over the more recent and spoiled text. Friedrich Rückert, for example, while being positive about the structure of the Turkish language, remarked that the Turkish literature was not original and thus to be studied in addition to the Persian and Arabic literatures and that three quarters of the Turkish vocabulary were borrowed from Persian and Arabic.⁶⁶ Rückert repeated only what Hammer-Purgstall had already written in 1818 in his book on Persian poetry that he had dedicated to de Sacy.⁶⁷

On the other hand, research on Turkish and on Turkic languages was undertaken in the framework of the classification as “Ural-Altai Languages” by Orientalists who had other interests in general linguistics, Sanskrit or Chinese. Wilhelm Schott (1802-1889)⁶⁸ was appointed extraordinary professor in Berlin in 1838. He wrote an early work on the

65 Quoted in Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 217.

66 “Das Türkische reiht sich an Arabisch und Persisch an, von welchen beiden es 3/4 seines Wörtevvorraths geborgt hat. Seine Litteratur, obgleich unselbständig, ist doch als Ergänzung der Arabischen und Persischen wichtig und dem Sprachforscher unentbehrlich, zugleich ist sein eigner tatarischer Sprachbau, der das fremde Material wunderbar beherrscht, äußerst anziehend und lehrreich.” Quoted in Bobzin, “Über Friedrich Rückerts arabistischen Nachlaß”, 29; cf. also Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 102.

67 Joseph von Hammer, *Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens mit einer Blüthenlese aus zweyhundert persischen Dichtern* (Wien: Heubner und Volke, 1818), v. Cf. Polaschegg, *Orientalismus*, 221-222.

68 On him cf. Hartmut Walravens, “Einleitung”, in id. ed., *Freilich lag in zu überwindenden Schwierigkeiten ein besonderer Reiz... Briefwechsel der Sprachwissenschaftler Hans Conon von der Gabelentz, Wilhelm Schott und Anton Schiefner, 1834-1874* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 14-16 and id., *Wilhelm Schott (1802-1889). Leben und Wirken des Orientalisten* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001).

Tatar languages (comprising what today is known as Altaic languages)⁶⁹ but is also remembered for having authored the first systematic Chinese Grammar,⁷⁰ Otto Nikolaus von Böhrling (1815-1904), who is today remembered as an Indologist,⁷¹ in 1851 wrote a monumental study on the language of the Yakuts that was reprinted in 1964.⁷² The famous Wilhelm Radloff (1837-1918), who is counted among the founding fathers of Turkology, worked in Russia where, because of the Tsarist imperialist policy in Central Asia, research priorities for Orientalists were different from those in Germany.⁷³

Georg Jacob and his School

The Orientalist Georg Jacob (1862-1937) was credited as the one who established the studies of Turkology in Germany.⁷⁴ Jacob is remembered as an Orientalist with an amazing range of interests.

He set out to study both theology and Oriental studies, but increasingly became attracted by the latter. As a student he moved from Leipzig -where he studied with Fleischer- to Strasbourg, to Berlin and to Erlangen. In Strasbourg he seems to have been permanently influenced by two of his teachers, the Protestant theologian Edouard Reuss (1804-1891) and Theodor Nöldeke. It should be remarked that Reuss had studied under de Sacy in Paris in 1827 and that Nöldeke for some time in the 1860s had exclusively dedicated himself to the study of Turkish, intending to become a Turkologist.⁷⁵

In 1887, he obtained his Ph.D. in Leipzig with a study on the Arab trade with the Baltic sea. In 1892 he completed his habilitation at the University of Greifswald under Wilhelm Ahlwardt (1828-1909), who is remembered for his comprehensive catalogue of Arabic manuscripts in the Royal library of Berlin and his studies of Arabic poetry. After his habilitation, Jacob started to explore early Arabic poetry, too, but was always also interested in the "realia." By and by, this interest became increasingly dominant. Jacob developed a special passion for questions of botany and zoology. In 1895 he

69 Wilhelm Schott, *Versuch über die tatarischen Sprachen* (Berlin: Veit & Comp., 1836).

70 Christina Leibfried, "Die Etablierung der Sinologie an der Universität Leipzig", in *Der Orient in akademischer Optik*, 90 n. 5.

71 "Böhrling, Otto Nikolaus von", in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 2 (1955), 396-397 (Willibald Kirfel).

72 Otto von Böhrling, *Über die Sprache der Jakuten* (The Hague: Mouton, 1964). A rather cursory overview over the state of the art of "Ural-Altaic studies" within the field of linguistics up to 1867 is offered by Theodor Benfey: *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und der orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten* (München: Cotta, 1869) (*Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland. Neuere Zeit* 8), 741-751.

73 For the cooperation of colonialist policies and Oriental studies in 19th century Tsarist Russia cf. Wilhelm Barthold, *Die geographische und historische Erforschung des Orients mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der russischen Arbeiten*, trans. E. Ramberg-Figulla. Mit einem Geleitwort von Martin Hartmann (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1913), 154-203.

74 Fück, *Studien*, 320; Littman, *Ein Jahrhundert*, 100. For the following cf. also C. H. Becker, "Georg Jacob als Orientalist", in *Festschrift Georg Jacob zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag 26. Mai 1932 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Theodor Menzel (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932), 1-8 and Ernst Dammann, "Erinnerungen an Georg Jacob", in *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser (Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg), 113-118.

75 Littman, *Ein Jahrhundert*, 101.

traveled to Constantinople “in order to learn about Turkish popular culture”⁷⁶ and became impressed with the traditional Turkish shadow play. Thereupon, the art of shadow play across all cultures from the Near East to China would become one of Jacob’s favorite topics to which he devoted much time and energy. It seems that this voyage also triggered his interest in Turkish studies. In 1896 he became an unsalaried lecturer in Halle, where at the same time he worked as a librarian for the DMG. In 1901 he was appointed extraordinary professor in Erlangen, later his position was changed to an ordinary professorship. In 1911 he succeeded Georg Hoffmann (1845-1933) at the university in Kiel, where he remained until the end of his life. Jacob, who never married, was accompanied to Kiel by his mother and two sisters who took care of his household. He must have been a highly original and emotionally slightly eccentric personality with unusual views that he sometimes asserted aggressively. His hatred of classical philology and of Greek and Roman classicism has been variously noted. He even penned two small treatises on this subject, one of them revealingly entitled “The Cult of Latin as the Undertaker of German Culture.”⁷⁷ He also despised linguistics as an end in itself and, despite his passion for Arabic poetry, he seems to have held a low opinion of the Arabs’ cultural achievements in general.⁷⁸

Among Jacob’s many interests in the field of Turkish studies were Sufism, the *Bektashiyya*, folk literature, shadow play, Ottoman diplomatics, the Ottoman history of Hungary and the *divans* of the Sultans Mehmed Fatih and Süleyman Kanuni. In 1904 he initiated the famous series “Turkish Library” (*Türkische Bibliothek*).⁷⁹ It is generally agreed that he founded a “school”, although it seems difficult to define its particularities beyond a research emphasis on Turkish and a preference for the “realia” over philology.

One of the foremost contributors to the *Türkische Bibliothek* was Jacob’s disciple and successor in Kiel, Theodor Menzel (1878-1939). Born in Munich, he studied Oriental studies and law intending to pursue a diplomatic career. Having started with Hebrew and Arabic, he began to concentrate more and more on Turkish. In 1905 he wrote his Ph.D. thesis on Mehmed Tevfik’s *İstanbul’da Bir Sene* which was supervised by Jacob when the latter was still in Erlangen. Since 1904 he lived in Odessa, where he was detained during the war and joined the German army after the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. After the war he remained in Odessa and was appointed professor for Turkish at the newly founded archaeological institute there in 1921. Already in 1922, he returned to Germany where he worked with Georg Jacob at the University of Kiel. In 1926 he was proposed a professorship for Turkish literature in Baku. In 1929 he became the successor of Jacob.⁸⁰

His main interests were Turkish literature and folklore, but he also worked on Ottoman history, Sufism and epigraphy. He followed closely the publications on

76 Littmann, *Ein Jahrhundert*, 97.

77 “Der Lateinkult als Totengräber deutscher Kultur”, cf. Dammann, “Erinnerungen”, 114-115.

78 Cf. Littmann, *Ein Jahrhundert*, 104-105.

79 Since vol. 15 the series was edited by Jacob together with Rudolf Tschudi, since vol. 25 Jacob’s successor Theodor Menzel joined the board of editors.

80 Jan Rypka, “In Memoriam Theodor Menzel”, in Theodor Menzel, *Meddâh, Schattentheater und Orta Ojunu*, ed. Ottokar Menzel (Prague: Orientalisches Institut, 1941), ix-x.

Turkish studies in the Soviet Union and in Turkey, which was not common in his time. In 1937, after Menzel had opposed the installation of a second chair for Oriental studies in Kiel, he was pensioned off and the Orientalist institute at the university dissolved.⁸¹

Rudolf Tschudi (1884-1960) had studied classical philology in Basel, Switzerland, but also attended classes of the Orientalist Adam Mez (1869-1917) before he became a student of Georg Jacob in Erlangen. In 1910 he completed his Ph.D. thesis on Lutfi Paşa's *Asafname*.⁸² He subsequently worked at the Colonial Institute in Hamburg as assistant to Carl Heinrich Becker (1876-1933), before moving to Tübingen where he intended a habilitation. In 1914, before finishing it, he became Becker's successor at the Colonial Institute. In 1918 Tschudi returned to Switzerland, first to Zurich where he taught as extraordinary professor, then to Basel. In 1929 he declined the offer of the chair for Oriental studies in Göttingen. Despite his tremendous erudition he seems to have published only a handful of works, due, as Taeschner noted in his obituary, to a painstaking accuracy, which hampered his writing. In 1952 he was chosen an honorary member of the DMG and in 1959 a *Festschrift*, edited by his disciple and successor in Basel, Fritz Meier, was dedicated to him.⁸³

Franz Taeschner (1888-1867) who was nicknamed "sakallı dede" by his younger colleagues in his older age because of his white beard and dignified behavior, wrote his Ph.D. thesis under the direction of Georg Jacob. Through him he became mainly interested in Ottoman and Turkish history, but retained an interest in Arabic studies.⁸⁴ After his habilitation in Munster, he had to wait for thirteen years until, in 1935, he got a position at the same university.⁸⁵ In 1933 he became a member of Hitler's National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP)⁸⁶ and in 1934 published a booklet in which he argued for the compatibility of Roman Catholicism and Nazism.⁸⁷ In Munster Taeschner succeeded Anton Baumstark (1872-1948). The latter had been professor "for the study of the Christian Orient" and had already joined the NSDAP in 1932. Baumstark was, however, pensioned off in 1935 following rumors of his homosexuality.⁸⁸ Taeschner's foremost research fields were the phenomenon of the *futuwwa*, historical regional studies of the Ottoman Empire and the history of Persian and Turkish art, but he published on many other subjects including Arabic literature and Islamic history.

Walther Björkman (1896-1996)⁸⁹ was born in Lübeck as son of a Swedish father and a German mother. He studied in Bonn, Kiel and Munich and obtained his Ph.D.

81 Cf. Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 156-157.

82 *Das Asafname des Lutfi Pascha*. Nach d. Handschr. zu Wien, Dresden u. Konstantinopel zum ersten Male hrsg. u. ins Dt. übertragen von Rudolf Tschudi (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1910) (Türkische Bibliothek 12).

83 Cf. the obituaries by Franz Taeschner, "Rudolf Tschudi (1884-1960)", *ZDMG* 111 (1961), 4-6 and Fritz Meier, "Rudolf Tschudi (1884-1960)", *Der Islam* 38 (1963), 138-141.

84 Hans Joachim Kissling, "Franz Taeschner (1896 [sic] -1967)", *ZDMG* 118 (1968), 7-14.

85 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 87 n. 296.

86 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 36.

87 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 56-60.

88 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 35 and 61.

89 Cf. Lars Johanson, "In memoriam Walther Björkman", *Orientalia Suecana* 45-46 (1996-1997), 5-7.

from the University of Kiel in 1919 with a thesis on Ofen in Ottoman times.⁹⁰ After that he moved to Hamburg, where he taught at the newly founded university. In 1929 he went to Berlin where he worked first at the Seminary for Oriental languages (*Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen*; henceforth SOS) and later in addition at the university. In 1937 he became a member of the NSDAP.⁹¹ After obtaining an extraordinary professorship there in 1942, he was appointed extraordinary professor to the university of Breslau (Wrocław, Poland) in 1944. After the war, he emigrated to Sweden and in 1951, he started to teach Turkish at the university of Uppsala. During the years 1953-1959 he was professor for classical Oriental languages at the University of Ankara, but gave up this position for economic reasons. From 1959 to 1963 he taught again in Uppsala, where he stayed after his retirement. In 1966 he supervised Lars Johanson's dissertation on *Studien zur reichstürkischen Verbalsyntax*. Björkman's interests concentrated on Ottoman literature (he contributed three chapters on Ottoman literature in the manual *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*), Turkish-Swedish relations and themes of Ottoman history, but he published also on Islamic Egypt and Arab contemporary history.

Friedrich Giese (1870-1944)⁹² was not a disciple of Jacob but was induced by him to concentrate on Turkish at some point in his studies. Later they became close friends. He obtained his Ph.D. in 1892 from the University of Greifswald with a thesis supervised by the Arabist Ahlwardt. Giese went to Strasbourg to Nöldeke and from 1899 to 1905 taught at the German school in Constantinople. In 1906 he habilitated in Greifswald. In 1907 he was appointed professor for Turkish at the Seminary for Oriental languages in Berlin. In 1915 he became professor at the *Darülfünun* in Istanbul.⁹³ After his return to Germany he was first appointed extraordinary professor (1920), then ordinarius for Turkish studies in Breslau. In 1936 he retired and moved to his house in Eichwalde near Berlin, where he died in 1944 after suffering a stroke in 1940.

During his time as a teacher in Constantinople, Giese took advantage of the holidays to travel in Anatolia. He also became deeply impressed by the poetry of Mehmed Emin [Yurdakul] and published several translations of his poems. In 1902, enjoying the support of the then *vali* (governor) Avlonyalı Mehmed Ferid Pasha, he collected samples of folk literature and songs from the province of Konya among the Yürüks of Akşehir and among the inmates of the prison in Konya. After the war, he became interested in the history of the early Ottoman period. He carried out extensive research on the early Ottoman chronicles. In 1929 he published an edition of Aşıkpaşazade,⁹⁴ which led to an exchange of polemics with Paul Wittek (1894-1978) and in 1936, Giese came

⁹⁰ *Ofen zur Türkenzeit. Vornehmlich nach türkischen Quellen* (Hamburg: Friederichsen, 1920).

⁹¹ Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 37.

⁹² Cf. G. Jäschke, "Friedrich Giese", *ZDMG* 99 (1945-1949), 7-10.

⁹³ For the mission of German professors to the *Darülfünun* during the First World War cf. Klaus Kreiser, "Im Dienste ist der Fes zu tragen" - Türkische Vorlesungen deutscher Professoren am Istanbuler Dârülfünûn (1915-1918)", in *Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkische Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945*, eds. Christopher Kubasek & Günter Seufert (Würzburg: Ergon, 2008), 21-40.

⁹⁴ *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Āşīkpaşāzāde auf Grund mehrerer neuentdeckter Handschriften von neuem* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1929).

back to the problem of the original text of Aşıkpaşazade⁹⁵ in another monograph, without, however, being able to solve it.

The Emergence of Applied Oriental Studies, Islamic and Turkic Studies

The linguistic differentiation of Oriental studies was a process of specialization within the philological paradigm. Oriental studies boomed in Germany in the years after 1900.⁹⁶ At the same time dissatisfaction was felt about both the exclusion of the contemporary Middle East from the research agenda of Oriental studies and the continued dominance of the philological paradigm. As both criticisms seem interrelated with one another to coincide with the upswing of imperialism in Germany since the mid 1880s, the standard argument has been to view both the emergence of applied Oriental studies and Islamic studies as two sides of the same coin, thus depending on the emergence of German imperialism in the Wilhelminian era. But while there can be no doubt that the institutionalization of applied Oriental studies was connected to political and economical imperialism, the institutionalization of Islamic studies at German universities did not begin until after the First World War.⁹⁷ Since its first colonialist endeavors in 1884/85, the Prussian government seemed more conscious than before that it needed specialists providing know-how for dealing with the Near and Middle East as well as with Africa. First of all, linguistic expertise was required, which led to the foundation of the Seminary for Oriental languages that opened in October 1887 in Berlin.⁹⁸ The driving force behind its foundation was the high-ranking Prussian official Friedrich Althoff, who played a dominant role in the Prussian policy of education from the end of the 19th until the beginning of the 20th century. In public perception, the SOS appeared to be a part of the Berlin University but was, in fact, an independent institute financed in equal parts by Prussia and the German Empire. Its first director was the Orientalist Eduard Sachau (1845-1930) who concurrently held the chair for Oriental languages at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University. The SOS was dedicated solely to practical purposes both in the diplomatic and the economic fields. It drew some inspiration from the French and Austrian academies for Oriental languages, although this was played down subsequently by the nationalist rhetoric prevalent in Wilhelminian Germany. On the other hand, the SOS served as a model for the establishment of the London School of Oriental Studies in 1890.⁹⁹ In the beginning seven languages were offered: Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Chinese, Japanese, Hindustani and Swahili. More African languages were added following the development of German colonialist policy. During the first five years, half of the students attended classes in Ottoman Turkish and Chinese. In contrast

95 *Die verschiedenen Textrezensionen des 'Aşıkpaşazāde bei seinen Nachfolgern und Ausschreibern* (Berlin: Akad. d. Wissenschaften, 1936).

96 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 62.

97 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 261. Cf. also Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 164-184.

98 For the SOS cf. Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 226-250; Hanisch, *Orientalismus*, 40-45 and Larissa Schmid, "Das Berliner Seminar für orientalische Sprachen in der Weimarer Republik" (M.A thesis, FU Berlin, n.d. [2010]).

99 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 235. In 1926 this institution was renamed into *School of Oriental and African Studies*.

to Oriental studies at the universities, the SOS gave high priority to teaching the active usage of languages. Native language speakers were employed as assistant lecturers. High priority was also given to teaching the realia of the linguistic regions, i.e. religion, customs, geography, statistics and recent history. However, the concentration on contemporary practical issues came at a price. The SOS had been as surprised by the outbreak of the Balkan war as the German and Ottoman politicians; consequently the education provided by the institute came under public and parliamentary criticism.¹⁰⁰

Quantitatively speaking, this practical teaching program seemed to pay off. In contrast to the Orientalist departments of the universities, the SOS was attracting a comparatively large number of students. Already in 1887/88 almost 100 of them were enrolled; in 1910/11 they were more than 400. The institute's target group was described by Sachau in a report as "traders, technicians, officials, travelers", who were to be provided not only with practical language skills, but also with practical knowledge useful on the spot but not taught elsewhere. Sachau himself gained considerable influence through his new position. He became a member of the Prussian Academy of Sciences and dean of the faculty of philosophy at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University. As the SOS had a directorial constitution, his position at the institute was very strong. Combined with the fact that the institute was originally designed to be a purely educational establishment without any research commitment, this led to constant conflict with some of the institute's more ambitious teachers.

Apart from the SOS, the second institute in Germany representing applied Oriental studies was the Colonial Institute (*Kolonialinstitut*) founded in Hamburg in 1908.¹⁰¹ As its name suggests, it was established in support of the policy of Wilhelminian colonialism. Carl Heinrich Becker was offered the newly established chair for "history and civilization in Islam", but left in 1913, accepting a chair at the University of Bonn instead. Initial hopes that the institute would form the nucleus of a university in Hamburg were eventually fulfilled with the foundation of the university in 1919. The Colonial Institute was integrated into it. In 1910 its periodical, *Der Islam*, was founded and still continues.

During the First World War, Orientalists of the SOS were involved in war propaganda and secret warfare. The most famous case is doubtlessly the "Holy War made in Germany" as Snouck Hurgronje sarcastically described the Ottoman declaration of jihad in cooperation with its German ally.¹⁰² The German Middle East war policies were masterminded by the wealthy diplomat and amateur Orientalist Max von Oppenheim (1860-1946). He initiated the creation of an informal bureau in the German Foreign Office that was called *Nachrichtenstelle für den Orient*. Its aim was to stir up unrest among the Muslims of the Entente's colonial empires. Until 1915 it was headed by Oppenheim himself, then by Karl Emil Schabinger von Schowingen (1877-1967) and since 1916 by Eugen Mittwoch (1876-1942). Orientalists who were affiliated to this bureau included Martin Hartmann (1851-1918), Rudolf Tschudi and Georg

100 Hanisch, *Orientalismus*, 45.

101 Cf. Veit Raßhofer, "Das Hamburger Kolonialinstitut", in *Vom Kolonialinstitut zum Asien-Afrika-Institut. 100 Jahre Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften in Hamburg*, ed. Ludwig Paul (Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2008), 13-30.

102 Cf. Gottfried Hagen, "German Heralds of Holy War: Orientalists and Applied Oriental Studies", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24.2 (2004), 145-162.

Kampffmeyer (1864-1936). The results obtained by the activities of the bureau failed to live up to the expectations. The case of the impostor Max Roloff may be considered emblematic of the failure of the *Nachrichtenstelle*'s missions. Roloff obtained 200,000 gold mark from the bureau for the promise to propagate the German cause during the month of pilgrimage in Mecca, but instead retired to a village in Germany, from where he sent fantastic reports about his adventures and successes to German newspapers.¹⁰³

Martin Hartmann was a controversial figure in Oriental studies. He is remembered as the first German Orientalist, who has put continuous effort into the research of the contemporary Islamic World.¹⁰⁴ Of Mennonite-Protestant origin, he studied theology in Breslau and Oriental studies in Leipzig, where he became a disciple of Fleischer. In his influential "compassionate but highly critical obituary",¹⁰⁵ Carl Heinrich Becker described him as "a wild shoot from the tidy and trimmed French garden of Fleischer's school."¹⁰⁶ Having spent some years in Syria, Hartmann accepted a teaching position at the SOS in 1887, where he remained for the rest of his professional life. Up to the mid 1890s he had a strong research interest in metric problems of poetry, but in later years his fields of interests shifted almost exclusively to modern Islam in Central Asia, in Russia, China and Africa, the so-called "Arab Question" and finally Young Turk politics and literature.¹⁰⁷ He is generally acknowledged for having been the first German Orientalist who consciously, methodically and persistently advocated the study of contemporary Islam. Although his endeavors have been described as having resulted in failure,¹⁰⁸ he has attracted quite an amount of recent scholarly interest.¹⁰⁹ Ideologically, he became a socialist, social evolutionist and materialist. While Hartmann was widely accepted as being thoroughly knowledgeable -e.g. over many years he corresponded with Ignaz Goldziher, Carl Heinrich Becker and others- his aggressively opinionated style of writing was regarded as repulsive. As Becker aptly remarked, he tended to write his scholarly works in the style of political editorials, caring little -despite his preoccupation with sociology- for consistency of thought. In spite of having been an ardent supporter of the almost non-existent Arab nationalism and a "passionate Turk-hater" before 1914, Hartmann changed his attitude towards the Turks rapidly when Germany and the Ottoman Empire went together to war as allies. "Hartmann's present enthusiasm for Muslim prayer and the Turks is as distasteful to me as was his previous slander of them", wrote Snouck Hurgronje.¹¹⁰ Carl Heinrich Becker, himself deeply

103 Cf. Donald McCale, *War by Revolution. Germany and Great Britain in the Middle East in the Era of World War I* (Kent, Ohio: Kent Univ. Press, 1998), 62 and Peter Heine, "C. Snouck Hurgronje versus C. H. Becker. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der angewandten Orientalistik", *Welt des Islams* 23/24 (1984), 384.

104 Ulrich Haarmann, "Die islamische Moderne bei den deutschen Orientalisten", in *Araber und Deutsche. Begegnungen in einem Jahrtausend*, eds. Friedrich H. Kochwasser & Hans R. Roemer (Tübingen - Basel: Horst Erdmann, 1974), 59.

105 Martin Kramer, "Arabistik and Arabism: The Passions of Martin Hartmann", *Middle Eastern Studies* 25.3 (July 1989), 298 n.1.

106 Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. 2, 481.

107 *Ibid.*, 485.

108 Cf. Ulrich Haarmann, "Islamische Moderne", 59 and the obituary of M. Hartmann by C. H. Becker reprinted in *id. Islamstudien*, vol. 2, 481-490.

109 Cf. the titles given in the bibliographical appendix to this article.

110 Quoted after Kramer, "Arabistik", 297.

involved in German national politics, was more forgiving when he called this conversion of Hartmann's a turning "from a Saul into a Paul."¹¹¹

While he was not directly involved in the Nachrichtenstelle,¹¹² Carl Heinrich Becker defended the jihad policy of the Foreign Office against the attacks of the Dutch Orientalist Hurgronje.¹¹³ Becker was the son of a wealthy merchant. He had been a Ph.D. student of the Assyriologist Carl Bezold (1859-1922) in Heidelberg, where he habilitated in the field of Semitic philology in 1902. It was there that he met with Ernst Troeltsch, Wilhelm Windelband and Max Weber.¹¹⁴ In 1899, he went for travel to the Middle East and spent some years in Berlin, where he met Martin Hartmann. Although he disagreed with Hartmann on many issues, he acknowledged his influence.¹¹⁵ After having held the chair at the Colonial Institute in Hamburg (1908-1913), he moved to the University of Bonn. In 1916 he accepted a position in the Prussian Ministry of Cultural Affairs and dedicated himself to politics but never became a member of any political party. In 1921 and from 1925 to 1930, he was minister of science, art and public education. From 1930 until his death in 1933, he was professor at the University of Berlin. In his publications he covered a considerable range of topics, including the economic history of early Islamic Egypt, Islam in Africa as well as the emergence of modern Turkey. He also authored wartime articles e.g. on the Caliphate and the Turkish idea of the state.¹¹⁶ Some of his writings related directly to colonial issues, e.g. his analysis of the question whether Islam posed a potential risk for the German colonies in Africa. In what may be called the "traditional view" of Oriental studies, Becker and (to a lesser degree Hartmann) have been set at the beginning of Islamic studies in Germany.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, Becker created his own invented tradition of Islamic studies by relating it to Theodor Nöldeke, Julius Wellhausen, Ignaz Goldziher and Snouck Hurgronje.¹¹⁸

It has been doubted whether the core of Becker's theoretical concept, his revision of Troeltsch, which included Islam into the Western world by tying both to the ancient Greek heritage,¹¹⁹ has been very influential in the emerging field of Islamic studies.¹²⁰ His influence on Islamic studies was of a rather institutional nature, based on his found-

111 Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. 2, 488.

112 Hagen, "German Heralds", 154.

113 Heine, "C. Snouck Hurgronje versus C. H. Becker."

114 Cf. Josef van Ess, "From Wellhausen to Becker: The Emergence of *Kulturgeschichte* in Islamic Studies", in *Islamic Studies: A Tradition and its Problems*, ed. Malcolm H. Kerr (Malibu, CA: Undena Publications, 1980), 33-34.

115 Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. 2, 484-485.

116 Reprinted in his *Islamstudien*, 2 vols.

117 Cf. Littmann, *Beitrag*, 9; Fück, *Studien*, 269-273, 318-319; Paret, *Arabistik*, 16.

118 Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 260 n. 1383. Cf. also Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. 2, 484. Goldziher and Hurgronje are accepted in this function also by Haarmann, "Islamische Moderne", 57.

119 "Without Alexander the Great no Islamic civilization", was Becker's provocative formulation to underline his belief in the essential importance of Hellenism for the emergence of classic Islamic culture. Cf. the analysis in van Ess, "Wellhausen to Becker", 45-48 and Alexander Haridi, *Das Paradigma der islamischen Zivilisation' - oder die Begründung der deutschen Islamwissenschaft durch Carl Heinrich Becker (1876-1933). Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2005).

120 Cf. Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 261; Wokoek, *German Orientalism*, 170-177; Haridi, *Paradigma*, 179. On the other hand, at least Tschudi always agreed with Becker's concept of the continuity of classical antiquity in Islam; Meier, "Rudolf Tschudi", 139.

ing of the periodical *Der Islam* and his activity as minister of science, art and public education.¹²¹

In 1912, an association for the study of Islam, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Islamkunde* was founded. Its president was Martin Hartmann and its vice president Georg Kampffmeyer. Eugen Mittwoch also played a leading role. All three were members of the SOS. The association also created its own periodical, *Die Welt des Islams* that is now published with a new series that begun after World War Two and still continues. It may be assumed that one important reason for the foundation of the association and its periodical was that the three founding fathers wanted to create to a forum that would give them greater scholarly independence from the SOS and its disliked director Sachau.¹²² Programmatically, the new association advocated the study of Islam as the cultural bond connecting the entire Islamic world and intended to put an emphasis on modern Islamic studies.

After the First World War, economic crisis, international isolation and the loss of the German colonies led to a decline of the SOS and to a fierce discussion about its new identity.¹²³ With thirty German consulates closed down in the region of the former Ottoman Empire and the abolishment of the dragoman career path after the war, the German Foreign Office lost interest in the SOS.¹²⁴ African languages vanished for the most part from the teaching program of the SOS and were replaced by European languages. Arabic, Persian and Turkish continued to be taught,¹²⁵ but after 1918 the once tremendous upswing of interest for Turkish in Germany caused by the Ottoman-German war alliance¹²⁶ dwindled rapidly. This had consequences at other universities, too. In Gießen, Freiburg, Halle and Leipzig the Turkish native language lecturers were either dismissed or their contracts were not renewed.¹²⁷

Since 1920, following the retirement of Sachau, Eugen Mittwoch had been director of the SOS, until he was removed by the Nazis in 1935 because of his Jewish origins. At German universities, Oriental studies with an explicit emphasis on Turkish studies were existent only in Kiel and Breslau. At the SOS, on the other hand, Turkish studies always had a stronghold. In 1890 Karl Foy (1856-1907)¹²⁸ was appointed as lecturer for Turkish. Born in Ludwigslust in Mecklenburg-Schwerin as son of a tailor, Karl Arthur Philipp Heinrich Foy had an early enthusiasm for Greek and the Greeks. He chose Leipzig for his studies because of the “highly interesting colony of Greeks” living in that town and studied with the classical philologist Georg Curtius (1820-1885). A revised and enlarged version of his Ph.D. thesis on the phonetic system of Vulgar Greek

121 Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 171.

122 Peter Heine, “Die deutsche Gesellschaft für Islamkunde”, in *Islamstudien ohne Ende. Festschrift für Werner Ende zum 65. Geburtstag* (Würzburg: Ergon in Komm. 2002), 176-177.

123 Schmid, “Das Berliner Seminar”, 64-93.

124 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 91.

125 Schmid, “Das Berliner Seminar”, 95.

126 Cf. Klaus Kreiser, “Halbmond im letzten Viertel und die Konjunktur des Türkisch-Lernens während des Weltkriegs (1914-1918)”, in *Germano-Turcica*, ed. id., 93-99.

127 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 91-92.

128 Martin Hartmann, “Dem Andenken Karl Foys”, *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 10 (1907), 299-305.

was published in 1879 and became a basic work in the field. On completion of his studies he went to Constantinople to work as the tutor of the children of the influential banker and landowner Ulysses Negroponte (1832-1914). After the family emigrated to Paris, Foy became tutor of a Greek family that had moved from Egypt to Constantinople and from there to Salonika. For a time he lived in Athens, but later returned to Germany. While in Istanbul, Foy learned Albanian and Turkish. He published in Greek on Greek and Albanian linguistics in two Greek periodicals of Constantinople, on Turkish dialects and on Ottoman and Azeri Turkish. He also worked on the earliest Turkish "Transkriptionstexte" in gothic letters. Before choosing the career of a scholar and teacher at the SOS, he apparently considered becoming a writer. In 1888 he had published a volume of poetry.¹²⁹

After the early death of Karl Foy in 1907, Friedrich Giese was appointed professor for Turkish, a position he held until he left to participate in the war in 1914. His lectures were temporarily held by Martin Hartmann, until he was succeeded by Wilhelm Bolland (1866-1942) from 1916 to 1931.

On the other hand, scholars who were employed at the SOS for teaching in different fields were also interested in Turkish studies, like Martin Hartmann; others were specialists rather for Turkish than for Arabic, like Walther Björkman and the famous Ottomanist Franz Babinger, who were both professors of Arabic from 1929 to 1945 and from 1920 to 1934 respectively.

Willy Bang-Kaup and the Berlin School of Linguistic Turkology

Contrary to Tsarist Russia in the 19th century, research on Turkic languages had a low priority in Germany, where the emergence of specialized linguistic Turkic studies was a phenomenon that combined in its origins both the imperialist archaeology of the late Wilhelminian Empire and the so-called "re-academization" of Oriental studies after the German defeat in the First World War.

From 1902 to 1914, four archaeological Turfan expeditions led by Albert Grünwedel (1856-1935) and Albert von Le Coq (1860-1930) were organized by the German authorities. These expeditions -perfect examples of imperialist archaeology- brought a huge amount of archaeological treasures, among them ca. 30,000 fragments of manuscripts and woodblock prints in more than twenty different languages (ca. 8,000 in Turkic languages) and alphabets dating from about 400 to 1400 to Berlin.¹³⁰

Friedrich W. K. Müller (1863-1930),¹³¹ assistant director of the Ethnological Museum since 1896 and its director since 1907, Albert von Le Coq, Karl Foy, Wilhelm Thomsen (1842-1927), Willy Bang-Kaup (1869-1934) and Raşid Rahmeti Arat (1900-1964) were among the first generation of scholars who worked on this material, making

129 *Lieder vom Goldenen Horn* (Leipzig: Liebeskind 1888).

130 Sajora Khassankhanova, "Zur Geschichte der Berliner Turkologie in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts. Die Erschließung der alttürkischen Turfan-Texte. W. Bang-Kaup und seine sprachwissenschaftliche Schule", (PhD diss., Humboldt University Berlin, 1979), 2-3. For the context of this enterprise cf. Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 416-426.

131 On him cf. *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, "Mueller, Friedrich W. K.", (Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst) = <http://www.iranica.com/articles/mueller-friedrich-w-k> (June 3, 2010).

significant contributions to Iranian and Turkic studies. In 1927 systematic research on the Turfan texts was transferred to the Prussian Academy of Sciences. It was the only major research project of Oriental studies that was initiated during the Weimar Republic (1919-1933).¹³²

Johann Wilhelm Max Julius (known as “Willy”) Bang-Kaup became the founder of the so-called Berlin school of linguistic Turkology. Born in Wesel, Germany he studied Oriental studies with Charles-Joseph de Harlez de Deulin (1832-1899) at the University of Leuven, Belgium. He was, however, employed first as an extraordinary, later as ordinary professor for Germanic philology at the same university and taught both English and German literature. Within a few years he became an outstanding scholar in his new field, but retained his old interest in Oriental studies.¹³³ When the First World War broke out, he left Leuven for Germany and also returned to Oriental, especially Turkic studies. In 1917 he became professor for Turkish in Frankfurt and from 1918, he was attached to the Turkological department at the newly established Hungarian Institute of the University of Berlin. Among his disciples were Raşid Rahmeti Arat, Tahsin Banguoğlu (1904-1989), Saadetin Buluç (1913-1984), Saadet Çagatay (1907-1989), Annemarie von Gabain (1901-1993), Karl Heinrich Menges (1908-1999), Gunnar Jarring (1907-2002), Matti Räsänen (1893-1976), Jakub Schinkewitsch/Szynkiewicz (1884-1966) and Ananiasz Zajczkowski (1903-1970).¹³⁴

Raşid Rahmeti Arat was the favorite disciple of Bang-Kaup.¹³⁵ When the Nazis came to power in Germany in 1933, he moved to Turkey where he became professor for Old Turkic philology at the University of Istanbul. Another Tatar disciple of Bang was the daughter of Ayaz İshaki, Saadet Çagatay. She completed her Ph.D. thesis under Bang’s supervision in 1933, before she, too, moved to Turkey, where she held the chair for Turkology at the *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi* of the University of Ankara.

Among the most brilliant students of Bang-Kaup was Karl Heinrich Menges, who became a noted scholar in both Slavic and Turkic studies as well as in several other linguistic fields. After the death of Bang in 1934, while his chair remained vacant, Menges continued to teach classes in Turkic studies at the Hungarian Institute together with Annemarie von Gabain. Among Menges’ students in these days was Bertold Spuler (1911-1990). There was some expectation that Menges would become the successor of Bang-Kaup; obviously the latter himself had nourished this idea.¹³⁶ But in 1936 Menges left Nazi Germany for political reasons, turning first to Prague, then -with the help of Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu who was the Turkish ambassador in Czechoslovakia- to Ankara, where he was allowed to work as a university teacher of Russian. In 1940

¹³² Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 91.

¹³³ Cf. Alois van Tanagerloo, “Willi Bang (1869-1934). Die Löwener Tage”, *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den Deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser (Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg), 79-86.

¹³⁴ Cf. Peter Zieme, “Die Erforschung der alttürkischen Turfan-Texte im Rahmen der Turkologie”, in *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den Deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser (Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg), 91 and Khassankhanova, “Zur Geschichte”, 93-113.

¹³⁵ Khassankhanova, “Zur Geschichte”, 104.

¹³⁶ Knüppel, *Schriftenverzeichnis*, 16-18.

Menges managed to leave Turkey. He wrote about the highly ideological politics of science in Turkey during the 1930s in a somewhat convoluted sentence:

I accepted this appointment [to the Columbia University (C.H.)] gratefully, as it offered me the opportunity to get away from this country [Turkey (C.H.)] that in its official sympathies increasingly took the side of the Nazi regime and was completely sterile for Slavic and Turkic studies - which sounds highly paradoxical, but for anybody who has known the situation of Turkology in Turkey, i.e. of what was labeled there as Turkology, is immediately intelligible.¹³⁷

In the United States, he taught at Columbia University until his retirement in 1976, when he moved to Vienna, where he acted as a visiting professor until the end of his life. The list of his amazing oeuvre contains over 700 titles.¹³⁸

The most celebrated disciple and successor of Bang-Kaup, however, became Annemarie von Gabain, to whom her own disciples attached the honorary nickname "Maryam Apa." In 1934 Afet İnan, who had attended a public lecture of Gabain in Berlin, invited her to Ankara, where she taught Sinology at the University of Ankara from 1935 until 1937. In 1937 Gabain returned to Berlin, where she habilitated in 1939 with her famous Old Turkic Grammar (*Alttürkische Grammatik*).¹³⁹ In December of the same year, she became a member of Hitler's National Socialist German Workers Party.¹⁴⁰ After the Second World War she began teaching at the University of Hamburg, but simultaneously continued working on the Turfan corpus of texts in East Berlin.

Turkish Studies in Vienna

The situation of Turkish studies in Vienna¹⁴¹ was different from the rest of the German lands in that Turkish studies were almost continuously represented. In the Hapsburg capital,¹⁴² a natural political interest in the Turkish language led to early attempts to institutionalize its learning. From 1674 to 1677 Johann Baptist Podestà taught Turkish, Arabic and Persian at the university in Vienna. It was also in Vienna that his former teacher Franz de Mesgnien Meninski (1623-1698), who originated from the Lorraine, printed his famous *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae* (1687) that was reprinted in 2000 in Istanbul.¹⁴³ In Vienna a second edition appeared in 1780. It was in 1754 that Maria Theresa founded the Oriental Academy

137 Knüppel, *Schriftenverzeichnis*, 26.

138 Knüppel, *Schriftenverzeichnis*, 49-140.

139 Jens Peter Laut, "Annemarie von Gabain, 1901-1993", *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 52 (1995), 368.

140 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 39

141 Cf. Anton Cornelius Schaendlinger, "Die Turkologie und Iranistik in Österreich", *Bustan* 4/5 (1963-1964), 8-11; Ernst Dieter Petritsch, "Die Wiener Turkologie vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert", in *Germano-Turcica*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, 25-39; Füick, *Studien*, 254-260; Wolfdieter Bihl: *Orientalistik an der Universität Wien. Forschungen zwischen Maghreb und Ost- und Südasien* (Vienna etc.: Böhlau, 2009).

142 It should be noted that important traditions of Oriental studies developed at the Hapsburg universities of Prague and Pest (where Vámbéry taught) the discussion of which is, however, beyond the scope of the present study. On Vámbéry cf. Klaus Kreiser, "Hermann Bamberger und die Turkologie", in id. *Türkische Studien in Europa* (Istanbul: Isis, 1998), 111-119.

143 Together with an introduction by Mehmet Ölmez who initiated this reprint project, and an essay on Meninski's life, works and some introductory words on his *Thesaurus* by Stanisław Stachowski who also contributed an index of the Turkish words in the *Thesaurus*.

(*k.k. Orientalische Akademie*) that was not attached to the University of Vienna. In many ways it did not markedly differ in its practical purposes from the SOS over hundred years later.¹⁴⁴ The fact that it restricted access to students of the Roman Catholic creed and required them to pass an examination on the Catholic faith and in Austrian history reflected the political expediency of the institution. Ideological loyalty was considered important. The practical dimension of the Academy was reflected in the predominance it gave to Turkish and French over Arabic and Persian. The first two languages were taught for six years, Arabic for three and Persian for one year. In addition, Italian and Modern Greek were also taught. Even drawing and calligraphy were included into the curriculum.¹⁴⁵ Among the Oriental Academy's many graduates, the most famous was doubtlessly Hammer-Purgstall, who did not, however, achieve much in his career as a diplomat. On the other hand, a famous Austrian diplomat, Anton Prokesch von Osten (1795-1876),¹⁴⁶ who was made an honorary member of the DMG in 1847, had never received a training in Oriental languages. Among his contributions to Oriental (and Turkish) studies was an early work on Egypt (1831), a detailed study of the Greek war of independence¹⁴⁷ and several volumes of personal reminiscences of his time in the Ottoman Empire, including his travels in Egypt, Syria and Anatolia. He seems to have been especially impressed by Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Paşa, to whom he dedicated a study that was printed shortly before his death in 1876.¹⁴⁸ An Austrian diplomat cum Orientalist who belonged to a younger generation than Prokesch was Alfred von Kremer (1828-1889),¹⁴⁹ the author of the celebrated *Kulturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen* (2 vols. 1875-1877), who had studied law at the university and Oriental studies at the Oriental Academy in Vienna. Another Austrian diplomat of Kremer's generation was Freiherr Ottokar Maria Schlechta von Wssehrd (1825-1897).¹⁵⁰ Schlechta graduated from the Oriental Academy in 1847 and wrote several books on contemporary Ottoman history and Persian literature. He was a regular member of the DMG and also contributed several articles to its periodical.

The first scholar of the new Orientalist tradition who taught at the University of Vienna was August Pfizmaier (1808-1887),¹⁵¹ who later became famous as a Sinologist and Japanologist. From 1844-1848 he held classes in Turkish, Arabic, Persian and

144 Kreiser, *Türkische Studien*, 88.

145 Cf. *Ibid.* and *Germano-Turcica. Zur Geschichte des Türkisch-Lernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser (Bamberg: Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg, 1987), 130-131.

146 Daniel Bertsch, *Anton Prokesch von Osten (1795 - 1876). Ein Diplomat Österreichs in Athen und an der Hohen Pforte. Beiträge zur Wahrnehmung des Orients im Europa des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005).

147 *Geschichte des Abfalls der Griechen vom Türkischen Reiche im Jahre 1821 und der Gründung des Hellenischen Königreiches aus diplomatischem Standpunkte*. 6 vols. (Vienna: In Commission bei Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1867).

148 Mehmed Ali. *Vizekönig von Ägypten, aus meinem Tagebuch 1826-1841* (Wien: Braumüller, 1877). The book was printed already in September, 1876 shortly before Prokesch's death; cf. Pertsch: *Prokesch von Osten*, 187.

149 On him Fück, *Studien*, 187-189 and "Kremer, Alfred Freiherr von (österreichischer Adel 1855, Freiherr 1882)", in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 13 (1982), 5-6 (Hans L. Gottschalk).

150 "Schlechta von Wssehrd (Wssehrd) (Šlechta ze Všeherd) Ottokar Maria Frh", in *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950*, vol. 10, 175 (E. Petritsch).

151 For lit. on him cf. Bihl, *Orientalistik*, 16-17, n. 17.

Chinese. In 1839 he published an inspired translation of poems by Lâmicî¹⁵² and in 1847 authored a quite comprehensive Turkish grammar book.¹⁵³ In 1848 he became a founding member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna initiated by Hammer-Purgstall. Consequently Pfizmaier concentrated on the research of East Asian languages and discontinued teaching at the university. While the Oriental academy as *k.k. Konsular Akademie* continued its work, from 1851 lectures on Arabic, Persian and Turkish were held at the *k.k. Polytechnicum* in Vienna. In 1873 a public educational institute for the practical teaching of contemporary Oriental languages was founded,¹⁵⁴ and remained until 1948.¹⁵⁵ That the teaching of the three Middle Eastern languages was well established outside the university may have contributed to the fact that the University of Vienna made no continuous arrangement for the three Middle Eastern languages until late in the 19th century, while already in 1855, Anton Boller (1811-1869) had been appointed ordinary professor for Sanskrit and comparative linguistics. His successor became the linguist Friedrich Müller (1834-1898) in 1869.¹⁵⁶ After Pfizmaier, Jakob Goldenthal (1815-1868) was appointed extraordinary professor for Oriental languages and cultures in 1849. He was a specialist in Hebrew, but also taught Turkish and in 1865 authored a textbook on the Turkish language.¹⁵⁷ Walter Friedrich Adolf Behrnauer (1827-1890), a disciple of Fleischer from Saxony, who held a position at the Imperial library, the *k.k. Hofbibliothek*, from 1852 to 1861 became unsalaried lecturer for the Turkish language and literature in 1857. From 1858 until 1861 he taught among other things Ottoman palaeography and diplomatics.¹⁵⁸ Behrnauer's main interest was in the field of Ottoman studies. Among his translations from Ottoman into German is also the famous *Kocu Beg risalesi*.¹⁵⁹ From 1869 to 1875, when he accepted a chair at the University of Berlin, Eduard Sachau, disciple of Nöldeke and Fleischer, was extraordinary, then, from 1872 onwards, ordinary professor for Semitic languages in Vienna.¹⁶⁰

As late as in 1884, Joseph Karabaček (1845-1918)¹⁶¹ became ordinary professor "for the history of the Orient and her auxiliary sciences." Besides a wide range of topics of early Islamic history and culture, he also held classes on Ottoman history.¹⁶² The German Orientalist C. H. Becker in his obituary called him somewhat maliciously "the courtier among the German Orientalists", and added highly critical remarks on his per-

152 Cf. Klaus Kreiser: 'Ihr Karlsbader Orientalist erregt Erstaunen...' August Pfizmaiers turkologische Anfänge", in id., *Türkische Studien in Europa*, 95-104.

153 *Grammaire turque. Ou développement séparé et méthodique des trois genres de style usités, savoir l'arabe, le persan et le tartare* (Vienna: Impr. Roy. de Cour et d'État, 1847). Cf. also Kreiser, "Karlsbader Orientalist", 101-102.

154 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 23-24.

155 Kerstin Tomenendal, *Das türkische Gesicht Wiens* (Wien: Böhlau, 2000), 66.

156 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 19-25.

157 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 22-24.

158 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 24-25.

159 W.F.A. Behrnauer, "Koçibeg's Abhandlung über den Verfall des osmanischen Staatsgebäudes seit Sultan Suleiman dem Grossen", *ZDMG* 15 (1861), 272-332.

160 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 41-42. On Sachau cf. Fück, *Studien*, 234-236.

161 "Karabaček, Joseph Ritter von (österreichischer Adel 1904)", in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 11 (1977), 140 (Hans L. Gottschalk).

162 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 36-40.

sonality and scholarly achievements, describing him as a personality belonging to the 16th or 17th century.¹⁶³ In 1885 David Heinrich von Müller (1846-1912), a disciple of Sachau in Vienna, became ordinarius for Semitic languages. In 1886 Karabaček, von Müller, the Egyptologist Simon Leo Reinisch (1832-1919) and the Sanskritist Georg Bühler (1837-1898) approached the Austrian Ministry of Education with the proposal for the foundation of an Orientalist institute within the university, which was granted. In the following year 1887, the institute founded its own periodical, the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*.¹⁶⁴

Maximilian Bittner (1869-1918)¹⁶⁵ was a student of the Orientalist Institute in Vienna. Bittner possessed a tremendous aptitude for languages and, in 1901, became extraordinary and in 1906 ordinary professor there. Bittner published extensively on a broad range of Middle Eastern subjects including Arabic, Persian and Turkish, but his most important contribution was on the Semitic Mahra languages in which he continued the Austrian research tradition on South Arabia of Eduard Glaser (1855-1908) and David Heinrich von Müller.

Friedrich Kraelitz Edler von Greifenhorst (1876-1932), born in Vienna into a family of Austrian army officers, became a student of von Müller, Karabaček and Bittner. He received his doctoral degree in 1904 and was then employed at the Imperial library in Vienna, until becoming extraordinary professor at the Orientalist institute of the university in 1917. In 1924 he was appointed ordinarius for the “language, literature and history of the Turkish-Tatar peoples.”¹⁶⁶ Since 1920 he was a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. He worked on Turkish and Armenian philology, Ottoman diplomatics and history. His work on Ottoman diplomatics was path-breaking in his time and his translation of the Ottoman constitution of 1876, together with accompanying documents, is still usable.¹⁶⁷ In his classes he taught not only the Ottoman Turkish but also the Persian, Armenian and Mongolian languages and philologies.¹⁶⁸ Together with his disciple Paul Wittek, he founded the first European periodical of Ottoman historical studies *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, of which, unfortunately, only two volumes appeared.¹⁶⁹ When Kraelitz died, he had published only a part of his works, the larger portion of which remained in his posthumous papers.¹⁷⁰ Paul

163 C. H. Becker, *Islamstudien* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1932), vol. 2, 491-498, here 491; see also, Fück, *Studien*, 254-255.

164 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 47-48 and 55.

165 “Bittner, Max”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 2 (1955), 282 (Fritz Rudolf Kraus); Biehl, *Orientalistik*, 60-66; Fück, *Studien*, 260.

166 Cf. Biel, *Orientalistik*, 95-96 and N. Rhodokanakis, “Friedrich Kraelitz”, in *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien für das Jahr 1932*. 82. Jhrg (1932), 239-242.

167 E.g. *Die Verfassungsgesetze des Osmanischen Reiches* (Wien: Rudolf Haupt, 1919).

168 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 96-99.

169 Vol. 1 (1921-1922) and vol. 2 (1923-1926). Both volumes were reprinted in Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1972. The first vol. contains also a review article of Babinger’s habilitation thesis on Shaykh Bedreddin by Mehmed Köprülü (“Bemerkungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens”, 203-222). The periodical was planned to be accompanied by a series of monographs consisting of editions and translations of the most important Ottoman manuscripts of the Imperial library in Vienna; cf. “Einleitung der Herausgeber”, *Mitteilungen*, vol. 1, 7-9.

170 Rhodokanakis, “Friedrich Kraelitz”, 242.

Wittek, who became an important father figure of Ottoman studies in Great Britain, was one of Kraelitz's most influential disciples. Wittek, who is remembered today mainly for his *Gazi*-thesis of early Ottoman history, had studied classical philology and history at the University of Vienna at the outbreak of the war, which sent him to Galicia and finally to Istanbul and Syria, where he was attached to the staff of Cemal Paşa. After the war, he returned to Vienna, where he completed his classical studies and, between 1921 and 1924, embarked on the study of Ottoman diplomatics, history and philology. As academic positions were not available, he worked as a journalist in Vienna and Istanbul, before being appointed in 1927 to a position at the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul. At the end of 1934, he quit his job for political reasons and moved to Brussels, where he was appointed director of the seminary of Turkology at the *université libre*. When Belgium was invaded by German troops in 1940, Wittek escaped to England, where he had already established academic contacts in the 1930s. In 1948 he was appointed to the newly established chair of Turkish studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, where he worked until his retirement in 1961. Although Wittek spent almost his entire academic career outside his original homeland, Colin Heywood called him a "quintessentially Austrian scholar."¹⁷¹ Heywood dedicated several insightful studies to him, in which he analyzed the influence of "the Austrian tradition" of historical thinking and the circle around the German poet Stefan George (1868-1933) on Wittek's historiography.¹⁷²

After Kraelitz's death, Turkish studies in Vienna were taught by Herbert Jansky (1898-1981). He studied with Kraelitz and other Orientalists at the University of Vienna. In 1922 he obtained his doctoral degree with a thesis on the conquest of Syria by Sultan Selim Yavuz.¹⁷³ From 1921 to 1923, he studied law and economics in order to find a bread winning job, and worked as a consultant of the Austrian-Oriental chamber of commerce until 1930. He also became a court interpreter for Turkish, Arabic, Persian and Greek. Despite his daytime job, he habilitated in 1933 in Turkology and began to work as an unpaid lecturer at the University of Vienna.¹⁷⁴ Two months after the German annexation of Austria in 1938, Jansky became a member of the NSDAP.¹⁷⁵ In 1940 he became extraordinary professor in Vienna, but lost this status after the end of the war. In 1956 he was rehabilitated and restored to his former office in the following year. From 1962 he was director of the academy of the Hammer-Purgstall association in Vienna. As a Turkologist he is most known for his Turkish textbook and his German-Turkish dictionary, but he was also working on Turkish Sufism, dialects, folk literature and folk music.¹⁷⁶

171 Colin Heywood, "Wittek and the Austrian Tradition", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1988), 7.

172 Cf. the titles given in the bibliography at the end of this article.

173 Published as "Die Eroberung Syriens durch Sultan Selim I.", *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte* 2.3-4 (1923-1926), 173-241.

174 Cf. A. C. Schaendlinger, "Herbert Jansky (1898-1981)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 74 (1982), 11-12 and Biel, *Orientalistik*, 124-125.

175 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 38.

176 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 124-125.

It was, however, not him, but another disciple of Kraelitz, Herbert Wilhelm Duda (1900-1975), who became Kraelitz's successor on his chair. Duda came to the Ottoman Empire as a soldier during the First World War. From 1919 to 1925 he studied Oriental studies first in Prague with Max Grünert (1849-1929), then in Vienna with Kraelitz-Greifenhorst and in Leipzig with Richard Hartmann and August Fischer. In Leipzig he received his doctoral degree. He subsequently spent a year in Paris at the *Ecole nationale des langues orientales vivantes*, studying under such famous Orientalists as Jean Deny (1879-1963) and Vladimir Minorsky (1877-1966). From 1927 to 1932, he lived in Istanbul as a private scholar. He habilitated in Leipzig in 1932 and taught there as an unpaid lecturer, until he was appointed extraordinary professor of Turkology and Islamic philology at the University of Breslau in 1936. Duda did not become a member of the NSDAP but obviously of at least one of its associated organizations.¹⁷⁷ After a visiting professorship during the war in Sofia, he became director of the German institute of culture in the same city.¹⁷⁸ In 1943 he was appointed to the chair of Turkology and Islamic studies in Vienna, which he held until his retirement in 1970. Duda published more than 170 writings. His major area of research was Ottoman diplomatics, history, literature and theater. Among his works are studies on the situation of Christians in the Ottoman Balkans, on Yunus Emre and Ahmed Haşim and on the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey,¹⁷⁹ as well as two critical comments on the Turkish alphabet and language reforms. In the 1950s Duda's field of research shifted from Ottoman to Iranian studies. In 1959 he published a translation and commentary of the important history of the Seljuks by Ibn Bībī.¹⁸⁰ He was an honorary member of the DMG, a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and of the *Türk Dil Kurumu*.

The eminent Turkologist Andreas Tietze (1914-2003) has left a vivid (and highly critical) description of the situation of Turkish studies in Vienna in the first half of the 1930s that may be summarized as follows: Ottoman studies, at that time, were an academic discipline thoroughly dominated by German-speaking scholars without, however, any awareness of historiography and methodological debates that were going on elsewhere like in European social history. Spoken Turkish was not a requirement, the new Turkish Latin alphabet was despised. Preferential treatment was accorded to early Ottoman history until the 15th century, while the 19th century was considered uninteresting and the 20th was completely ignored. Scholarly production in Turkey was equally ignored. Thus, Tietze complains that during his studies, he did not even hear the name of Ahmed Refik. Traveling to Turkey was not considered a necessity because the archives in Vienna contained enough Ottoman source material for countless dissertations.¹⁸¹ Much of his account, however, seems specific for the situation in post-war Vienna after the death of Kraelitz.

177 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 39.

178 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 135.

179 *Vom Kalifat zur Republik* (Vienna: Verlag für Jugend und Volk, 1948).

180 *Die Seldschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959). Duda used the abridged copy, known as *Mukhtaşar*, of Ibn Bībī's original work.

181 Andreas Tietze, "Mit dem Leben gewachsen. Zur osmanischen Geschichtsschreibung in den letzten fünfzig Jahren", in *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1789: Entspannung und Austausch*, eds. Gernot Heiss & Grete Klingenstein (München: Oldenbourg, 1983), 15-16.

Tietze at that time was not an Orientalist, but a student of the economic historian Alfons Dopsch (1868-1953) with a special interest in Slavic and Oriental languages and the history of the Balkans. He received his doctoral degree in 1936 with a thesis on the agrarian theories of the Italian economic theorists of the 17th century.¹⁸² In the same year, he went to Turkey with his friend Robert Anhegger (1911-2001) to travel in Anatolia.¹⁸³ As is well known, Turkey was to become a second home for them both. It was only in 1958 that Tietze left Istanbul for the Department of Middle Eastern Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. He remained there until 1973, when he returned to Vienna to succeed Duda on the chair of Turkish and Islamic studies until his retirement in 1982. In the remaining two decades of his retirement, he continued to teach and embark on new projects, the last of which was his *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatu*. The first of the planned six volumes appeared in 2002.

Anton Cornelius Schaendlinger (1931-1991)¹⁸⁴ studied in Vienna with Duda, Jansky and the Arabist Hans Ludwig Gottschalk (1904-1981). He received his Ph.D. in 1962 with a path-breaking thesis on Ottoman numismatics that was published in 1973.¹⁸⁵ His habilitation thesis of 1975 was on Ottoman sources of the first and second Hungarian campaign of Sultan Süleyman Kanuni.¹⁸⁶ In 1977 he became extraordinary professor at the institute for Oriental and Islamic studies at the University of Vienna and in 1984 was appointed to the chair of the institute. Among his areas of research were Ottoman numismatics and diplomatics, the Hapsburg-Ottoman relations and Ottoman reform treatises. He was a member of the DMG, a corresponding member of the *Türk Tarih Kurumu* and an active member of the Austrian Rotary Club.

In 1992 Markus Köhbach became his successor as ordinarius “for Turkology and Islamic studies.” Turkish Studies at the institute for Oriental studies are also represented by Prof. Claudia Römer and Prof. Gisela Procházka-Eisl.¹⁸⁷ Finally, mention should be made of Marlene Kurz, who has been assistant professor at the department for modern history since 2002.

Oriental and Turkish Studies in Germany since the Weimar Republic

If one is to search for a periodization in German Oriental studies in the 20th century, the end of the First World War seems to offer a reasonable date. It marked the end of German colonialist enterprises and the gradual decline of its accompanying Orientalist discourse. Because of the international isolation and the distressed economic situation

182 Markus Köhbach, “In memoriam Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 94 (2004), vii-xii.

183 Cf. Erik-Jan Zürcher, “Two Young Ottomanists Discover Kemalist Turkey. The Travel Diaries of Robert Anhegger and Andreas Tietze”, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 26.2 (2002), 359-369.

184 Cf. Markus Köhbach & Claudia Römer, “Anton C. Schaendlinger (1931-1991)”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82 (1992), 5-14.

185 *Osmanische Numismatik. Von den Anfängen des Osmanischen Reiches bis zu seiner Auflösung 1922*, (Braunschweig: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1973).

186 *Die Feldzugstagebücher des ersten und zweiten ungarischen Feldzugs Suleymans I.* (Wien: Verlag des Verbandes der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft Österreichs, 1978).

187 Biel, *Orientalistik*, 213-216; 230-231.

of Germany after the First World War, Oriental studies at German universities experienced a process of what has been termed “re-academicalization” (*Reakademisierung*), i.e. a turning away from politics and a return to the academic self-sufficiency of the discipline, and a decline of interest in the contemporary Middle East.¹⁸⁸

The international isolation and ostracism that German Orientalists were experiencing after the First World War (e.g. they were excluded from participation in international congresses until Germany joined the League of Nations in 1926)¹⁸⁹ may have been partly reverted during the Weimar Republic. But the Nazi regime paved the way for an even greater isolation of German Orientalists. On a practical level, academic isolationism went hand in hand with Nazi imperialism.

Prosopographically speaking, the Nazi takeover of power was followed by a significant rupture in German Oriental studies as in German academia in general. According to a rough estimate, 25 % of all Orientalist professors in Germany were considered to be Jewish and consequently purged from their positions and persecuted. Approximately one third of the academic personnel in German Oriental studies was purged until 1938.¹⁹⁰ As a rule, those scholars who emigrated did not return after 1945, causing a considerable brain drain. Orientalists with a special interest in Turkish studies, who emigrated, were Robert Anhegger, Franz Babinger, Karl Heinrich Menges, Karl Süßheim, Gotthold Weil, Paul Wittek and Andreas Tietze.

Much attention has been paid to the emigration of German academics to Turkey.¹⁹¹ It is, however, important to remember that both political emigrants like Menges and academics loyal to the Nazi regime like von Gabain were equally employed at Turkish universities. In the context of Turkish studies, it should also be kept in mind that teaching Turkology and Turkish studies in 1930s Turkey was reserved to ethnic Turks and that German Turkologists there were employed in adjacent academic fields.

As a result of the generally anti-academic attitude of the Nazi regime, the purging of Orientalists in Nazi Germany went hand in hand with an erosion of the institutional base of Oriental studies. Of seventeen Oriental seminaries in Germany five were closed between 1933 and 1940 (Frankfurt, Gießen, Heidelberg, Kiel and Königsberg). The Orientalist chairs of Bonn, Breslau, Göttingen, Leipzig and Munich were orphaned as a result of their occupants being involved in wartime services.¹⁹²

On the other hand, from the viewpoint of prosopography, the end of the Nazi era did not mark a rupture in Oriental studies. Although several Orientalists temporarily lost their academic positions after the Allied occupation in 1945, all of them were

188 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 86. Programmatically formulated by Brockelmann in his address on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the DMG at the congress of German Orientalists in Leipzig in 1921; Brockelmann, “Morgenländische Studien”, 17.

189 Ludmila Hanisch, “Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft”, in *Kulturwissenschaften und Nationalsozialismus*, eds. Jürgen Elvert & Jürgen Nielsen-Sikora (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 506.

190 Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 116-118.

191 A recent publication is Christopher Kubaseck & Günter Seufert (eds.), *Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkischen Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2008) (Istanbuler Texte und Studien 12).

192 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 163.

restored in the course of several years.¹⁹³ It is therefore fair to speak of an almost uninterrupted personal continuity of Oriental studies in Germany after the end of the Nazi regime. Only very recently has the role of Oriental studies and of Orientalists (including Turkologists) during the Nazi era become subject to an ongoing scholarly research.¹⁹⁴ Even decades after the Allied occupation, the obituaries of Orientalists whose active years had been falling into the Nazi era were usually completely silent or notably vague about this period.

Typically, established academic German Orientalists were not early adopters of organized Nazism. Ideologically, however, they shared parts of the ultra-nationalist, racist and hegemonialist National Socialist discourse, which made it easier for them to collaborate with the Nazis as soon as the latter were in power. The lion's share of Orientalists' memberships in the National Socialist German Workers Party or their affiliated organizations dated from the time after the National Socialist takeover of power in 1933, when membership in the NSDAP was widely viewed -not only by Orientalists- as a means of bolstering personal career interests. Orientalist members of the NSDAP included Anton Baumstark (since 1932), the specialist in Islamic philosophy Max Horten (1874-1945), Franz Taeschner, Otto Spies (1901-1981) and the Arabist August Fischer (1865-1949; since 1933). Between 1933 and 1937 generally no new party members were enrolled. After the ban on new enrollments had been lifted in 1937, the archaeologist Kurt Bittel, Walther Björkman, Albert Dietrich, Karl Garbers, Erwin Gräf, Walther Hinz, Wilhelm Hoenerbach, Ernst Klingmüller, Max Krause, Curt Prüfer, Martin Schede, Helmuth Scheel and Bertold Spuler obtained memberships. Herbert Jansky and several of his Austrian colleagues joined the NSDAP after the annexation of Austria in 1938. The Iranist Wilhelm Eilers and Annemarie von Gabain became both party members 1939; Johannes Benzing, the Assyriologist Adam Falkenstein, Gotthard Jäschke and the Arabist Hans Wehr in 1940, and Fritz Steppat in 1942. Herbert Wilhelm Duda and Hans Heinrich Schaefer were not members of the NSDAP but of organizations associated to the Nazi party.¹⁹⁵ Although many Orientalists did neither hesitate to adopt the Nazi discourse nor to actively collaborate with the regime when it seemed to further their personal or professional interests, there was no National Socialist revolutionizing of German Oriental studies. Neither the articles in Orientalist periodicals nor papers on congresses or university calendars showed much difference to the pre-Nazi era.¹⁹⁶ The Nazi regime also seems to have lacked a general strategy towards Oriental studies: "The political intervention aimed not *ad rem*, but *ad hominem*."¹⁹⁷ There were certain exceptions, however. The SOS in Berlin was changed into a college for the study of foreign countries (*Auslandshochschule*) in 1936. In 1940 following a political intervention by the Security Service (*Sicherheitsdienst*), a branch of the SOS, the *Auslandshochschule* was dissolved into the "faculty of foreign studies"

193 Cf. Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 175 and Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 435-436.

194 Cf. Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 114-173; id., "Arabistik", 503-525; Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 185-209 and more comprehensive but slightly imbalanced, Ellinger, *Orientalistik*.

195 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 36-39.

196 Hanisch, "Arabistik", 518; id., *Nachfolger*, 152-157.

197 Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 199.

(*Auslandswissenschaftliche Fakultät*) of the University of Berlin. Yet again these transformations seem to have been rather the outcome of personal initiatives and random political processes than of planned political strategy.¹⁹⁸

Especially during the war, the regime made use of the linguistic and cultural know-how of Orientalists, but again obviously without an overall strategy. Among the projects launched by the SOS in 1942 was the “working group Turkistan” (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft Turkestan*) within the institutional framework of the DMG, whose director was Helmuth Scheel (1895-1967) at that time. The working group had the task of studying the conditions of the central Asian parts of the Soviet Union and was to remain secret. It brought together German Orientalists and Turkologists such as Annemarie von Gabain, Richard Hartmann, Herbert Jansky and Bertold Spuler as well as “local specialists” who were recruited among local Nazi collaborators or prisoners of war.¹⁹⁹

The career of Helmuth Scheel may serve as an illustrative example of the personal continuity of Oriental studies in Germany after the Second World War. He was born in Berlin as the son of a Prussian official and first intended to embark on a career as a bureaucrat. During the First World War, however, he autodidactically acquired sound knowledge of Turkish, so that in 1916, he was able to pass the examination for translators at the SOS and was sent to the Ottoman Empire for the rest of the war, where he worked at the military meteorological station in Sinop. Back in Germany, he pursued both Oriental studies at the SOS and an education as a bureaucrat. In 1926 Becker, at that time Prussian Minister of Science, Art and Public Education, obtained a position in his office for his former disciple. He finished his Ph.D. thesis on the Ottoman-Prussian relations between 1721 and 1774 under Erich Bräunlich (1892-1945) in Greifswald. Among his Orientalist teachers were Franz Babinger, Wilhelm Bolland, Georg Kampffmeyer, Eugen Mittwoch, Johannes Heinrich Mordtmann and Gotthold Weil. After Mordtmann’s death in 1932, he taught Ottoman diplomatics at the SOS besides his main job as a Prussian bureaucrat. After having become a member of the NSDAP in 1937, he was appointed professor in Berlin and director of the re-organized Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1938. A year later he became director of the DMG and in 1941 honorary professor at the newly established “faculty of foreign studies” of the University of Berlin. Shortly after the war, in 1946, he became ordinary professor for Oriental studies in Mainz. The city was part of the French zone of occupation. The French authorities intended to establish it as a local cultural center and Scheel obviously had formerly established good contacts with French colleagues. He was commissioned with the foundation of the Academy of Science and Literature in Mainz and remained its general secretary until his death in 1967. In 1948 he organized the re-foundation of the DMG and again became its director and the editor of its periodical. He also secured the editorship of the academy for the *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. During the years 1953-1954, he was dean of the philosophical faculty and in 1955-1956 became prorector of the University of Mainz. He was awarded an honorary doctorate of the University of Dijon and the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany. His area of research concentrated on the study of Ottoman relations with the European pow-

198 Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 206.

199 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 268.

ers and Ottoman diplomatics.²⁰⁰ There can be no doubt that as a bureaucrat, Scheel was as loyal to the Nazi regime as he was later to the Federal Republic. He seems to have possessed considerable skills in pursuing his interests, as may be gleaned from the fact that in 1939, despite serious opposition from within the Nazi bureaucracy, he succeeded in obtaining the permission for the print of the second volume of the *Volkskundliche Texte aus Ost-Türkistan* by the dissident Karl Heinrich Menges. Scheel was interested in the work and the volume was finally printed in the state's printing press in limited edition and -on special requirement of the *Gestapo* (Secret State Police)- anonymously without mention of its original author.²⁰¹

The case of Helmuth Scheel may, in several respects, be viewed as exceptional at least for an Orientalist. But even less brilliant continuations of academic careers involved in most cases only temporary career slumps, as can be gleaned from the example of the noted specialist on the contemporary history of the Republic of Turkey, Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983).²⁰² He was born into a Pietist family in Silesia. His father was a professor. From 1912 to 1916 he studied law and Oriental studies in Freiburg (Breisgau) and in Berlin. During the war, he interrupted his studies. In 1915 he was seriously wounded in the Somme sector. He received a diploma in Turkish from the SOS in 1914. In 1917 he obtained his Ph.D. in law and thereafter embarked on a career as a diplomat. After he had obtained the position of a legation secretary at the German embassy in Ankara in 1927, he quit the diplomatic service in 1931, obviously because he felt being discriminated against on the basis of the social status of his wife, who had been a nurse. He returned to Germany and accepted a position at the SOS in Berlin, where he stayed as an extraordinary professor for Turkish throughout the transformation of this seminary into the *Auslandshochschule*, its subsequent merger with the "faculty for foreign studies" and until its eventual demise in 1945. From 1936 until 1944, he edited the *Welt des Islams* together with Walther Björkman. Having been a member of the NSDAP and several other Nazi organizations,²⁰³ he worked as a teacher for religious education in Potsdam after 1945. From 1947 he taught as a visiting professor at the University of Munster, where he enjoyed the support of Franz Taeschner. He retired in 1959. Still in 1950, however, the ministry of education of the state North Rhine-Westphalia denied him the authorization to supervise exams for candidates of the diploma in Turkish. In Turkey, on the other hand, he was made an honorary member of the *İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü* in 1955 and of the *Türk Tarih Kurumu* in 1959. In 1975 he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Ankara. Several of his almost 400 books and articles, dealing mostly with the history of the Turkish Republic, have been translated into Turkish. It may be observed, however, that in his work he meticulously avoided sensitive issues like e.g. the Armenian question. As Klaus Kreiser put it: "Jäschke respected the sensitivities of official Turkey to the limits of historical credibility."²⁰⁴

200 Ewald Wagner, "Helmuth Scheel (1895-1967)", *ZDMG* 118 (1968), 1-13.

201 Knüppel, *Schriftenverzeichnis*, 24-25.

202 Cf. Klaus Kreiser, "Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983): Von der Islamkunde zur Auslandswissenschaft", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), 406-423.

203 Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 39.

204 Kreiser, "Jäschke", 418.

However, the end of the Nazi regime stood not only for the continuation of Orientalist careers, but also allowed for the rehabilitation of scholars like Hellmut Ritter (1892-1971) and Franz Babinger.

Ritter was the son of a Lutheran pastor and one of his brothers was the historian Gerhard Ritter (1888-1967). Hellmuth Ritter had been a disciple of such famous Orientalists as Carl Brockelmann, Paul Kahle, Enno Littmann and Theodor Nöldeke. His Ph.D. thesis of 1914 was supervised by C. H. Becker, whom Ritter later acknowledged to have had an extraordinarily important influence on his intellectual formation. During the war, he went to Iraq as a translator in the staff of von der Goltz and later with Falkenhayn to Palestine. A series of ethnographic studies originate from his time in Iraq.²⁰⁵ In 1919 he became the successor of Rudolf Tschudi on the chair of Oriental studies at the University of Hamburg. In 1925 his homosexuality led to his legal conviction and subsequent removal from his professorship in Hamburg in 1926.²⁰⁶ With the help of influential friends (notably his mentor Becker) he managed to install himself in Istanbul, where he became the representative of the local branch the DMG had founded there. Its main task was the edition of Arabic and Persian manuscripts in the series *Bibliotheca Islamica*. A number of Orientalists came to Ritter during these years, both benefitting from his knowledge and contributing to his editorial work, among them Duda, Wittek, Martin Plessner (1900-1973), Otto Spies and Gotthelf Bergsträsser's successor in Munich, Otto Pretzl (1893-1941). He corresponded with over hundred Orientalists all over the world. He was also in contact with one of the most enigmatic German Orientalists of the time, Oskar Rescher, who had left his position as an ordinary professor in Breslau and moved to Istanbul in 1928. In 1937 the Nazi regime revoked his *venia legendi*. He became a Turkish citizen and called himself Osman Reşer. His works appeared in Istanbul in private print and extremely small editions, a fact that made them practically unobtainable for Orientalist circles in Europe. In his house overlooking the Bosphorus, he lived a solitary life surrounded by many cats until his death in 1972.²⁰⁷

In 1935 Ritter accepted a lectureship for Arabic and Persian at the University of Istanbul. In 1937 he became a professor at the *Şarkiyat Enstitüsü*, where he taught until he was dismissed in 1949.²⁰⁸ In 1947 he used his international reputation and wide range of contacts to initiate an international Orientalist association, the International Society for Oriental Research (that had as its official Turkish name *Milletlerarası Şark Tetkikleri Cemiyeti*), consisting mainly of American, British, German and Turkish scholars. In 1948 the association began to edit its own periodical *Oriens*. The editorial board of the first edition consisted of Adnan Adıvar (1882-1955), Rahmeti Arat (1900-

205 Published as "Mesopotamische Studien", pts. i-iv in *Der Islam*, dealing with traditional boats on the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, Arabic folk songs and war poetry and boys' games from Amāra, in 1919, 1920, 1923 and 1942 respectively.

206 Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller, *Mann für Mann. Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte von Freundschaft und mann männlicher Sexualität im deutschen Sprachraum* (Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript Verlag, 1998), 588. C. H. Becker too had homosexual tendencies; cf. *ibid.*, 112-113 and 588.

207 Bertold Spuler, "Oskar Rescher/Osman Reşer zum 100. Geburtstag - 1. Okt. 1883/1983", *Der Islam* 61 (1984), 12-13.

208 Thomas Lier, "Hellmut Ritter in Istanbul 1926-1949", *Welt des Islams* 38 (1998), 334-385.

1964), John Kingsley Birge (1888-1952), the Sinologist Wolfram Eberhard (1909-1989, who moved the same year from Ankara to Berkeley), the Hittitologist Hans Gustav Güterbock (1908-2000, who also left Turkey in 1948), Muhammad Hamidullah (1908-2002), Fuat Köprülü (1890-1966), and the Swedish theologian and Orientalist Helmer Ringgren (b. 1917). In 1949 Ritter was appointed extraordinary, in 1953 ordinary professor in Frankfurt (Main), where he taught until his retirement in 1956. He returned to Istanbul to catalog manuscripts of Persian divans in the libraries of Istanbul together with Herbert W. Duda and Ahmed Ateş. The project was financed by the UNESCO. Ritter also resumed teaching at the University of Istanbul.²⁰⁹ His final research project was the exploration of Tūrōyo, the language spoken by the Christians of Tur Abdin that resulted in five volumes of comprehensive research.²¹⁰ In 1969 his failing health forced him to return to Germany, where he died in 1971. Ritter's research was more oriented to classical Islamic themes and had an emphasis on the philology of Arabic and Persian texts. Nevertheless, he published a range of contributions to Turkish studies, notably on the shadow play,²¹¹ but also articles on the abolishment of the caliphate in 1924, notes on Ottoman grammar and stylistic devices (1926) and several contributions on Mevlana and the Mevlevis. Ritter enjoyed considerable international fame; he was elected a corresponding fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland in 1955, of the *Türk Dil Kurumu* (1957) and of the American Oriental Society (1964); he was a fellow of the Arab Academy of Damascus (since 1948), of the Islamic Research Association in Bombay (from 1955), of the German Archaeological Institute in Berlin (since 1962), of the *Real Academia de Buenas Letras* in Barcelona (since 1964) and -two years before his death- finally became an honorary member of the DMG. In 1967 he was awarded an honorary doctorate of the University of Istanbul.²¹²

Franz Babinger was born in Bavaria and remained all his life a heartfelt Bavarian royalist.²¹³ During his studies of Oriental philology in Munich, he attended classes on Hebrew, Syriac, Akkadian, Sanskrit, modern and ancient Persian, Arabic, Turkish and Coptic. His Ph.D. thesis was supervised by the Indologist and Indo-Europeanist Ernst Kuhn (1846-1920) and dealt with the Orientalist Gottfried Siegfried Bayer (1694-1738). During the First World War, he served as a German and Ottoman officer. It is probable that he met with Mustafa Kemal Pasha. After the war he entered one of the paramilitary groups (*Freikorps*) that fought against the revolutionary Munich Soviet Republic.²¹⁴

In 1921 he published his habilitation thesis of the same year that dealt with Shaykh Bedreddin.²¹⁵ After having been unsalaried lecturer for three years, he became extraor-

209 Fritz Meier, "Hellmut Ritter", *Der Islam* 48 (1972), 193-205.

210 *Tūrōyo. Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Tur 'Abdīn* (Wiesbaden 1967ff).

211 *Karagös. Türkische Schattenspiele*. The work appeared in three parts in 1924, 1941 and 1953, the third one with contributions by Andreas Tietze.

212 Richard Walzer, "Hellmut Ritter 27. 2. 1892 - 19. 5. 1971", *Oriens* 23-24 (1974), 1-2.

213 Hans Joachim Kissling, "Franz Babinger (1891-1967)", *Südost-Forschungen* 26 (1967), 376.

214 Gerhard Grimm, "Franz Babinger (1891-1967): Ein lebensgeschichtlicher Essay", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), 300-312.

215 "Schejch Bedr ed-Din, der Sohn des Richters von Simaw", *Der Islam* 11 (1921), 1-106.

dinary professor in Berlin and in 1925 he obtained a teaching position at the SOS. During his time in Berlin, he had close contacts with Johann Heinrich Mordtmann and concentrated on Ottoman history. It was during Babinger's time in Berlin that he published his seminal work on the Ottoman historians.²¹⁶ In 1930 or 1931 Babinger became a party member of the Catholic political party *Deutsche Zentrumspartei*.²¹⁷

Already in 1925, his hopes to be appointed to the chair of Oriental studies in Munich had been frustrated. When after the death of Gotthelf Bergsträsser in 1933 the chair became available again, he made a renewed attempt. This time, however, Babinger's aspirations were frustrated by a malicious expert report written by his colleague Hans Heinrich Schaeder (1896-1957), who did not even refrain from exploiting the fact that one of Babinger's grandmothers had been of Jewish origin. This information was transpired to the notorious National Socialist propaganda paper *Der Stürmer*, which in January 1934 published an article that denounced Babinger as a Jewish mongrel. Following this campaign, he was pensioned off from his position at the SOS in Berlin. In 1935 or 1936 Babinger found employment in Romania, where he enjoyed the protection of the politician and historian Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940). But soon Iorga's assassination and Hitler's Balkans campaign left Babinger in a difficult situation. The Germans sent him on a mission of espionage to Bulgaria before he was recalled to Germany in 1943.²¹⁸ Three years after the end of the war, in 1948, he was appointed to a newly established professorship for Turkology in Munich. The focus of Babinger's research had shifted increasingly towards South-East Europe. Nevertheless, he remained an Ottomanist interested in fields as diverse as Sufism, popular religion and diplomatics. Babinger, who published extensively, must have been a strong but problematic personality. During his time as ordinarius in Munich, he supervised no more than four Ph.D. theses by Nicoara Beldiceanu, Irene Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Erdmute Heller and Sait Gökçe.²¹⁹ His most famous monograph on Mehmed Fatih²²⁰ was translated into several languages,²²¹ but it was also variously criticized. The book is without annotations. A planned second volume with references was never published. In an article of 1984, the Byzantinist Erich Trapp identified numerous passages in Babinger's celebrated book that are almost literary borrowings from Hammer-Purgstall's *History of the Ottoman Empire*, Ludwig Pastor's *History of the Popes* and Johann Zinkeisen's Ottoman history.²²² While one may assume that Babinger would have acknowledged his sources had the volume of references appeared, his extensive plagiarism can still hardly be considered a literary technique widely accepted in 20th century scholarship.

216 *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1927).

217 Grimm, "Babinger", 316.

218 Grimm, "Babinger", 319-327.

219 Hans Georg Majer, "Das Münchner Institut: Tradition und Perspektiven", in *Turkologie heute - Tradition und Perspektive*, eds. Nurettin Demir & Erika Taube (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 196-197.

220 *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit*.

221 French (1954), Italian (1957), Serbo-Croatian (1968) and English (1978). The German edition was printed in 1959 and 1987. Majer, "Münchner Institut", 196 n. 9.

222 Erich Trapp, "Plagiat in der Geschichtsschreibung Mehmeds II.? Byzantinische Tradition in moderner Zeit", in *Byzantios. Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. W. Hörandner, J. Koder, O. Kresten u. E. Trapp, (Wien: Ernst Beccar, 1984), 321-332.

The personal continuity of Oriental studies after 1945 also implied a methodological one. It was not until the end of the 20th century that the philological tradition -widely considered to have given the German Orientalist traditions its specific mark- finally eroded. German-speaking (or rather: German-writing) Orientalists had dominated Turkish studies well into the 20th century. But the development since has put Germany at the margins of the discipline - at least quantitatively speaking. Ottoman and Turkish studies today are more than ever before international enterprises, with English and Turkish as their main languages. German, on the other hand has ceased to be a language that is used and read by the international scientific community in most fields and also in Turkish studies. The fact that a considerable share of German scholarly work in Turkish studies is still published in German leads to its being internationally ignored and sometimes reduplicated, a fate that is shared by scholarly work in other European and non-European languages, perhaps most notably by the prolific production in Japanese.

Selected Locations of Turkish Studies in Germany

A general characteristic of universities in Germany is their relatively weak centralization. There are umpteen universities, and many of them are located at small towns like Bamberg, Erfurt, Freiburg, Heidelberg, Trier, Marburg or Tübingen. There is a strong traditional and historical element in their geographical distribution, reflecting in many instances early modern historical developments. In certain cases, however, these traditions have been re-invented, as in the cases of Bamberg, Erfurt or Trier, when universities that had been closed down were “reopened” in the second half of the 20th century.

The following part attempts a brief historical overview of some more recent academic and university-based centers of Turkish studies in Germany in the tradition of Oriental studies. This section is necessarily a preliminary one because of its dependence on available secondary literature.

With very few exceptions, individual and institutional contributions to Turkish studies outside of the Orientalist disciplinary tradition have not been included. A caveat may be in order here. Apart from the fact that the verification of dates etc. would require archival studies that are beyond the scope of the present overview, three circumstances have contributed to an element of institutional instability: the fact that Turkish studies have remained very closely connected to the Middle East branch of Oriental studies, the comparatively small number of specialists covering a huge academic field and -somewhat paradoxically- the increasing requirement of specialization. Several examples illustrate how a new appointment to a chair completely changed the former field of interest - at least within what may be roughly termed the field of Middle East studies. This has been the case in Heidelberg, where in 1991 Michael Ursinus was appointed to the chair for Islamic studies that had before been held by Anton Schall (1920-2007). His appointment caused the institute, that had been predominantly a center of Semitic languages, to shift towards Ottoman studies. On the other hand, in Munster, Taeschner and Jäschke had given Oriental studies at that university a heavy emphasis on Turkish studies. But after Taeschner's retirement in 1957, the chair was given to Hans Wehr (1909-1981), a noted Arabist best known for his dictionary of mod-

ern Arabic.²²³ When Jäschke retired in 1959, Turkish studies ceased to play an important role in Munster.

Shifts are not always that clearcut, as may be illustrated in the case of Turkish studies in Freiburg. Hans Robert Roemer (1915-1997), who held the chair for Islamic studies from 1963, had a special interest in Iranian studies and especially the Timurid period, but he also counted Turkish and Arabic studies among his fields of interests. When Roemer retired at the beginning of the 1980s, his successor Werner Ende, who held the chair until 2002, concentrated more on Arabic and Iranian Islamic intellectual history of the 19th and 20th centuries. Ottoman studies, on the other hand, were represented in Freiburg by Josef Matuz (1927-1992). Matuz had been a disciple of the famous Hungarian Turkologists Gyula Németh and Lajos Fekete. Following his participation in the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, he had to emigrate. In Munich he managed to continue his studies, and obtained his Ph.D. in 1961. Sharing his time between lecturing in Freiburg and continuing his studies in Strasbourg, he became *docteur en études orientales* in 1965 and a member of the CRNS. In 1972 he habilitated in Freiburg with a study on the Ottoman central bureaucracy in the time of Sultan Süleyman Kanuni, published in 1974 (*Das Kanzleiwesen Sultan Süleymans des Prächtigen*, Wiesbaden: Steiner). Appointed extraordinary professor in 1973, his research interests concentrated on Ottoman diplomacies in the 16th century. For years his introductory work on Ottoman history²²⁴ remained the standard textbook on the subject in the German language. Between 1988 and 1992, when Michael Ursinus was professor at the Oriental seminary in Freiburg, the emphasis on Ottoman studies was reinforced. In 1992 he left for the chair of Islamic studies at the university of Heidelberg. A more generally linguistic approach to Turkology was brought to Freiburg by Ingeborg Baldauf, who was associated professor of Islamic Studies during the years 1993-1995. After she had left Freiburg to accept a full professorship at the Humboldt University in Berlin, she was replaced by Jens Peter Laut in the beginning of 1997. In addition, Erika Glassen, who, following her habilitation on late Abbasid religious policy in 1981, was appointed extraordinary professor at the seminary in Freiburg. She held the position of director of the Orient-Institute in Beirut and Istanbul from 1989 to 1994 and became increasingly interested in late Ottoman and modern Turkish literature. Together with Jens Peter Laut, she acts as an editor of the publication series "Türkische Bibliothek", a project of translation of Turkish literature into German launched by the Swiss-based publisher Unionsverlag. Erika Glassen retired in 1999. In 2004 Werner Ende was succeeded by Maurus Reinkowski, among whose primary fields of interest is 19th Century Ottoman history. For several years, Turkish studies in combination with Turkology again enjoyed a strong position in Freiburg. But in 2008, Jens Peter Laut moved to the chair of Turkology in Göttingen. This time linguistic Turkology in Freiburg was left orphaned. With Maurus Reinkowski having left for the chair of Islamic studies in Basel, Switzerland and the professorship of Turkology in Freiburg still vacant, the future direction of Oriental studies in Freiburg

223 Heine, *Geschichte*, 27.

224 *Das Osmanische Reich. Grundlinien seiner Geschichte* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985). It was repeatedly reprinted.

seems once again to be open in summer 2010. This pattern of weak institutionalization of Oriental studies in general and Turkish studies in particular can be observed in practically all institutes of Oriental studies at German universities. Below a short alphabetically arranged overview of universities with Oriental studies and a certain emphasis on Turkish studies or Turkology is provided.

Bamberg

Bamberg is a case in point of a re-invented traditional German university. Originally founded in 1647, it lost its status as a university after 1803 and practically ceased to exist from 1939 to 1945. It regained its university status only in 1979. Oriental studies were gradually established from 1984 (comprising now Arabic, Iranian, Islamic, Jewish and Turkish studies as well as history of Islamic art).²²⁵ The chair for Turkish studies was held from 1984 to 2004 by Klaus Kreiser and, since 2008, by Christoph Herzog. From 1984 until his retirement in 2006, Semih Tezcan represented linguistic Turkology; he is teaching now at Bilkent University, Ankara.

Berlin

The University of Berlin was founded in 1810, following the Prussian defeat against Napoleon, as a new model university striving to implement the neo-humanist educational reform. As its first Turkologist one may count Wilhelm Schott (1802-1889), who, besides his Sinological studies, was also interested in Turkic languages.²²⁶ The SOS and the research on Turfan texts by the Bang school have already been mentioned. After 1945 the University of Berlin (subsequently named Humboldt University) remained in the Soviet sector of Berlin, which – as a political reaction – led to the establishment of a new university, the so-called “Free University” (*Freie Universität*; abbrev. *FU Berlin*) situated in the American sector.

At the Humboldt University, Turkology was reintroduced with the appointment of György Hazai. Hazai²²⁷ was a student of Gyula Németh, Lajos Fekete, Lajos Ligeti and István Kniezsa. In 1963 he came to East Berlin and had considerable impact on Turkology as the head of a newly created research-group that had the task to continue the studies on the Turfan texts. Among his Ph.D. students were Peter Zieme and Sigrid Kleinmichel. In 1982 Hazai returned to Hungary, in the following year he became the director-general of the Akadémiai Kiadó. In 1991 he went to Nicosia, where the University of Cyprus was founding a new institute for Turkology. From 2000 to 2003, he was rector of the Andrassy University in Budapest.

In 1990, following the dissolution of the German Democratic Republic, Turkology at the Humboldt University was dissolved and a chair for Central Asian studies held by Ingeborg Baldauf was set up instead, while at the Freie Universität a chair for

225 Cf. Rolf Bergmann, “Die Planung der Bamberger Orientalistik (1977-1982). Mit einem Anhang von Klaus Kreiser: Chronik der Orientalistik Bamberg (1984-1988)”, in *Artikulation der Wirklichkeit. Festschrift für Siegfried Oppolzer zum 60. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt, etc.: Lang, 1989, 45-60.

226 Cf. <http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/turkologie/institut/geschichte/index.html> (June 15, 2010).

227 Cf. the notes on him in his *Festschrift Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele & Peter Zieme (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), ix-xii. His publications up to 1996 are listed *ibid.*, 233-264.

Turkology was established that has been held by Barbara Kellner-Heinkele until her retirement in 2006 and since then by Claus Schönig.

Bonn

The University of Bonn, founded in 1818, claims as its first Orientalist the famous Indologist August Wilhelm, who, together with his brother Friedrich, is counted as one of the founders of the German Romantic school of philosophy and literature. In 1913 a seminary for Oriental studies was established. Its first director became C. H. Becker. From 1951 to 1969, the chair for Islamic and Oriental studies was held by Otto Spies, who included Ottoman and Turkish studies and particularly modern Turkish literature among his fields of interest. In 1959 the different branches of Oriental studies in Bonn were united under the roof of the newly established seminary for Oriental languages as an institutional successor of the SOS in Berlin. After several shake-ups, Oriental studies in Bonn were organized in the framework of the *Institut für Orient- und Asienwissenschaften* in 2005.²²⁸ Despite Turkish being part of the language education, neither Turkish studies nor linguistic Turkology form an institutionalized part of Oriental studies in Bonn today. Mention should finally be made of the Ottomanist Hedda Reindl-Kiel, who is based in Bonn.

Frankfurt

A professorship for Turkology was established in 1971. It was held by Horst Wilfrid Brands until 1979. His successor from 1982 until 1990 became Barbara Kellner-Heinkele. Since 1994 Marcel Erdal held the position.²²⁹

Freiburg (see above)

Gießen

The first modern Orientalist in Gießen since 1833 was Johann August Vullers (1803-1880), who had studied with de Sacy. After his death in 1881, his position remained vacant for twenty years. In 1901 Friedrich Zacharias Schwally (1863-1919), a disciple of Theodor Nöldeke, became ordinary professor for Semitic languages. His successors were Paul Kahle (1875-1964; until 1923), Rudolf Strothmann (1877-1960) and Julius Lewy (1895-1963). When the latter was dismissed by the Nazi regime, Oriental studies in Gießen came to a de facto end, until a seminary for Oriental studies with a chair for Islamic studies was established in 1961.²³⁰ In 2003 the seminary was extended by an institute of Turkology headed by Mark Kirchner.

228 Cf. http://www.ioa.uni-bonn.de/institut/geschichte_des_ioa (June 10, 2010).

229 Cf. <http://web.uni-frankfurt.de/fb09/turkologie/history.html> (June 10, 2010). For the developments until 1971 cf. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, "Das Frankfurter Orient-Institut und die türkischen Studien", in *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen. Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz Bamberg*, 3-6. Juli 1987. Eds. Ingeborg Baldauf, Klaus Kreiser & Semih Tezcan (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 223-233 and id. "Das Wissenschaftliche Institut für die Kultur und Wirtschaft des modernen Orients in Frankfurt a.M. (1917-1971)", in *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser (Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg), 119-120.

230 Cf. Klaus Röhrborn, "Orientalistik an der Gießener Univesität von 1833 bis 1989", in *Kaškül. Festschrift zum 25. Jahrestag der Wiederbegründung des Instituts für Orientalistik an der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), 1-7 and <http://www.uni-giessen.de/orientalistik-alt/Institut/geschich.htm> (June 10, 2010).

Göttingen

The old tradition of Oriental studies in Göttingen, dating back to Heinrich Ewald, has already been mentioned. However, the field of Turkology was institutionalized only in 1970, when Gerhard Doerfer (1920-2001) was appointed to the newly established chair of Turkology.²³¹ Doerfer had studied Romance and English philology and Islamology at the Humboldt University in Berlin. He continued his studies at the Freie Universität in West Berlin in 1952, concentrating on Turkology and Altaistics. In 1954 he received his doctoral degree with a thesis on the syntax of the Secret History of the Mongols. Having engaged in editorial work for the first volume of *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, he received a grant from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* that enabled him to work on and complete his project on Turkic and Mongolic Elements in Modern Persian. He habilitated in 1963 in Göttingen, where he was appointed extraordinary professor in 1966. Several times he lectured as a visiting professor at Indiana University, Bloomington and in the winter term of 1975-1976 at the University of Istanbul. In 1982 the chair of Turkology in Göttingen obtained the status of a seminary. Doerfer retired in 1988.²³² In 1992 he was succeeded by Klaus Röhrborn and in 2008, some years after the latter's retirement, by Jens Peter Laut. Mention should also be made of two Iranologists in Göttingen: Walter Hinz (1906-1992) who supervised the Ph.D. thesis of Nejat Göyünç (1925-2001) and Hans Heinrich Schaefer, Hinz's predecessor, who was the mentor of Omeljan Pritsak (1919-2006). Pritsak, an Ukrainian historian, had become prisoner of war and was thereupon made "*Ostarbeiter*" at the University of Berlin, where he was probably drafted into the "working group Turkistan" (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft Turkestan*). After the war, he came to Göttingen, where he obtained a doctoral degree in "Turkology and Altaistic, Islamic and Slavic studies" with a study on the Karakhanid Empire in 1948. In 1951 he defended his habilitation thesis on tribes and titles of the Altaic peoples ("Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der altaischen Völker"). From 1954 until 1966 he was the editor of the periodical *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*. Having been professor in Hamburg since 1957, he was appointed professor of Turkology at the University of Washington in Seattle in 1961. In 1964 he moved to Harvard, where he managed to initiate the institute for Ukrainian studies.²³³

Hamburg

In 1919 the Colonial Institute was integrated into the newly established University of Hamburg. Its director Rudolf Tschudi returned to Switzerland. He was succeeded by Hellmut Ritter. After Ritter, the Islamicist Rudolf Strothmann held the chair from 1927 until his retirement in 1947.²³⁴ He was succeeded in 1948 by Bertold Spuler, who made

231 Wolfhart Westendorf, "Zur Geschichte der Göttinger Orientalistik", in *Die Geschichte der Verfassung und der Fachbereiche der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, ed. Hans-Günther Schlotter (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 117-118.

232 Lars Johanson, "Gerhard Doerfer (1920-2003)", *Turkic Languages* 8 (2004), 3-4.

233 Lubomyr A. Hajda, "Omeljan Pritsak: A Biographical Sketch", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3-4 (1979-1980), 1-6.

234 Cf. Achim Rohde, "Zur Geschichte der Abteilung für Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orients (Islamwissenschaft)", in *Vom Kolonialinstitut zum Asien-Afrika-Institut*, ed. Ludwig Paul (Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2008), 135-140.

Hamburg an important center of Oriental studies, including Turkology. He retired in 1980. Spuler was an encyclopedic scholar, who earned fame not only for editing the multi-volume *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. He was equally interested in the history of Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Notably, he was a specialist in Mongol history in Iran and Russia (his study on the Ilkhanids in Iran was translated into Turkish in 1957)²³⁵ and the history of Eastern Christianity. He was a member of the Old Catholic Church that had split from the Roman Catholic Church over the issue of the *ex cathedra* papal infallibility, decreed by the First Vatican Council in 1871. He was strictly conservative. His diehard conservatism, however, did not prevent him from embarking on close collaboration with the Nazi Regime. Spuler's reputation was severely damaged during the student protests of the late 1960s, when he lost countenance on one occasion, yelling at protesting students that they deserved to be put into concentration camps.²³⁶

Turkish had come to Hamburg with Rudolf Tschudi in 1910.²³⁷ Not long after that, Mustafa Refik Bey and Bakır Bakıroğlu were teaching Turkish at the Colonial Institute. During the First World War, Turkish studies had become more important than Arabic. But after Ritter had been dismissed in 1926, Turkish studies began to decline at the University of Hamburg. Turkology reemerged only after the Second World War, when Annemarie von Gabain was appointed extraordinary professor for Turkology and Chinese Buddhism in 1949. When, in the last years of Spuler's directorship and against his will, the seminary for Oriental studies was divided into three sections, Turkology became one of them. From 1952 Omeljan Pritsak taught at the University of Hamburg. In 1957 he was appointed professor. In 1961 he moved to the United States.²³⁸ After von Gabain was retired in 1966, Barbara Flemming re-oriented the emphasis of Turkology in Hamburg back to Ottoman and Turkish philology, history and literature. In 1979 she accepted a position at the University of Leiden. Turkish studies in Hamburg were also shaped by Hanna Sohrweide (1919-1984), a noted specialist in Persian and Ottoman manuscripts. After having taught at the department for many years, she was appointed professor in 1980. From 1981 until her premature death in 2004, Petra Kappert (1945-2004) held the professorship for Turkology. In 2006 Raoul Motika succeeded her.

Any description of contemporary Oriental studies in Hamburg would be incomplete without mention of the *Deutsche Orient Institut* that was established in 1960.²³⁹ From 1976 until 2007, it was headed by Udo Steinbach, who has a background in Oriental studies. Turkey formed one of his main research interests. Altogether the institute leaned more towards political science and is today part of the German Institute for Global and Regional Studies.²⁴⁰

235 *İran Moğolları. Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür İlhanlılar Devri, 1220-1350*, trans. Cemal Köprülü (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957).

236 Rohde, "Zur Geschichte", 141-142.

237 For the following cf. Raoul Motika, "Zur Geschichte des Arbeitsbereichs für Turkologie", in *Vom Kolonialinstitut zum Asien-Afrika-Institut*, ed. Ludwig Paul, (Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2008), 150-155.

238 Hajda, "Omeljan Pritsak", 4.

239 It should not be confounded with the *Orient-Institut Istanbul* with which it has no organizational link.

240 Rohde, "Zur Geschichte", 146.

Heidelberg (see above)

Mainz

After the reopening of the University of Mainz²⁴¹ in 1946, Helmuth Scheel held the chair for Islamic studies and philology and was the first director of the Oriental seminary. He retired in 1963. Scheel's successor was Johannes Benzing (1913-2001), who became extraordinary professor in 1959 and held the chair from 1963 until 1981. Benzing had studied in Berlin with Richard Hartmann, Hans Heinrich Schaefer, Walther Björkman, Annemarie von Gabain and the Mongolist and Sinologist Erich Haenisch (1880-1966). He learned Tatar from Saadet Çagatay. He also attended classes at the SOS. Among his teachers was Gotthard Jäschke. Benzing received his Ph.D. in 1939 with a thesis on the verbal system of Turkmen ("Über die Verbformen im Turkmenischen") and completed his habilitation in 1942 with a study on the Chuvash language ("Tschuwaschische Forschungen").²⁴² A member of the NSDAP since 1940, he accepted a position in the German foreign office. Between 1950 and 1955, he lived in Paris, working for the French foreign office. In 1953 he became a member of the Academy of Sciences and Literature founded by Scheel in Mainz. It may be assumed that his career was supported by the latter. Since Benzing, who continued the tradition of the Bang school, Turkology in Mainz has been a stronghold of linguistic studies. After his retirement, his chair for Islamic studies was changed to a chair for Turkology, which was held by Lars Johanson until his retirement in 2001. Johanson has been followed by Hendrik Boschoeten in 2002. After completing his habilitation in 1975, Ottomanist Hans Jürgen Kornrumpf became extraordinary professor in Mainz. When he retired in 1991, his position was not filled again.

Munich

Oriental studies in Munich did not have a very strong tradition in the early 19th century. Since 1833 Karl Friedrich Neumann (1793-1870) had been professor for Armenian and Chinese, but as a Sinologist he had not a very good reputation among his colleagues.²⁴³ In the same year, the Bavarian crown prince (later king) Maximilian II (1811-1864) sent Marcus Johann Müller (1809-1874) to de Sacy in Paris and to Leiden, where he was interested above all in Pahlavi. During his time at the *lyceum* in Augsburg, Müller had become the favorite pupil of the famous Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790-1861) who belonged to the circle around Maximilian.²⁴⁴ In 1837 the philosophical faculty of the University of Munich refused his application for professorship with the argument that there was no need for a professor teaching Arabic and Persian. It was only in 1847 that Müller became ordinarius in Munich. He was suc-

241 The chronology given below is based on <http://www.orientalistik.uni-mainz.de/geschichte.html> (May 15, 2010).

242 Lars Johanson, "Johannes Benzing (1913-2001)", *Turkic Languages* 5 (2001), 165-166.

243 This is at least true for Wilhelm Schott. Cf. his harsh criticism of Neuman in his letter to Gabelentz in 1837, quoted in Hartmut Walravens ed., "Freilich lag in den zu überwindenden Schwierigkeiten ein besonderer Reiz..." *Briefwechsel der Sprachwissenschaftler Hans Conon von der Gabelentz, Wilhelm Schott und Anton Kiefer, 1834-1874* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 37-38.

244 Franz Babinger, "Ein Jahrhundert morgenländischer Studien an der Münchener Universität", *ZDMG* 107 (1957), 248.

ceeded by Ernst Trumpp (1828-1885). In 1868 Martin Haug (1826-1876) was appointed to the newly established chair of Sanskrit and comparative linguistics. His successor became Ernst Kuhn (1846-1920). Before they came to Munich, both Haug and Trumpp had spent some time in India where they ruined their health, a fact that may have contributed to their early deaths. Trumpp's chair remained vacant until 1892, when Fritz Hommel (1854-1936) was appointed ordinarius for Semitic philology, a position he held until his retirement in 1925. He was one of the most prominent supporters of the hypothesis of a linguistic relationship between the Sumerian and the Turkic languages.²⁴⁵ Turkish studies eventually came to play a major role in Munich with a man whose importance in German Turkish studies has long been ignored: Karl Süßheim (1878-1947).²⁴⁶ He was an offspring of a wealthy Jewish family in Nuremberg. After his military service, he studied history in Jena, Munich, Erlangen and Berlin. In 1902 he wrote a Ph.D. thesis on the political situation of his homeland Franconia between Prussia and Austria in the 18th century. In Berlin he began to study Arabic and Turkish at the SOS. From 1902 to 1904 Süßheim lived and studied in Constantinople. He subsequently edited the early 14th century chronicle *al-'Urāḍa fī hikāyat al-Salcūkiyya* by Ibn al-Nizām. In 1908, being in Cairo, he became friends with Dr. Abdullah Cevdet. He returned to Istanbul in the wake of the restoration of the constitution in summer 1908. In 1911 he became unsalaried lecturer at the University of Munich "for the history of the Muhammedan peoples" teaching Turkish and later also Persian and Arabic. In 1919 he was appointed extraordinary professor but never became ordinarius. Among his students were Franz Babinger, Anton Spitaler, Bertold Spuler and Hans Joachim Kissling, all of whom were to become noted Orientalists. He taught in Munich until he was removed from the university in June 1933. Having lost his fortune, he stayed as a private scholar in Munich. In the beginning of 1941, he was able to move to Istanbul with the help of Turkish friends, where he taught at the University of Istanbul. He died in 1947 and was buried at the Ashkenazi cemetery in Ortaköy.

In 1948, Franz Babinger was appointed to a newly established professorship for Turkology. He spent much effort to provide his new institute with a decent stock of literature. In 1959 his assistant Hans Joachim Kissling (1912-1985), who after his habilitation in 1949 had become *Privatdozent*, succeeded Babinger in Munich. Kissling had studied Oriental studies and international law in Munich, Vienna and Breslau. Among his teachers were Gotthelf Bergsträsser, Fritz Hommel, Karl Süßheim, Franz Taeschner, Wilhelm Geiger, Herbert Jansky, Theodor Seif, Friedrich Giese and Carl Brockelmann.²⁴⁷ Kissling had a phenomenal knowledge of languages; he had a proficiency in over forty and spoke about fifteen.²⁴⁸ Among his research interests counted Ottoman linguistics

245 Klaus Kreiser, *Atatürk. Bir Biyografi*, transl. Dilek Zaptçioğlu (Istanbul: İletişim, 2010), 341.

246 Barbara Flemming, "Karl Süßheim (1878-1947) zum 100. Geburtstag", *Der Islam* 56 (1979), 1-8; id. & Jan Schmidt (Eds.): *The Diary of Karl Süßheim (1878 - 1947), Orientalist Between Munich and Istanbul* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002). Süßheim kept his diary in Arabic script first in Ottoman Turkish and later in the Arabic language.

247 Hans Georg Majer, "Hans Joachim Kießling (1912-1985)", *Der Islam* 65 (1988), 190-199.

248 Brigitte Moser-Weithmann, "Hans Joachim Kissling -eine persönliche Erinnerung", *Münchener Zeitschrift für Balkankunde* 5 (1983-1984), 183.

and philology, which resulted e. g. in the publications of his Ottoman-Turkish Grammar,²⁴⁹ and several works on Islamic-Ottoman piety, popular religion and the dervish orders, especially the *Bayramiyye* and the *Bektaşiyye*, the relations between Venetia and the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman military administration. Kissling took a special interest in Sultan Bayezid, the son of Mehmed Fatih to whom he dedicated numerous articles without, however, being able to complete a planned biographical monograph on him. Finally, he initiated the longstanding research project on the historical topography of the Balkans, a subject he had already explored in his habilitation thesis.²⁵⁰ Together with Bedriye Atsız, he published a collection of Turkish idioms in 1974.²⁵¹ Among Kissling's disciples were Buğra Atsız, Kemal Beydilli, Karl Binswanger, Konrad Dilger, Ctirad Heeren-Sarka, Klaus Kreiser, Eberhard Krüger, Hans-Peter Laqueur, Hans Georg Majer, Brigitte Moser-Weithmann, Hedda Reindl-Kiel, Gerhard Rettelbach and Şenay Yola.²⁵² Kissling retired in 1980. His successor became Hans-Georg Majer.²⁵³ During the years 1987–2007, Suraiya Faroqhi, who had been assistant professor at METU in Ankara, held an extraordinary professorship at the institute in Munich. Since 2008, Christoph K. Neumann has been holding the chair for Turkology.

The focus of the present overview is on Turkish studies in the tradition of Oriental studies. Owing to the limited scope of this outline and because they make a good indicator for the degree of institutionalization of an academic discipline in the current system of German universities, we have restricted ourselves to the mention of professorship positions in the academic and institutional tradition of Oriental studies. It should be noted, however, that it would be misleading to conclude that Turkish studies in Germany have been restricted to the works of the people named or that Turkish studies have been limited to the tradition of Oriental studies. But it was only in the framework of Oriental studies that at least a certain degree of university-based institutionalization could be achieved.

Of the number of important scholars from other academic disciplines that through personal research interest made notable contributions to the field, not all can possibly be enumerated here - but at least a few deserve special mention.²⁵⁴ In addition, there are also Orientalist scholars like Annemarie Schimmel (1922-2003) or Karl Emil Oskar Jahn (1906-1985),²⁵⁵ who worked and taught abroad but still published at least partly in German.

249 *Osmanisch-türkische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960).

250 *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956).

251 *Sammlung Türkischer Redensarten* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974).

252 Majer, "Münchner Institut", 198.

253 A list of his publications until 2002 in *Arts, Women and Scholars. Studies in Ottoman Society and Culture. Festschrift Hans Georg Majer*, eds. Sabine Prätör & Christoph K. Neumann (Istanbul: Simurg, 2002), vol. 1, xv-xxiv.

254 Cf. Eugen Wirth, "Orientalistik und Orientforschung. Aufgaben und Probleme aus der Sicht der Nachbarwissenschaften", in *ZDMG*, Supplement III.1, lxii-lxv.

255 On him cf. *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, "Jahn, Karl Emil Oskar." (J. T. P. de Bruijn) = <http://www.iranica.com/articles/jahn-karl-emil-oskar> (June 17, 2010).

Mention should be made of Karl Steuerwald (1905-1989), the author of the still unsurpassed Turkish-German dictionary and the Islamic art historian Katharina Otto-Dorn (1908-1999), who made important contributions to the study of Seljuk art. She was professor at the University of Ankara between 1954 and 1967, before she moved to the University of California in Los Angeles.²⁵⁶ The jurist Ernst E. Hirsch (1902-1985) was the outstanding expert of Turkish law. After having been forced to leave Nazi-Germany in 1933, he had taught at the universities of Istanbul and Ankara until his return to Germany in 1952. He retained his Turkish citizenship until his death.²⁵⁷

Among scholars of a younger generation who come to mind here are the architect and ethnologist Peter Alford Andrews.²⁵⁸ He assumed responsibility for the monumental overview of the ethnic groups of Turkey for the research project *Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients*²⁵⁹ and penned an equally groundbreaking and encyclopedic work on the nomadic tent.²⁶⁰ The geographers Wolf-Dieter Hütteroth, who authored a reference work on the human geography of Turkey,²⁶¹ and Ernst Struck at the University of Passau,²⁶² the economist Şefik Alp Bahadır who is professor for contemporary Oriental studies at the University of Erlangen,²⁶³ are of note, along with the historians Fikret Adanır, who until his retirement in 2007, taught at the Ruhr University in Bochum, and Hans-Lukas Kieser at the University of Zürich.²⁶⁴

Finally, two institutes for Turkish studies not linked to universities should be mentioned: The Orient Institute Istanbul²⁶⁵ that emerged as a branch of the *Orient Institut der DMG in Beirut* during the Lebanese Civil war and the *Stiftung Zentrum Türkestudien (Türkiye Araştırmalar Merkezi Vakfı)* located in Essen.²⁶⁶ While the first

256 Cf. Joachim Gierlich, "Katharina Otto-Dorn (1908-1999)", *ZDMG* 152 (2002), 5-9.

257 Cf. Hilmar Krüger, "Zum Gedenken: Ernst E. Hirsch (1902-1985)", 141-153; the interview with his son Enver Tandoğan Hirsch in *Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkischen Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945*, eds. Christopher Kubasek & Günter Seufert (Würzburg: Ergon, 2008), 209-216.

258 Cf. his webpage at <http://www.andrewspeter.info/> (June 17, 2010).

259 *Ethnic Groups in Turkey* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1989). (Beihefte zum *Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients: Reihe B, Geisteswissenschaften*, Nr. 60).

260 *Felt Tents and Pavilions: The Nomadic Tradition and its Interaction with Princely Tentage*. 2 vols., (London: Melisende, 1999) (Kölner Ethnologische Mitteilungen, Sonderband).

261 *Türkei* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982) (*Wissenschaftl. Länderkunde* 21); a revised second edition together with Volker Höfeld appeared in 2002. For a list of monographic publications by Hütteroth cf. <http://www.geographie.uni-erlangen.de/pers/huetteroth/publikationen.html> (June 17, 2010).

262 Cf. his CV and list of publications at <http://www.phil.uni-passau.de/die-fakultaet/lehrstuehle-professuren/geographie/fachbereich-geographie/personal/prof-dr-ernst-struck.html> (June 17, 2010).

263 Cf. his CV on <http://www.orient.uni-erlangen.de/bahadir.htm> and list of publications on <http://www.orient.uni-erlangen.de/forschun/bahadir.htm> (June 17, 2010).

264 Cf. his webpage at <http://www.hist.net/kieser/> (June 17, 2010).

265 *1961-1991 Orient Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Herausgegeben anlässlich seines 30jährigen Bestehens. Beirut - Istanbul: Orient Inst. d. Dt. Morgenl. Ges., 1991; Christoph K. Neumann, "Das Orient-Institut der DMG in Istanbul", in *Turkologie heute - Tradition und Perspektive*, eds. Nurettin Demir & Erika Taube (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998), 205-210; Maurus Reinkowski, "Ausweichstelle, zweites Standbein, Außenstelle, Zweigstelle, Abteilung – Die wechselvolle Geschichte des Orient-Instituts in Istanbul", *Istanbuler Almanach* 1 (1997), 73-83. For its webpage cf. <http://www.oidmg.org/istanbul> (June 18, 2010).

266 Cf. <http://www.zft-online.de/> (June 18, 2010).

institution represents the Orientalist tradition of Turkish studies, the second one is rather linked to applied social sciences, focusing on migration studies.

Questions of Innovation and Ideology

Why does someone become an Orientalist? A common characteristic among those who do is a language aptitude that is above average and an early inclination for learning languages that goes beyond those languages taught at school. It occurs much more rarely that someone is drawn to the Orient in the first place by historical questions (historical in the widest sense of the term) and embraces the hard study of languages as a means to this end, without the hope of being able to equal the language virtuoso. But the latter's virtuosity does not give an indication of his overall intellectual capacity. It has been said about the cardinal Mezzofanti that he knew some forty languages but had nothing to say in any of them. The language expert has to avoid his skills degenerating into an end in themselves. He should use them as a means to bring to light and to acquire intellectual values (*geistige Werte*) that make his work and thus himself complete and whole.²⁶⁷

Schaeder wrote these words in 1940 in an obituary for the Assyriologist and Hittitologist Hans Ehelolf (1891-1939). The hegemony of philology in Oriental studies did not come to an end with Becker. The critical implication of Schaeder's statement was that for Orientalists knowing many languages had a certain tendency to become an end in itself and a fetish, as is testified by Hellmut Ritter who wrote in a letter in 1933:

As I am personally much attached to the texts, I may be allowed to say that I welcome the extension of the area of research of the Orientalist into the field of historical, archaeological and political questions owed among us mostly to Becker. But much to my regret, this field frequently has become the romping playground of linguistically untalented people. It is not enough to be allegedly musically gifted; one has to master the technique, otherwise the result will be a mess. History of material culture (*Realienkunde*) and Turkology: nice stuff; but if someone says his special field is Turkish, I cannot help the feeling that I have an urge to say: I see, Arabic was too difficult for you, my dear fellow.²⁶⁸

This was written to mock Babinger, who somewhat exaggeratedly attacked the dominance of philology in Oriental studies.²⁶⁹ That multilingualism and philology had become the crucial acid test for scholarly qualification and legitimation in Oriental studies may be gleaned from a small treatise in defense of Turkish and Ottoman studies formulated by his successor on the chair in Munich, Hans Joachim Kissling. He requires the aspiring Ottomanist to know, in addition to Arabic, Persian and Turkish,

²⁶⁷ Quoted after Wokocek, *German Orientalism*, 210 and 309 n. 1. Translation altered.

²⁶⁸ Quoted in Lier, "Hellmut Ritter", 351.

²⁶⁹ He had made himself especially hated among his colleagues when in 1933, he and Walther Hinz published a memorandum that criticized the state of Oriental studies in Germany as being too philologically oriented and submitted proposals for its reform; cf. Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, 144; Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, 150-151; Wokocek, *German Orientalism*, 190. Already in 1919, Babinger had been critical about that topic; cf. Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 477.

both medieval and modern Greek, all Slavic languages in use on the Balkans, Albanian, Romanian and Italian in all its relevant historical -Venetian and other- variants.²⁷⁰ Clearly these linguistic requirements were not only formulated as an ideal for competent research, but also in defense of Ottoman studies against the accusation of being pursued by people, who had failed to master Arabic (and the rest of the Semitic and Iranian languages).

What Colin Heywood has called “the Braudel-Barkanic Second Age of Ottoman historical scholarship”²⁷¹ was based less on extensive knowledge of all possibly relevant languages, but on new methodological approaches in historiography and on the use of new types of sources. I do not want to pit sociological and historical methodology against philology and multilingualism. Both are important. The philological standards set by Kraelitz, Fekete and their colleagues are indispensable. Today, it may be more the lack of truly multilingual scholars than the lack of methodological awareness that forms the main obstacle to progress in Ottoman and Turkish studies. But when it came to writing history, the lack of methodological awareness of Oriental studies in fields beyond philology cannot be denied. One may even argue that the philological paradigms were uncritically transferred to the field of history, e. g. when noted Orientalists like Nöldeke, Brockelmann or Schaefer called into question that Turkish peoples had made any worthwhile contribution to Islamic culture.²⁷² Andreas Tietze (who certainly understood much of philology and knew a lot of languages) summed up the characteristics of the post-German and post-philological age in Ottoman studies in five points:

- 1) emancipation from philology,
- 2) preference for archival sources,
- 3) experiments with quantitative methods,
- 4) an emphasis on research on institutions and on social and economic questions,
- 5) the shift of interest from the early Ottoman period with its chronic lack of sources to the source-rich 16th and 19th centuries.²⁷³ Two other developments have been noted by Tietze: the internationalization of scholarship, and the increasing importance of the contributions made by Turkish scholars in the field.

However, the “second age of Ottomanist scholarship” ended sometime in the 1980s and Ottoman studies began to include cultural history, anthropological, and later post-modernist and post-colonial approaches.

At the current stage, Turkish studies in Germany are immersed in the international scholarly discourse and exchange. Nevertheless the continuation of their Orientalist tradition -certainly on the institutional level- continues to attract criticism.

270 Hans Joachim Kissling, “Die türkischen Studien in der Orientalistik”, *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch* 12.2-3 (1962), 221.

271 Colin Heywood, “Between Historical Myth and ‘Mythohistory’: the Limits of Ottoman History”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988), 340.

272 Jens Peter Laut, “Carl Brockelmann und die türkische Sprachreform”, in *Strukturelle Zwänge - Persönliche Freiheiten*, ed. Hendrik Fenz (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 278-279.

273 Andreas Tietze, “Mit dem Leben gewachsen. Zur osmanischen Geschichtsschreibung in den letzten fünfzig Jahren”, in *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1789: Entspannung und Austausch*, eds. Gernot Heiss & Grete Klingenstein (München: Oldenbourg, 1983), 17-18.

An often repeated critique in Germany states that Oriental studies (and within its ranks: Turkish studies) were reclusive and refusing to leave their academic ivory tower. This argument either explicitly adds or tacitly implies that the legitimacy of an academic discipline correlates to its general usefulness.

This argument, in its strong version, leads to the consequence that Oriental studies engage in current social, political and cultural problems of what is considered to be of public relevance in the mass media. This critique therefore requests that scholars take a public stance in the political debate.

There are at least two caveats to this request:

- 1) In the history of Oriental studies in Germany, there were two waves of public engagement of Orientalists that were generally regretted afterwards. It may be objected that neither the imperialist designs of Wilhelminian Germany and its politics of war, nor the racism of National Socialism, are comparable to the liberal democratic discourse of the Federal German Republic and that the consequent political engagement of scholars was therefore structurally different. This difference cannot be denied. But the question, whether political interests match the ethical requirements of scholarly and scientific work or not, lies somewhere beyond this difference. The “war on terror”, with its restriction of civil liberties within the framework of neo-liberalism, is an example of a policy that is situated beyond the scope of Orientalist know-how. Political statements of Orientalists are bound to either operate within the limits of this political discourse or to transgress the borders of their disciplinary competence. They may of course take a public stance against these policies but they cannot do so as Orientalists.
- 2) The functioning of mass media within the public political discourse may prove incompatible with the requirements of scholarly discourse. Specifically, situating Turkish studies in the national public discourse will easily lead to conflict between political and scholarly perspectives. A case in point is the fate of the *Stiftung Zentrum Türkeistudien* (Center for Studies on Turkey) located in Essen, Germany. Its director, Faruk Şen, was practically dismissed in 2008 after having publicly compared the situation of Turkish immigrants in Europe with the historical discrimination of Jews on the continent.²⁷⁴ While in the academic context it is, of course, more than risky to embark on drawing historical parallels of that scope, to draw such a parallel in the mass media of the public sphere necessarily means joining a different game. It is no longer a scholarly statement that may be open to possibly fierce debate and criticism, but a political announcement that is bound to be evaluated along the lines of the existing political discourse. In the German political discourse, such a statement is bound to be perceived as a hostile act and a verbal aggression without moral justification or historical factuality. One may argue that it was as much Şen’s own nationalist agenda as his lack of knowledge about the red lines in the German political discourse that brought about his downfall. But the basic prob-

274 Şen made these statements in an article that appeared in the Turkish paper *Referans* on May 19, 2008. For the scandal this article created in Germany cf. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, June 23, 2008 “Faruk Şen: ‘Die Türken sind die neuen Juden’”, and *ibid.*, June 26, 2008, “Zentrum für Türkeistudien. Vorstand will Faruk Şen entlassen.”

lem may be more structural than personal. According to its self-definition, “the objectives of the Center for Studies on Turkey are to promote German-Turkish relations and the level of knowledge and information about Turkey and Turkish migrants in Europe, to advance the cooperation between Turkey, Germany and other European countries and also to support research and public relations.”²⁷⁵ What we have here is a fusion of political and scientific missions that totally ignores the possibility of conflicting interests. Even if we follow Habermas in assuming that assertions of truth should be the result of negotiation, this would require an ideal speech situation, which is not a given circumstance in the context of political discourse in modern mass media. I have chosen an example from the German political discourse, but it would be easy to imagine examples how German Turkologists’ political statements could upset the Turkish public.

Besides the strong version discussed above, there is a weaker version of the argument against the academic ivory tower of Orientalist studies that would refrain from obliging Turkish studies to interfere in public political debates, but instead press it to choose its interests of research according to the agenda of political exigency. Instead of linguistics and Seljuk or Ottoman studies, this argument proposes, the main focus of Turkish studies should be the current state of law, politics, society and economy in the Republic of Turkey. Within the confines of a neo-liberal utilitarian conception of knowledge as a commodity, it is difficult to argue against this proposition. In the words of the Austrian Iranologist Bert Fagner: “Some fifty years ago, the leading layers of our societies were basically convinced that scholarly searching for the unknown, the alien, the not yet discovered, were to be acknowledged as sound cultural values and were therefore to be served by administrative and financial institutions. This conviction does not anymore exist [...]”²⁷⁶

This is not to defend the contrary proposition that the social irrelevance of academic knowledge should be pushed to the extreme, but to argue that requiring Turkish studies to be of short-term public utility implies the obligation to serve political ends and comes at the cost of its scholarly character. Paradoxically, this would be also true for the proposition to serve the mutual understanding between Turkey and Germany by requesting Turkologists to enter the stage of public political discourse in the mass media because both political conflict of interest and conflicting usage of symbols in political discourse between nation states cannot be resolved under the assumption of the identity of political and academic discourses. It is my contention here that Turkish studies may serve the end of mutual understanding between the two countries best by keeping the coupling between the academic field of Turkish studies and politics as loose as possible; by allowing the academic discourse to function according to its own discursive rules.

275 <http://www.zft-online.de/> (June 11, 2010). This analysis is shared by the Center’s spokesman Dirk Halm; cf. Miriam Lau: “Faruk Şen und sein finsteres Deutschlandbild”, *Welt Online* (July 5, 2008), http://www.welt.de/politik/article2179999/Faruk_Sen_und_sein_finsteres_Deutschlandbild.html.

276 Bert G. Fagner, *Oriental Studies, Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies in Germany (An Overview)* (Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo, 2001) (Islamic Area Studies Working Paper Series 24), 10.

There is another critique directed against Oriental studies that targets the epistemic character of its discourse by contending its functional subordination to Western colonialism / imperialism. I am speaking of post-colonial theory that was to a great extent inspired by Edward Said's polemical book *Orientalism*. Much ink has been spilt on Said's book. It may serve as a suitable starting point for discussion more for its history of effect (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) than because of its actual scholarly achievements.²⁷⁷ It has been claimed -by Edward Said himself- that the absence of direct colonial involvement during most of the 19th century in the German lands made the German Oriental studies some sort of a special case that ought to be considered "less Orientalist" than the French and British models. But it would be rather surprising if German Oriental studies, in this respect, were essentially different from their European counterparts simply for the reason that, from their very beginnings, these studies in Germany formed a highly international enterprise within an international but, of course, exclusively European (including North America) network of scholars who in many respects must have shared their common knowledge within a common discourse.²⁷⁸ The phenomenon of Orientalism, after all, has been positioned at the epistemic level of discourse and must not be confounded with the simple expression (or the verbal camouflage) of direct economic and political colonial interests. Even then, it will be remembered, that this difference between Germany on the one side and France, Great Britain and Russia on the other melted away as Germany under Kaiser Wilhelm II entered the stage of European colonial rivalry during the high age of imperialism.

In a remarkable study of 1990, the Orientalist Baber Johansen has argued that Orientalism in Germany was a product of historicism in its Rankean interpretation and that Oriental studies may have reinforced Orientalism but they did so in serving historicism. As Johansen wrote: "The ideological authority of scholarly disciplines depends largely on their functional contribution to the reproduction of the political, economic, social and cultural order of their society. In this respect, Oriental studies have always ranked low."²⁷⁹ Historicism, according to Johansen, had excluded the Orient from world historical agency, relegating it to the role of an historical object.²⁸⁰ Lacking knowledge of Turkish, Ranke wrote about Ottoman history using Venetian sources. He could have

277 Cf. Polaschegg, *Orientalismus*, 28-38; Osterhammel, *Entzauberung*, 409-411.

278 This is confirmed by Bahodir Sidikov's study on the 19th century German studies on Middle Asia. Sidikov reaches the conclusion that the ideological base of the German studies on Middle Asia was not different from that of French or British Orientalist scholarship. Cf. Bahodir Sidikov, "Deutsche Mittelasiestudien (1852-1914) im Lichte der Orientalismus-Diskussion", in *Der Orient in akademischer Optik*, ed. Ludmila Hanisch (Halle: OWZ, 2006), 23. Cf. also Mangold, *Wissenschaft*, 273-274 who reaches a similar conclusion.

279 Johansen, Baber, "Politics and Scholarship. The Development of Islamic Studies in the Federal Republic of Germany", in *Middle East Studies. International Perspectives on the State of the Art*, ed. Tareq Y. Ismael (New York etc.: Praeger, 1990), 116.

280 *Ibid.*, 80-82. Birgit Schäbler, "Historismus versus Orientalismus? Oder: Zur Geschichte einer Wahlverwandtschaft", in *Das Unbehagen in der Islamwissenschaft*, eds. Abbas Poya & Maurus Reinkowski (Bielefeld: transcript, 2008), 51-70 has taken issue with Johansen's interpretation of the relation between C. H. Becker and Ernst Troeltsch (1865-1923).

used Ottoman sources indirectly by consulting the Ottoman history of Hammer, whom he had met in Vienna. But he preferred not to do so. “What he learned from the Venetians with their political and historical expertise, he would not have been able to find with any Turkish annalist”, Schaefer wrote on Ranke’s disinterest in Ottoman sources.²⁸¹ Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisen (1803-1863), author of a seven-volume Ottoman history had similar ideas. He, too, was not an Orientalist but a historian basing his work on European sources, including, however, some translations of Ottoman chronicles into Western languages.²⁸² Another historicist, the noted Romanian historian, intellectual and politician Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940) perhaps most drastically formulated the classical historicist excuse for both the inability and alleged uselessness to read Ottoman sources. He remarked in the preface to the third volume of his Ottoman history written in German:

“If I had wished to write the national history of the Turkish tribe and if this tribe had seen an intellectual development as the Christian peoples, then, of course, I would have been obliged to know the Turkish language and literature. But there is no Turkish national literature – only a slavish imitation of foreign Oriental patterns in a language that is not even that of the people. The nation of the Turks has never seen any intellectual development.”²⁸³

The Eurocentrism of historicism in the Rankean tradition was a paradigm that was certainly of questionable value for Oriental studies, but it is not clear how much it actually influenced them.

While Baber Johansen in his article generally seems to agree with Said on the assumption that there has been a conspiracy of Orientalism as a mode of imperialist knowledge against the Orient (only that Oriental studies did play a subordinate role in it), two recent studies on German Orientalism try to propose more diversified alternatives to the sharp dichotomy of Said’s Orientalism. Ursula Wokoeck has concentrated on the social dimension of scholarship and argued that the connection between imperialism and Oriental studies was much looser than implied by the concept of Orientalism.²⁸⁴ In a similar vein, Suzanne L. Marchand has argued explicitly against the shortcomings of discourse analysis in much of the Said-inspired scholarly production:

All too often, it seems to me, those who have followed Said’s lead and adopted the Foucauldian tactic of analyzing only the surfaces of the texts they study end up simply reiterating what we know, namely that people make representations for their own purposes; too rarely do they ask about the variety of those purposes, or about the rootedness of those representations in weaker or stronger interpretations of original sources.

281 Cf. Ernst Schulin, *Die weltgeschichtliche Erfassung des Orients bei Hegel und Ranke* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958,) 250.

282 Cf. the critical evaluation by Erich Prokosch, “Johann Wilhelm Zinkeisens, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa*.” *Österreichische Osthefte* 3 (2004), 433-451.

283 Nicolae Iorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches. Nach den Quellen dargestellt* [5 vols.] (Gotha: Perthes, 1908-1913), vol. 3, v.

284 Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 219.

Too frequently, discourses are identified by selectively assembling lines and phrases from disparate texts, and in the attempt to make power relations paramount, modern commentators are led to pick out metaphors or generalizations that have more to do with our own interests than with the author's original ideas. This is not really Foucault's fault; his primary purpose was to offer a philosophical deconstruction of the identities we have unreflectively assumed, and his work has helped us to gain critical purchase on the institutions, sciences, and thought structures of both past and present. But the re-elaboration of his philosophical critiques as historical methodology regularly results in tendentious bricolage, and when applied indiscriminately, this method frequently produces distorted and present-oriented pictures of hypostatized entities such as 'Orientalism'.²⁸⁵

Marchand has also drawn attention to the fact that restricting the critique of Orientalism to an analysis that remains confined to its categorical bifurcation of "the Orient" and "the Occident" has serious consequences resulting in historical misrepresentation and oversimplification.²⁸⁶ Orientalists had their own agenda within the academic institutions and Orientalists of different branches were not free of mutual rivalries. Finally there is a personal level. After all, Orientalists were only few, so that differences in individual thinking or personal animosity may not simply be ruled out statistically. Georg Jacob's grudge against the hegemony of Greek and Latin culture in the German discourse has as little to do with Orientalism as has Martin Hartmann's sudden conversion to a Turkophile at the beginning of the First World War. After the First World War, German Orientalists like Brockelmann (despite his low opinion of the Turkish role in classical Islamic history)²⁸⁷ were sympathizing with the Kemalist movement and the Turkish Republic not only because they represented a Western nationalist concept of statehood, but also because of their successful struggle against the victorious powers of the First World War and the post-War world order deeply resented by these Orientalists. Babinger, who according to the diary of Süßheim, returned from the First World War with a deep resentment of the Turks,²⁸⁸ nevertheless argued strongly against the "myth of Turkish lack of culture (*Kulturlosigkeit*)."²⁸⁹ Scholars specializing in Turkish studies like him and Kissling were resentful of what they regarded as philological Arabocentrism of Oriental studies. In their vigorous defense of Turkish studies, they also tended to indirectly defend the historical importance and achievements of the Turks.²⁹⁰

This is not to say that Orientalism, Eurocentrism and racism were absent in the writings of German Orientalists or Turkologists. But it is to deny that Orientalism,

285 Marchand, *German Orientalism*, xxi.

286 Ibid.

287 He even contributed a preface to Sadri Maksudi Arsal's book *Türk Dili İçin*; cf. Laut, "Carl Brockelmann."

288 Cf. Flemming/Schmidt (eds.), *Diary*, 139.

289 Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1927), v.

290 Cf. *ibid.* and Kissling, "Die türkischen Studien."

Eurocentrism and racism form the essence and the only noteworthy content of their scholarly work. Even Martin Hartmann's writings that are frequently outrageously distressing and annoying in their reviling of "Oriental" peoples and personalities still contain information that makes them useful and interesting sources – not only for the study of Orientalist discourse but also for the history of the Orient they are constructing. Such contradictions and ambivalences must be endured.

Perspectives

One may ask whether Turkish studies in Germany would be better off, if they emancipated themselves from Oriental studies or - drawing the logical consequence - whether Oriental studies should be dissolved and purged from German universities. From a historical perspective, two arguments might speak in favor of such a solution. Firstly, Turkish has been relegated to an inferior status compared to Persian and Arabic by the Orientalist philological tradition, as Babinger and Kissling complained.

It has not been completely rectified even today, although this seems to be now an institutional rather than an ideological phenomenon. Secondly, the very fact of the institutional presence of Oriental studies at German universities is, in itself, very much a historic relic of the past dominances of the theological and historicist paradigms. To dispense of it and either to integrate e.g. Ottoman studies into the departments of history and the study of Islam into the departments of religious studies or to change them into area studies would visibly dispense with this problematic heritage of the Orientalist tradition.

One should, however, also take a look at the cost side. While Oriental studies in Germany today possess a certain academic institutionalization, their dissolution into larger disciplines or into "applied area studies" in times of neo-liberal pressures on universities' humanities departments by free-market fundamentalists and strained public budgets, might easily lead to a qualitative and quantitative erosion of the scholarly substance of both Oriental and Turkish studies. In practical terms, it is not easily imaginable that history departments would sustain the considerable propaedeutic efforts and the costs necessary to teach Ottoman palaeography, while Ottoman Turkish naturally would be excluded from courses on business Turkish. A similar picture could be drawn for linguistic Turkic studies. Under these circumstances the current institutional presence of Oriental and Turkish studies at the universities may be regarded to function as - metaphorically speaking - "affirmative action policies" for an academic field of knowledge that is in danger of being totally marginalized. In this perspective, it should be preferable for Turkish studies in Germany to cope with the burdens of their Orientalist heritage.

Appendix

Universities in Germany with a department / chair with a special interest in Turkish / Ottoman Studies in the tradition of Oriental studies (2010).

University	Institution	URL	Main fields of interest*
Bamberg	Institut für Orientalistik: Turkologie	http://www.uni-bamberg.de/turkologie/	OE, TR, HS
Berlin, Freie Universität	Institut für Turkologie	http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/turkologie/institut/index.html	CA, LG, HS
Berlin, Humboldt Universität	Institut für Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften: Zentralasien-Seminar	http://www2.hu-berlin.de/zentralasien/index.php	CA, TR, LG, HS, LT
Bonn	Institut für Asien- und Orientwissenschaften: Orientalische und Asiatische Sprachen, Arbeitsbereich Nahost	http://www.ioa.uni-bonn.de/abteilungen/orientalische-und-asiatische-sprachen/arbeitsbereich-nahost	TR, LG
Frankfurt/Main	Institut für Orientalische und Ostasiatische Philologien: Turkologie	http://www.uni-frankfurt.de/fb/fb09/ophil/turkologie/index.html	CA, TR, LG, HS, LT
Freiburg/Breisgau	Orientalisches Seminar: Islamwissenschaft	http://www.orient.uni-freiburg.de/islam	OE, TR, HS
Gießen	Professur für Turkologie	http://www.uni-giessen.de/cms/fbz/fb04/institute/turkologie	CA, OE, TR, LT, LG
Göttingen	Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde	http://www.uni-goettingen.de/de/60858.html	CA, TR, HS, LG
Hamburg	Asien-Afrika-Institut: Abteilung Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orients	http://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/voror/	TR, OE, HS, LT
Heidelberg	Seminar für Sprachen und Kulturen des Vorderen Orients: Islamwissenschaft	http://islamwissenschaft.uni-hd.de/index.html	OE, HS
Kiel	Seminar für Orientalistik: Islamwissenschaft	http://www.uni-kiel.de/fakultas/philosophie/orientalistik/index.php?x=http://www.uni-kiel.de/islam/welcome.htm&menu=islamwiss	TR, RL
Mainz	Seminar für Orientkunde: Turkologie	http://www.orientalistik.uni-mainz.de/turkologie.html	CA, TR, HS, LG
München	Institut für den Nahen und Mittleren Osten: Turkologie	http://www.nahe-osten.uni-muenchen.de/ueber_uns/turkologie/index.html	OE, TR, HS, LT

* Abbrev.: OE = Ottoman Empire, TR = Turkey, CA = Central Asia, HS = history, LG = linguistics, LT = literature, RL = religion.

Bibliographical Notes*

a) General

Adıgüzel, M. Sani, "Avusturya'da Türkoloji ve Türkçe Öğretimi", *Türk Dili* 578 (2000), pp. 142-151.

Babinger, Franz, "Die türkischen Studien in Europa bis zum Auftreten Josef von Hammer-Purgstall", *Welt des Islams* 7 (1919), pp. 103-129.

*A comprehensive bibliography is beyond the scope of this study. The following titles are merely intended to be pointers to further reading.

- _____, "Ein Jahrhundert morgenländischer Studien an der Münchner Universität", *ZDMG* 107 (1957), pp. 241-269.
- Benfey, Theodor, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und der orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten*, München: Cotta, 1869 (Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland. Neuere Zeit 8).
- Bihl, Wolfdieter, *Orientalistik an der Universität Wien. Forschungen zwischen Maghreb und Ost- und Südasiens*, Vienna etc.: Böhlau, 2009.
- Brockelmann, Carl, "Die morgenländischen Studien in Deutschland", *ZDMG* 76 (1922), pp. 1-17.
- Demir, Nurettin; Taube, Erika, *Turkologie heute. Tradition und Perspektive*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998.
- Ellinger, Ekkehard, *Deutsche Orientalistik zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus 1933-1945*, Edingen - Neckarhausen: deux mondes, 2006.
- Ess, Josef van, "From Wellhausen to Becker: The Emergence of *Kulturgeschichte* in Islamic Studies", in: *Islamic Studies: A Tradition and its Problems*, ed. Malcolm H. Kerr, Malibu, CA: Undena Publications, 1980, pp. 27-51 (Giorgio Levi Della Vida Conferences 7).
- Fragner, Bert G., *Oriental Studies, Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies in Germany (An Overview)*, Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo, 2001 (Islamic Area Studies Working Paper Series 24).
- Fück, Johann, *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955.
- Haarmann, Ulrich, "Die islamische Moderne bei den Deutschen Orientalisten", in: *Araber und Deutsche. Begegnungen in einem Jahrtausend*, ed. Friedrich H. Kochwasser & Hans R. Roemer, Tübingen - Basel: Host Erdmann, 1974, pp. 56-91.
- Hagen, Gottfried, "German Heralds of Holy War: Orientalists and Applied Oriental Studies", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24.2 (2004), pp. 145-162.
- Hanisch, Ludmila, "Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft", in: *Kulturwissenschaften und Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Jürgen Elvert and Jürgen Nielsen-Sikora, Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008, pp. 503-525.
- _____, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten. Deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.
- _____, (ed.), *Der Orient in akademischer Optik. Beiträge zur Genese einer Wissenschaftsdisziplin*, (Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte 20) Halle: OWZ, 2006.
- Heine, Peter, "Berliner Islamwissenschaft. Ein wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Überblick", in: *Berlin für Orientalisten. Ein Stadtführer*, ed. Gerhard Höpp and Norbert Mattes, Berlin: Das arabisch Buch, 2001, pp. 43-56.
- Heywood, Colin, "Between Historical Myth and 'Mythohistory': the Limits of Ottoman History", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988), pp. 315-345.
- Ileri, Esin, "Turkologie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland - Argumente für einen Strukturwandel", in: *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen*, Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz Bamberg, 3.-6. Juli 1987, ed. Ingeborg Baldauf, Klaus Kreiser and Semih Tezcan, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991, pp. 181-197.
- Johansen, Baber, "Politics and Scholarship. The Development of Islamic Studies in the Federal Republic of Germany", in: *Middle East Studies. International Perspectives on the State of the Art*, ed. Tareq Y. Ismael, New York etc.: Praeger, 1990, pp. 71-130.

- Majer, Hans Georg, "Das Münchner Institut: Tradition und Perspektiven", in: *Turkologie heute - Tradition und Perspektive*. Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Leipzig, 4.-7. Oktober 1994, ed. Nurettin Demir and Erika Taube, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998, pp. 195-203.
- Mangold, Sabine, *Eine «weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft» - Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2004.
- Marchand, Suzanne L., *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship*, Washington, DC etc.: German Historical Institute, 2009.
- Kissling, Hans Joachim, "Die türkischen Studien in der Orientalistik", *Zeitschrift für Kultur- und Austausch* 12.2-3 (1962), pp. 218-221.
- Kreiser, Klaus, "Clio's poor Relation: Betrachtungen zur osmanischen Historiographie von Hammer-Purgstall bis Stanford Shaw", in: *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683-1789: Entspannung und Austausch*, ed. Gernot Heiss, Grete Klingenstein, München: Oldenbourg, 1983, pp. 24-43.
- _____, (ed.), *Germano-Turcica. Zur Geschichte des Türkisch-Lernens in den Deutschsprachigen Ländern*, Ausstellung des Lehrstuhls für Türkische Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Universität Bamberg in Zusammenarbeit mit der Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg, Bamberg: Universitätsbibliothek, 1987.
- _____, *Türkische Studien in Europa*. Istanbul: Isis, 1997 (Analecta Isisiana 31).
- Littmann, Enno, *Der deutsche Beitrag zur Wissenschaft vom Orient*, Stuttgart - Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1942.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, *Die Entzauberung Asiens. Europa und die asiatischen Reiche im 18. Jahrhundert*, [New edition], München: C. H. Beck, 2010.
- Paret, Rudi, *Arabistik und Islamkunde an deutschen Universitäten. Deutsche Orientalistik seit Theodor Nöldeke*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1966.
- Paul, Ludwig (ed.), *Vom Kolonialinstitut zum Asien-Afrika-Institut. 100 Jahre Asien- und Afrikanwissenschaften in Hamburg*, Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2008.
- Polaschegg, Andrea, *Der andere Orientalismus. Regeln deutsch-morgenländischer Imagination im 19. Jahrhundert*, Berlin - New York: De Gruyter, 2005.
- Poya, Abbas; Reinkowski, Maurus (eds.), *Das Unbehagen in der Islamwissenschaft. Ein klassisches Fach im Scheinwerferlicht der Politik und der Medien*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2008.
- Preißler, Holger, "Die Anfänge der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft", *ZDMG* 145 (1995), pp. 241-327.
- _____, "Deutsche Orientalisten und die Öffentlichkeit um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts", in: *Akten des 27. Deutschen Orientalistentages (Bonn - 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1998). Norm und Abweichung*, ed. Stefan Wild & Hartmut Schild, Würzburg: Ergon, 2001, pp. 777-784.
- Roemer, Hans Robert, "Spezialisierung, Integration und Innovation in der deutschen Orientalistik", *Welt des Islams* 28.1/4 (1988), pp. 475-495.
- Schaendlinger, Anton Cornelius, "Die Turkologie und Iranistik in Österreich", *Bustan* 4/5 (1963-1964), pp. 8-11.
- Schwab, Raymond, *The Oriental Renaissance. Europe's Discovery of India and the East, 1680-1880*, Transl. by Gene Patterson-Black and Victor Reinking, Foreword by Edward Said, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1984.

- Schulze, Reinhard, "Orientalistik und Orientalismus", in: *Der Islam in der Gegenwart*, ed. Werner Ende & Udo Steinbach, 5th ed., Munich: Beck, 2005, pp. 755-767.
- Sidikov, Bahodir, "Eine unermessliche Region", *Deutsche Bilder und Zerrbilder von Mittelasien 1852-1914*. Berlin: Logos, 2003.
- , "Deutsche Mittelasienstudien (1852-1914) im Lichte der Orientalismus-Diskussion", in: *Der Orient in akademischer Optik*, ed. Ludmila Hanisch, Halle: OWZ, 2006, pp. 19-27. [Essentially a summary of his book *Eine unermessliche Region*.]
- Stauth, Georg, "Civilizing the Soul: German Orientalists", in: *Kaškül. Festschrift zum 25. Jahrestag der Wiederbegründung des Instituts für Orientalistik an der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989, pp. 157-169.
- Tietze, Andreas, "Mit dem Leben gewachsen. Zur osmanischen Geschichtsschreibung in den letzten fünfzig Jahren", in: *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1789: Entspannung und Austausch*, ed. Gernot Heiss & Grete Klingenstein, München: Oldenbourg, 1983, pp. 15-23.
- Waardenburg, Jacques, "The Study of Islam in German Scholarship", in: *Mapping Islamic Studies. Genealogy, Continuity and Change*, ed. Azim Nanji. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997, pp. 1-32.
- Westendorf, Wolfhart, "Zur Geschichte der Göttinger Orientalistik", in: *Die Geschichte der Verfassung und der Fachbereiche der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, ed. Hans-Günther Schlotter, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994, pp. 111-120.
- Wirth, Eugen, "Orientalistik und Orientforschung. Aufgaben und Probleme aus der Sicht der Nachbarwissenschaften", in: *ZDMG*, Supplement III.1. XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg im Breisgau, ed. Wolfgang Voigt. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977, pp. lv-lxxxii.
- Wokoec, Ursula, *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945*, New York etc.: Routledge, 2009.

b) Biographical²⁹¹

- Deutsche Biographie*. <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de> (accessed May 1, 2010). [A common web portal to the digitalized versions of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 56 vols. (1875-1912) and the *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 24 vols. (1953-2010), planned for 28 vols.]
- Hanisch, Ludmila, "Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz. Porträts vertriebener Orientalisten und Orientalistinnen 1933-1945." in: *Orientalwissenschaftliche Hefte* [Halle] 1 (2001), pp. 15-141.
- , *Verzeichnis der Orientalistennachlässe in deutschen Bibliotheken und Archiven*. Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1997 (Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientalwissenschaft 23).
- Littmann, Enno, *Ein Jahrhundert Orientalistik. Lebensbilder aus der Feder von Enno Littmann und Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*, ed. Rudi Paret u. Anton Schall, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957.
- Österreichisches biographisches Lexikon: 1815 - 1950*, ed. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 12 vols., Wien: Verl. der Österr. Akad. der Wiss., 1957-2005.

291 Cf. also the biographical notes of orientalist in Hanisch, *Nachfolger*, pp. 177-212 and in Ellinger, *Orientalistik*, pp. 461-542.

Anhegger, Robert (1911-2001)

Hanisch, "Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz, pp. 20-21.

Ortaylı, İlber, "Yaşayan Türkologlar: XVII. İçimizden Biri Robert Anhegger", *Tarih ve Toplum* 8.46 (1987), pp. 245-246.

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, "Two Young Ottomanists Discover Kemalist Turkey: The Travel Diaries of Robert Anhegger and Andreas Tietze", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26.2 (2002), pp. 359-369.

Babinger, Franz (1891-1967)

Duda, Herbert Wilhelm, "Franz Babinger", in: *Almanach der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 118, Jahrgang (1968), pp. 317-323.

Grimm, Gerhard, "Franz Babinger (1891-1967): Ein lebensgeschichtlicher Essay", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), pp. 286-333.

Kissling, Hans Joachim, "Franz Babinger (1891-1967)", *Südost-Forschungen* 26 (1967), pp. 375-379 [reprinted in: Franz Babinger: *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*. Vol. 3. München: Trofenik, 1976, pp. 338-342; vol. 2 of the same title contains Babinger's publications 1910-1961 (pp. 1-51), vol. 3, [pp. ix-xvii] an addendum covering the years 1961-1968].

Trapp, Erich, "Plagiat in der Geschichtsschreibung Mehmeds II.? Byzantinische Tradition in moderner Zeit", in: *Byzantios. Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Hörandner, J. Koder, O. Kresten & E. Trapp, Vienna: Ernst Becvar, 1984, pp. 321-332.

Bang-Kaup, Willy (1869-1934)

Çagatay, Saadet, "Ölümünün 40. Yıldönümünde Prof. Willy Bang-Kaup'u Anarken (9.8.1869 – 8.10.1934)", *Türk Dili* 278 (1974), pp. 911-914.

Gabain, Annemarie von, "Johannes Wilhelm Max Julius Bang Kaup", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1(1953), p. 576.

Koşay, Hamit Z., "Büyük bir Türkologun Ölümü. Wilhelm Bang Kaup (1869-1934)", *Türk Kültürü* 32.378 (1994), pp. 597-600.

Schaeder, H. H., "Willy Bang Kaup. 9. August 1869 – 8. Oktober 1934", *ZDMG* 88 (1934), pp. 200-203.

Sertkaya, Osman F., "Willy Bang-Kaup, 1869-1934", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı* 1984 (1987), pp. 285-304.

Tangerloo, Alois van, "Willi Bang (1869-1934). Die Löwener Tage", in: *Germano-Turcica*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, pp. 79-86.

Becker, Carl Heinrich (1876-1933)

Essner, Cornelia; Winkelhane, Gerd, "Carl Heinrich Becker (1876-1933), Orientalist und Kulturpolitiker", *Welt des Islams* 28 (1988), pp. 154-177.

Hanisch, Ludmila, "Einführung", in: id. (ed.): *Islamkunde und Islamwissenschaft im Deutschen Kaiserreich. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Carl Heinrich Becker und Martin Hartmann (1900-1918)*, Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1992, pp. 11-27 [a bibliography of his publications relating to Oriental studies on pp. 149-155].

Schaeder, H. H., "Carl Heinrich Becker 12. April 1876 bis 10. Februar 1933", *Iranistische Mitteilungen* 27.1 (1997), pp. 97-106.

Wende, Erich, *C. H. Becker. Mensch und Politiker. Ein biographischer Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte der Weimarer Republik*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1959.

Benzing, Johannes (1909-2001)

Johanson, Lars, "Johannes Benzing (1913-2001)", *Turkic Languages* 5 (2001), pp. 165-168.

—, Schönig, Claus, "Zum Geleit", in: *Kritische Beiträge zur Altaistik und Turkologie. Festschrift für Johannes Benzing*, ed. Lars Johanson and Claus Schönig, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988, pp. vii-ix.

—, "Johannes Benzing und die vergleichende Turkologie", in: *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt. Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonzferenz Universität Mainz*, ed. H. Boeschoten & H. Stein, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007, pp. 1-5.

Bittner, Maximilian (1869-1918)

Kraus, Fritz Rudolf, "Bittner, Max", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 2 (1955), p. 282.

Björkman, Walther (1896-1996)

Johanson, Lars, "In Memoriam Walt[h]er Björkman", *Orientalia Suecana* 45-46 (1996-1997), pp. 5-7.

Doerfer, Gerhard (1920-2003)

Johanson, Lars, "Gerhard Doerfer (1920-2003)", *Turkic Languages* 8 (2004), pp. 3-6.

Knüppel, Michael, "In Memoriam Gerhard Doerfer: (8.III.1920-27.XII.2003)", *Materialia Turcica* 25 (2005), pp. 352-358.

Duda, Herbert Wilhelm (1900-1975)

Gottschalk, Hans L., "Herbert W. Duda", in: *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Almanach für das Jahr 1975*, 125. Jahrgang, Wien: Verlag der Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1976, pp. 578-581.

Güzel, Abdurrahman, "Ord. Prof. Dr. Herbert W. Duda (18 Ocak 1900 – 16 Şubat 1975)", *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* 15.1/2 (1976), pp. 227-252.

Heinz, Wilhelm, "Herbert Wilhelm Duda (1900-1975)", *ZDMG* 128 (1978), pp. 1-4.

Káldy-Nagy, Gyula, "In memoriam. Herbert W. Duda 1900-1975", *Acta Orientalia (Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae)* 30 (1976), pp. 133-135.

[Schriftenverzeichnis] *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 56 (1960), pp. xiii-xvi and 67 (1975), pp. vii-viii.

Foy, Karl (1856-1907)

Hartmann, Martin, "Dem Andenken Karl Foy's", *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 10 (1907), pp. 299-305 [includes a list of Foy's publications on p. 305].

Gabain, Annemarie von (1901-1993)

Eren, Hasan, "Annemarie von Gabain (1901-1993)", *Türk Dili* 495 (1993), pp. 213-215.

Fedakâr, Durdu, "Maryam Apa'nın Ardından: Annemarie von Gabain (4.07.1901 – 15.01.1993)", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yılı* 1993 (1995), pp. 135-139.

- Laut, Jens Peter, "Annemarie von Gabain, 1901-1993", *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 52 (1995), pp. 367-374.
- ___, "Annemarie von Gabain (4.7.1901 - 15.1.1993)", *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 4 (1994), pp. 5-10.
- Ölmez, Mehmet, "Yitirdiklerimiz: Annemarie von Gabain", *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 3 (1993), pp. 289-292.
- Temir, Ahmet, "Ünlü Alman Türkologu Meryem Apa'nın Ardından", *Türk Kültürü* 31.359 (1993), pp. 129-134.
- Zieme, Peter, "In memoriam Annemarie von Gabain (4.7.1901 - 15.1.1993)", *ZDMG* 144 (1994), pp. 239-244.

Giese, Friedrich (1870-1944)

- Jäschke, G., "Friedrich Giese", *ZDMG* 99 (1945-1949), pp. 7-10.

Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von (1774-1856)

- Baum, Wilhelm, "Josef von Hammer-Purgstall. Ein österreichischer Pionier der Orientalistik", in: *Zwischen Euphrat und Tigris. Österreichische Forschungen zum Alten Orient*, ed. Friedrich Schipper. Münster: Lit, 2004, pp. 3-18.
- Bietak, Wilhelm, *Gottes ist der Orient, Gottes ist der Okzident. Eine Studie über Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall*, Vienna etc.: Europa-Verl., 1948.
- Efe, Peri, "Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall Nam-ı Diğer 'Üç Dilin Tercümanı'. Yusuf bin Hammer'in Avusturya'da Bıraktığı İzleri Takip Ederek", *Toplumsal Tarih* 174 (Haziran 2008), pp. 48-54.
- Elgohary, Baher M., *Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall. 1774 - 1856. Ein Dichter und Vermittler orientalischer Literatur*, Stuttgart: Akad. Verl. Heinz, 1979.
- Eyice, Semavi, "J. von Hammer-Purgstall ve Seyahatnâmeleri", *Belleten* 182 (1982), pp. 535-550.
- Fragner, Bert G., "Der Orient in der Pupille des Westens. Der Fall Hammer-Purgstall", in: *Zwischen Orient und Okzident. Studien zu Mobilität von Wissen, Konzepten und Praktiken. Festschrift für Peter Heine*, ed. Anke Bentzin, Henner Fürtig and Thomas Krüppner. Freiburg, Brsg.: Herder, 2010, pp. 28-38.
- Hammer-Purgstall in Klosterneuburg-Weidling. Ein Führer durch d. Hammer-Purgstall-Gedenkstätten in Klosterneuburg-Weidling*, Hrsg. vom Kulturreferat d. Stadt Klosterneuburg unter Mitw. von Erwin Mehl, Klosterneuburg: Stadtgemeinde, 1959, [51 pp.].
- Hammer-Purgstall, Josef von, "*Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*" 1774-1852, ed. Reinhart Bachofen von Echt. Wien - Leipzig: Hölder - Pichler - Tempsky, 1940 [an extract from his diaries and some letters; a review of this book gives Bertold Spuler in *Der Islam* 28 (1949), pp. 129-131].
- Heppner, Harald, "Hammer-Purgstall und die Orientfrage", *Österreichische Osthefte* 21 (1979), pp. 89-96.
- Solbrig, Ingeborg Hildegard, *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe. "Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug"*, Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973 (Stanford German Studies 1) [contains pp. 21-43 a review of the literature on Hammer until the early 1970s].

Hartmann, Martin (1851-1918)

- Becker, C.H., "Martin Hartmann", in: id., *Islamstudien*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1932, vol. 2, pp. 481-490. [Reprint: Hildesheim: Olms 1967].
- Haarmann, Ulrich, "Die islamische Moderne bei den Deutschen Orientalisten", *Araber und Deutsche: Begegnungen in einem Jahrtausend*, (ed.) Friedrich H. Kochwasser ve Hans R. Roemer, Tübingen – Basel: Host Erdmann, 1974, s. 56-91.
- Hanisch, Ludmila, "Einführung", in: id. (ed.), *Islamlkunde und Islamwissenschaft im Deutschen Kaiserreich. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Carl Heinrich Becker und Martin Hartmann (1900-1918)*, Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1992, pp. 11-27, [The volume also contains pp. 129-148 a bibliography of Martin Hartmann's publications].
- _____, "Bericht über den Nachlaß Martin Hartmanns (1851-1918)", *Welt des Islams* 32 (1993), pp. 113-114.
- _____, "Einführung", in: id. (ed.), "*Machen Sie doch unseren Islam nicht gar zu schlecht*", *Der Briefwechsel der Islamwissenschaftler Ignaz Goldziher und Martin Hartmann 1894-1914.*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000, pp. ix-xxvii.
- Jäschke, Gotthard, "Islamforschung der Gegenwart. Martin Hartmann zum Gedächtnis", in: *Welt des Islams* 23 (1941), pp. 111-121.
- Kramer, Martin, "Arabistik and Arabism: The Passions of Martin Hartmann", *Middle Eastern Studies* 25.3 (July 1989), pp. 283-300.

Jacob, Georg (1862- 1937)

- Becker, C.H., "Georg Jacob als Orientalist", in: *Festschrift Georg Jacob zum siebzigsten Geburtstag 26. Mai 1932 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Theodor Menzel. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932, pp. 1-8.
- Dammann, Ernst, "Erinnerungen an Georg Jacob", in: *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg, pp. 113-118.
- Diekmann, Norbert, "Ein Werkstattbericht: Die Sammlung der Briefe Georg Jacobs (1862-1937)", in: *Der Orient in akademischer Optik*, ed. Ludmila Hanisch, Halle: OWZ, 2006, pp. 155-165.
- Littmann, Enno, "Georg Jacob (1862-1937)", *ZDMG* 91 (1937), pp. 486-500, [reprinted in Littmann, *Ein Jahrhundert Orientalistik*, pp. 96-109; *ibid.* pp. 107-108 the titles of Jacob's unpublished typescript articles since 1932].
- Menzel, Theodor, "Versuch einer Jacob-Bibliographie", in: *Festschrift Georg Jacob zum siebzigsten Geburtstag 26. Mai 1932 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Theodor Menzel, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932, pp. 369-381.

Jansky, Herbert (1898-1981)

- Duda, Herbert Wilhelm, "Herbert Jansky ein Siebziger", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1969), pp. 1-6.
- Eisenstein, Herbert, "Herbert Jansky (25.Juni 1898 bis 12.März 1981)", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 28 (1981/82), pp. 278-279.
- Esin, Emel, "Profesör Herbert Jansky, 1898-1981", *Türk Kültürü* 21.236 (1982), pp. 895-897.
- Güzel, Abdurrahman, "Avusturya'lı Türkolog Prof. Dr. Herbert Jansky", *Türk Kültürü* 16.185 (1978), pp. 298-302.

Schaendlinger, A.C., "Herbert Jansky (1898-1981)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 74 (1982), pp. 11-13.

Jäschke, Gotthard Friedrich Comenius (1894-1983)

- Benzing, Johannes, "Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983)", *Der Islam* 62.1 (1985), pp. 1-2.
- Kreiser, Klaus, "Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983): Von der Islamkunde zur Auslandswissenschaft", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), pp. 406-423.
- _____, "Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983): Zur Entstehung der türkischen Zeitgeschichtsforschung", in: *Turkologie heute - Tradition und Perspektive*. Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Leipzig, 4.-7. Oktober 1994, ed. Nurettin Demir and Erika Taube, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998, pp. 185-194.
- Spuler, Bertold, "Gedenkwort: Gotthard Jäschke (1894-1983)", *Welt des Islams* 23-24 (1984), p. 498.
- _____, "Gotthard Jäschke", tr. Mihin Lugal, *Bulleten* 189-190 (1984), pp. 309-338.
- "Schriftenverzeichnis Gotthard Jäschke", *Welt des Islams* 15.1-4 (1974), pp. 5-25.
- Schwartz, Werner, "Ergänzung zum Schriftenverzeichnis Gotthard Jäschke seit 1973. Nachtrag zu WI N.S. Bd. 15 (1974)", *Welt des Islams* 23-24 (1984), pp. 499-502.

Kappert, Petra (1945-2004)

- Fenz, Hendrik, "Zum Wirken Petra Kapperts", in: id. (ed.), *Strukturelle Zwänge - Persönliche Freiheiten*, Berlin - New York: de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 25-30 [contains a bibliography].
- Knüppel, Michael, "In Memoriam Prof. Dr. Petra Kappert: (3.4.1945-23.5.2004)", *Materialia Turcica* 25 (2005), pp. 349-350.

Karabaček, Joseph (1845-1918)

- Becker, C.H., "Joseph von Karabacek", *Der Islam* 10 (1920), pp. 235-238 [reprinted in Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. 2, pp. 491-498].
- Fück, Johann, *Arabische Studien*, pp. 254-255.
- Rhodokanakis, Nikolaus, "Josef v. Karabacek", in: *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien für das Jahr 1919*, 69. Jahrgang, Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1919, pp. 188-198.

Kissling, Hans Joachim (1912-1985)

- Akpınar, Turgut, "Prof. Kissling'in Ardından", *Tarih ve Toplum* 11.62 (Şubat 1989), pp. 41-43.
- Atsız, Bedriye, "Yaşayan Türkologlar - VIII. Hans Joachim Kissling", *Tarih ve Toplum* 4.20 (Ağustos 1985), pp. 55-61.
- Kretzenbacher, L., "Hans-Joachim Kissling (8.IX.1912-10.X.1985)", *Südost-Forschungen* 45 (1986), pp. 237-239.
- Krüger, Eberhard, "In memoriam Hans-Joachim Kissling", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 22 (1986), pp. 2-3.
- Majer, Hans Georg, "Hans Joachim Kißling (1912-1985)", *Der Islam* 65 (1988), pp. 190-199.
- Moser-Weithmann, Brigitte, "Hans Joachim Kissling - eine persönliche Erinnerung", *Münchener Zeitschrift für Balkankunde* 5 (1983-1984), pp. 183-185.
- Trofenik, Rudolf [untitled short note in:] Kissling, Hans Joachim, *Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae*. I. Das Derwischtum. München: Trofenik, 1986.

Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Friedrich (1876-1932)

- “Kraelitz von Greifenhorst, Friedrich Joh”, in: *Österreichisches biographisches Lexikon: 1815 - 1950*, Vol. 4, p. 185 (Grohmann) [http://www.biographien.ac.at/oebl_4/185.pdf].
- Rhodokanakis, Nikolaus, “Friedrich Kraelitz”, in: *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien für das Jahr 1932*, 82. Jahrgang, Wien: Hölder-Pichler -Tempisky, 1932, pp. 239-242.
- Seif, Theodor, “Friedrich Kraelitz Edler von Greifenhorst”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39 (1932), pp. 1-5.

Kreutel, Richard F. (1916-1981)

- Kreiser, Klaus, “Richard F. Kreutel (2.V.1916 – 28./29.X.1981)”, *Südost-Forschungen* 41 (1982), pp. 353-354.
- Schaendlinger, Anton C., “Richard F. Kreutel (1916-1981)”, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 28 (1982), p. 280.
- Teply, Karl, “Richard F. Kreutel (1916-1981)”, *Der Islam* 59 (1982), pp.191-194.

Matuz, Josef Eugen (1927-1992)

- Géza, David, “Josef Matuz und seine Festschrift. Im ehrenden Gedenken an den Freiburger Wissenschaftler”, *Philologia Fenno-Ugrica* 2/3 (1996/1997), pp. 39-51.
- Ivanics, Mária, “Josef Matuz. Budapest, 25. Oktober 1927 - Freiburg, 20. Dezember 1992”, *Turkish Linguistics Post* 6 (1993), pp. 2-3.
- Ursinus, Michael, “Josef Matuz zum Gedenken”, *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 120.2 (1993), pp. 7-8.

Menges, Karl Heinrich (1908-1999)

- Doerfer, Gerhard, “Nachruf für Karl Heinrich Menges”, *Turkic Languages*, 4.2 (2000), pp. 151-152.
- Hanisch, “Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz”, pp. 76-77.
- Knüppel, Michael, *Schriftenverzeichnis Karl Heinrich Menges. Nebst Index in den Werken behandelter Lexeme und Morpheme*, Wien: Lit, 2006 (Neue Beihefte zur Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 1) [pp. 7-43 give Menges' biography].
- Tietze, Andreas, “Karl Heinrich Menges (1908-1999)”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 91 (2001), pp. 7-8.

Menzel, Theodor (1878-1939)

- Dammann, Ernst, “Erinnerungen an Georg Jacob (1862-1937)”, in: *Germano-Turcica - Zur Geschichte des Türkischlernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, Universitätsbibliothek Bamberg, pp. 113-118 [some remarks on him on p. 113].
- Hanisch, “Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz”, pp. 78-79.
- Rypka, Jan, “In Memoriam Theodor Menzel”, in: Theodor Menzel, *Meddâh, Schattentheater und Orta Ojunu. Eine kritische Übersicht über die Ergebnisse der jüngeren Forschung nebst neuen Beiträgen*. Aus dem Nachlaß hgg. von Ottokar Menzel, Prag: Orientalisches Institut, 1941 (Monographien des Archiv Orientální 10), pp. xi-xiv [a bibliography of Menzel's publications *ibid.*, pp. xvii-xx].

Mordtmann, Andreas David (1811-1879)

- Babinger, Franz, "Andreas David Mordtmann's Leben und Schriften", in: Mordtmann, A. D. d. Ä., *Anatolien. Skizzen und Reisebriefe aus Kleinasien (1850-1959)*, ed. Franz Babinger. Osnabrück: Biblio, 1972 [reprint of the edition Hannover: Heinz Lafaire, 1925], pp. vii-xxxiv [ibid. pp. xxi-xxxiii a list of his publications].
- Eyice, Semavi, "Mordtmann, Andreas David (Baba)", in: *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5, pp. 489-490.
- Majer, Hans Georg, "Mordtmann, Andreas David", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1997), pp. 92-93.

Mordtmann, Johann Heinrich (1852-1932)

- Babinger, Franz, "J.H. Mordtmann zum Gedächtnis", *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, 2. Abt.: Westasiatische Studien 35 (1932), pp. 1-16 [including a bibliography, pp. 7-16].
- Majer, Hans Georg, "Mordtmann, Johann Heinrich", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1997), pp. 93-94.
- Rachmati, G.R., "Prof. Dr. Johannes H. Mordtmann (1852-1932)", *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 12 (1932), p. 304.

Pritsak, Omeljan (1919-2006)

- Hajda, Lubomyr A., "Omeljan Pritsak: A Biographical Sketch", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3-4 (1979-1980) [= special issue Eucharisterion: *Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on His Sixtieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students*, ed. Ihor Ševčenko and Frank E. Sysyn], pp. 1-6.
- _____, "The Bibliography of Omeljan Pritsak", *ibid.*, pp. 7-50.
- Keenan, Edward L., "In Memoriam Omeljan Pritsak (1919-2006)", *Kritika. Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 7.4 (Fall 2006), pp. 931-936.

Radloff, Wilhelm (1837-1918)

- Ercilasun, A.B., "Wilhelm Radloff and Turkish Eternal Stones", *Eurasian Studies*, 13 (1998), pp. 93-103.
- Hummel, Siegbert, "Wilhelm Radloff zum 75. Todestag: Würdigung seines opus magnum zur Orchon-Expedition, zugleich als Weg- und Sachweiser durch das Werk", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 24 (1994), pp. 26-34.
- Laut, Jens Peter, "Radloff, Friedrich Wilhelm", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 21 (2003), pp. 96-97.
- Meyer, Iben Raphael, "Der Briefwechsel Thomsen-Radloff", *Materialia Turcica* 23 (2002), pp. 1-43.
- Temir, Ahmet, "Leben und Schaffen von Friedrich Wilhelm Radloff (1837-1918). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Türkologie", *Oriens* 8.1 (1955), pp. 51-93.
- _____, *Türkoloji Tarihinde Wilhelm Radloff Devri. Hayatı, İlmî Kişiliği, Eserleri*, Ankara: TDK, 1991.
- _____, "Wilhelm Radloff'un Hayatı (1837-1918)", *Türk Dili* 56.444 (1988), pp. 293-302.
- Yıldız, Naciye, "Wilhelm Radloff. Hayatı, Eserleri, Manas Destanı", *Türk Kültürü* 384.33 (1995), pp. 205-223.

Rescher, Oskar (1883-1971)

Auer-Faraut, Susanne, "Oskar Rescher - Osman Reşer (1883-1972). Biographie, liste des publications, préparée sous la direction de Monsieur le professeur Toufic Fahd", Strasbourg M.A. thesis Strasbourg, 1982..

Busse, Heribert, "Introduction", in: Rescher, Oskar, *Abriss der arabischen Literaturgeschichte. Neudruck der Originalausgabe Stuttgart 1925-1933*, Mit Nachträgen aus dem Handexemplar des Verfassers, Indices der Personen und arabischer Titel sowie einem Literaturverzeichnis, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1983. (Osman Reşer, Gesammelte Werke Bd. 1), pp. vii-ix.

Hanisch, "Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz", pp. 98-99.

Spuler, Bertold, "Oskar Rescher/Osman Reşer zum 100. Geburtstag - 1. Okt. 1883/1983", *Der Islam* 61 (1984), pp. 12-13.

Ritter, Hellmut (1892-1970)

Gruber, E. A., "Verzeichnis der Schriften von Hellmut Ritter", *Oriens* 18-19 (1965-1966), pp. 5-32.

___, "Nachtrag zum Verzeichnis der Schriften von Hellmut Ritter", *Oriens* 27-28 (1981), pp. 66-69.

Lier, Thomas, "Hellmut Ritter in Istanbul 1926-1949", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), pp. 334-385.

Meier, Fritz, "Hellmut Ritter", *Der Islam* 48 (1972), pp. 193-205.

Neuwirth, Angelika; Bassarak A. (eds.), *Hellmut Ritter und die DMG in Istanbul*, Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Istanbul, 1997.

Plessner, Martin, "Hellmut Ritter (1892-1971)", *ZDMG* 122 (1972), pp. 6-18.

Walzer, Richard, "Hellmut Ritter 27. 2. 1892 - 19. 5. 1971", *Oriens* 23-24 (1974), pp. 1-6.

Roemer, Hans Robert (1915-1997)

Glassen, Erika, "Hans Robert Roemer zum Gedenken", *ZDMG* 148 (1998), pp. 1-6.

Haarmann, Ulrich, "Zum Gedenken: Hans Robert Roemer (18.2.1915-15.7.1997)", *Welt des Islams* 38.1 (1998), pp. 1-8.

Hoffmann, Birgitt, "Hans R. Roemer (1915-1997)", *Iranian Studies* 30.3/4 (1997), pp. 417-419.

Schaeder, Hans Heinrich (1896-1957)

Eilers, W., "H. H. Schaeder. (Nekrolog) - Schriftenverzeichnis Hans Heinrich Schaeder 1920-1957", *Kratylos*, 3 (1958), pp. 82-93.

Pritsak, Omeljan, "Hans Heinrich Schaeder (31.Januar 1896 - 13.März 1957)", *ZDMG* 108 (1958), pp. 21-40.

Schaendlinger, Anton Cornelius (1931-1991)

"Ein Nachruf auf den Rotarier Anton Cornelius Schaendlinger", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82 (1992), pp. 5-6.

Köhbach, Markus; Römer, Claudia, "Anton C. Schaendlinger (1931-1991)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82 (1992), pp. 5-14 [ibid., pp. 9-14 a list of his publications].

Scheel, Helmuth (1895-1967)

Pareja, F.M., "In memoriam Helmuth Scheel", *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Orientalistas*, 4 (1968), p. 7.

Wagner, Ewald, "Helmuth Scheel (1895-1967)", *ZDMG* 118 (1968), pp. 1-13 [pp. 6-13 contains a list of his publications].

Schimmel, Annemarie (1922-2003)

Conrad, Lawrence I., "Nachruf: Annemarie Schimmel", *Der Islam* 80 (2003), pp. 213-223.

Heine, P., "Annemarie Schimmel und die Berliner Universität", *Spektrum Iran*, 17.1 (2004), pp. 5-14.

Wild, Stefan, "In Memoriam Annemarie Schimmel (7. April 1922 - 26. Januar 2003)", *Welt des Islams* 43.2. (2003), pp. 131-142.

Schwarz, Klaus (1943-1989)

Roemer, H.R., "Klaus Schwarz (1943-1989)", *ZDMG* 141 (1991), pp. 8-11.

Göyünç, Nejat, "Yaşayan Türkologlar: X. Dr. Klaus Schwarz (Batı Berlin Prusya Kültür Varlığı Devlet Kütüphanesi'ndeki Türk Beratları)", *Tarih ve Toplum* 4.22 (Ekim 1985), pp. 29-31.

Tunçay, Mete, "Klaus Schwarz Ardından", *Tarih ve Toplum* 12.68 (Ağustos 1989), pp. 19-21.

Sohrweide, Hanna (1919-1984)

Braun, Hellmut, "Hanna Sohrweide (1919-1984)", *ZDMG* 137 (1987), pp. 1-5.

Flemming, Barbara, "Hanna Sohrweide (1919-1984)", *Der Islam* 63 (1986), pp. 1-4.

Spies, Otto (1901-1981)

Heissig, Walther, "Otto Spies (5.4.1901 - 29.10.1981) als Märchen- und Erzählforscher", *Fabula*, 23 (1982), pp. 301-302.

Nagel, Tilman, "Otto Spies. Ein Nachruf", *Welt des Islams* 21.1/4 (1981), pp. 1-4.

Noth, Albrecht, "Otto Spies (1901-1981)", *Der Islam* 59 (1982), pp. 185-188.

Schützinger, Heinrich, "Otto Spies (1901-1981)", *ZDMG* 133 (1983), pp. 11-17.

Spuler, Bertold (1911-1990)

Busse, Heribert, "Bertold Spuler (1911-1990)", *Der Islam* 67 (1990), pp. 199-205.

Ende, Werner, "Bertold Spuler 1911-1990", *Orient* (Opladen) 31.2 (1990), pp. 171-172.

___, Fragner, Bert; Riedel, Dagmer, "Spuler, Berthold", in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica* <http://www.iranica.com/articles/spuler-bertold>. (accessed October 20, 2010).

Göckenjahn, Hansgerd, "Bertold Spuler (1911-1990)", *ZDMG* 142 (1992), pp. 1-2.

Süssheim, Karl (1878-1947)

Flemming, Barbara, "Karl Süssheim (1878-1947) zum 100. Geburtstag", *Der Islam* 56 (1979), pp. 1-8.

___, Schmidt, Jan (eds.), *The Diary of Karl Süssheim (1878 - 1947), Orientalist Between Munich and Istanbul*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002.

Hanisch, "Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz", pp. 120-121.

Kreiser, Klaus, "Karl Süssheim (1878-1947)", *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, 25.1 (2001), pp. 61-66.

Taeschner, Franz (1888-1967)

- Kissling, Hans-Joachim, "Franz Taeschner (1896-1967)", *ZDMG* 118 (1968), pp. 14-18.
Schriftenverzeichnis Franz Taeschner", *Der Islam* 39 (1964), pp. 261-270.

Tietze, Andreas (1914-2003)

- Anetshofer, Helga, "'Long live Ottoman studies': Erinnerungen an Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)", *Journal of Turkish Studies* 30.1 (2005), pp. 323-334.
Faroqhi, Suraiya, "In memoriam Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)", *Turcica* 36 (2004), pp. 5-11.
Griswold, William J., "In memoriam: Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)", *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 38.1 (2004), pp. 142-143.
Hanisch, "Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz", pp. 122-123.
Hazai, György, "Abschied von Andreas Tietze", *Archivum Ottomanicum* 22.2004 (2005), pp. 9-22.
—, "Versuch einer Bibliographie von Andreas Tietze", *Archivum Ottomanicum* 22.2004 (2005), pp. 23-54.
Johanson, Lars, "Andreas Tietze (26.04.1914 – 23.12.2003)", *Turkic Languages*, 7.2 (2003), pp. 151-156.
Köhbach, Markus, "In memoriam Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 94 (2004), pp. viii-xxiii [followed by a list of Tietze's publications 1985-2002, *ibid.* pp. xxv-xxix. For Tietze's publications up to 1985 cf. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 76 (1986), pp. 5-9.]
Ortaylı, İlber, "Yaşayan Türkologlar II. Andreas Tietze", *Tarih ve Toplum* 3.14 (Şubat 1985), pp. 44-45.
Sezer, Engin, "Andreas Tietze (1914-2003)", *Journal of Turkish Literature* 1 (2004), pp. 145-147.

Tschudi, Rudolf (1884-1960)

- Meier, Fritz, "Rudolf Tschudi (1884-1960)", *Der Islam* 38 (1963), pp. 138-141.
Taeschner, Franz, "Rudolf Tschudi (1884-1960)", *ZDMG* 111 (1961), pp. 4-6.

Vambéry, Arminius (1832-1913)

- Alder, Lory, Dalby, Richard, *The Dervish of Windsor Castle. The Life of Arminius Vambery*, London: Bachmann & Turner, 1979.
Conrad, Lawrence I., "The Dervish's Disciple: On the Personality and Intellectual Milieu of the Young Ignaz Goldziher", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society Great Britain and Ireland* 2 (1990), pp. 225-266 [on Vambéry cf. pp. 243ff and p. 264 n. 68 for a concise bibliographical overview].
Kreiser, Klaus, "Hermann Bamberger und die Turkologie", in: id., *Türkische Studien in Europa*, pp. 111-119.
Landau, Jacob M., "Arminius Vambéry: Identities in Conflict", in: *The Jewish Discovery of Islam: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lewis*, ed. M. Kramer, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Univ., 1999, pp. 95-102.
Tschudi, R., "Hermann Vambéry", *Der Islam* 5 (1914), pp. 107-108.

Weil, Gotthold Eljakim (1882-1960)

George, D., "Gotthold Weil, der erste Direktor der Orientalischen Abteilung der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek 1918-31", *Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz: Mitteilungen*, 14 (1982), pp. 59-61.

Landau, Jacob M. "Gotthold Eljakim Weil (Berlin, 1882 - Jerusalem, 1960)", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), pp. 280-285.

Wittek, Paul (1894-1978)

Heywood, Colin, "A Subterranean History: Paul Wittek (1894-1978) and the Early Ottoman State", *Welt des Islams* 38.3 (1998), pp. 386-405.

___, "'Boundless Dreams of the Levant': Paul Wittek, the George-'Kreis', and the Writing of Ottoman History", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1989), pp. 32- 50.

___, "Wittek and the Austrian Tradition", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1988), pp. 7-25.

Shaw, Stanford J., "In memoriam: Professor Paul Wittek, 1894-1978", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 10.1 (1979), pp. 139-141.

Schaendlinger, Anton, "Paul Wittek 1899-1978", *Der Islam* 56 (1979), pp. 9-10.

Wansbrough, John, "Paul Wittek", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 42 (1979), pp. 137-139.

Notes on the Development of Turkish and Oriental Studies in the German Speaking Lands

Christoph HERZOG

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of the history of Turkish Studies in the institutional context of Oriental studies in the German-speaking lands since the beginning of the 19th century. It argues that the separation of Oriental studies from theology and its professionalization constituted a relatively slow process that was not complete until the 19th century. The academic institutionalization of Oriental studies remained comparatively weak. This is even more the case for Turkology and Turkish studies, which both remained largely tied to the framework of Oriental studies on both an institutional and personal level. This paper discusses the question of Orientalism in German Oriental studies and argues for the keeping of Oriental studies as a distinct cluster of disciplines within the current academic structure instead of dissolving them into specific area studies or attaching them to other related disciplines like history or sociology.

Keywords: Turkish studies, Oriental studies, Germany, Austria, Orientalism