

Russian Turkology: From Past to Present

Liaisan ŞAHİN*

RUSSIAN scholarship on Turkey –Russian Turkology¹– has a long and rich history. Unfortunately, the achievements in this field are virtually unknown in Turkey. The turmoil of the 20th century, and especially the ideological atmosphere during the Cold War, hindered the development of cultural and scholarly relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey for decades. The situation has improved since the 1990s, and it is hoped that sound and mutually beneficial relations will be established between the Russian and Turkish academic communities in the near future.

The aim of this article is to provide general information about the historical development of Russian Turkology, with particular attention to the study of Turkish history. Turkology and Russian *vostokovedenie*² (Oriental Studies) have, in general, combined philological studies with historical studies from their very inception. V. V. Barthold (1869-1930), a prominent Russian Orientalist, noted that Russian history has been tightly interwoven with the history of Eastern peoples, and therefore a Russian Orientalist could not be limited “to purely philological and linguistic tasks; instead, he was interested in the East as a whole, in the present and the past of Eastern peoples, which inevitably led him to consider the issues which formed the subject of the historical science.”³ Distinguished Russian Orientalists are usually universal specialists with broad research interests, possessing simultaneously the skills of linguists, littérateurs, ethnographers, and historians. In view of the integrated character of the Russian Orientalist tradition, it is necessary to examine Turkish history studies in the broad context of the overall development of Russian Turkology.

* Marmara University, Institute of Turkic Studies; Ph. D. Student, Marmara University, Department of Political Science and International Relations.

1 The term *Turkology* has been used in European languages to refer to the studies of Turkic peoples. But in the Russian language, it refers only to studies of the Turkish people (*turkologiia*), while for studies of Turkic people, the term *türkologiia* has been employed. This distinction has had geographical and political meanings. Almost all Turkic peoples except the Turks lived within the Russian Empire’s and then the Soviet state’s borders (The situation changed only with the collapse of the Soviet Union). From the beginning of Russian Oriental studies, the Turks were, so to say, an “external” subject of investigation for Russian *türkologiia*. Studies of Turkey obtained a separate place in this context that was manifested in using a separate term for this field. In this article, the terms will be used as they have been employed by Russian scholars: *Turkology* meaning the studies of Turkey and *Türkology* referring to Turkic studies.

2 In Russian, it means “knowing the East.”

3 V. V. Barthold, “Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii [History of Oriental Studies in Europe and Russia],” *Sochineniia [Works]*, v. IX. (Moscow, 1979), 734.

First, the peculiarities of Turkology within the Russian Orientalist tradition will be considered, while touching upon the issue of Russian-Turkish relations. Then, the institutional developments, character, and major trends of the scholarly studies of Russian Turkology will be focused on, with special attention paid to the field of Turkish history studies. A quantitative description of four bibliographical reference books and a selected bibliography of Turkological works will be provided at the end of the article in order to inform the reader about the developments in Russian Turkology.⁴

Russian Turkology: The Main Tendencies of Historical Development

Turkology is an illustrative case within the discipline of Russian Orientalism, wherein the turning points and contradictory tendencies of Russian Oriental Studies can easily be traced. At the same time, Turkological studies also have their own character. Turkology, the study of the Turks, is a subfield of Türkology, the study of the Turkic peoples, which is the oldest and one of the most developed branches of Russian Oriental Studies. Due to the fact that the Russians lived side by side with the Turkic peoples since ancient times and the Russian state expanded by conquering majority of Turkic lands and peoples, Russian Orientalist science began with studies on the Turkic peoples.

War with the Ottoman Empire and related geopolitical and ideological issues (the Eastern Question) added a specific political agenda to Türkological studies. As a result, Turkology emerged as a separate field in Oriental studies. From the very beginning, Turkology developed as a heavily politicized field of research. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the Russian public showed a great deal of interest in publications on the Ottoman Empire, the Russian Empire's rival in Caucasia and the Black Sea region. In addition to the academic writing on this subject, a large amount of politically biased popular literature was created, a considerable part of which was translated from European languages. There was some difficulty in establishing Turkology as an objective scientific discipline, as the popular literature outnumbered the scholarly work on the subject. V. V. Barthold, the distinguished Russian Orientalist, complained: "Being the neighbor of the Orient, Russia has preferred to read bad Western books on the subject instead of examining the Orient directly."⁵ It was hard for Turkologists to defend their scholarly views, which differed from the publicly accepted stereotypes of the Ottoman Empire.⁶

What factors brought about this situation? Russian Turkologists today offer the following explanation:

Since the 15th century, numerous messengers from the Balkan peoples came to Russia seeking support for their anti-Ottoman struggle. Similar appeals for help to fight the Ottomans also came from the Vatican and the Central European countries. A growing amount of anti-Ottoman literature –mostly of Polish and Italian origin– had accu-

4 This article is mostly based on my master thesis entitled, "Soviet Studies on Turkey, 1917-1991: Institutional History and Analytical Perspectives," submitted to the Atatürk Institute, Bosphorus University in 2005. The content was improved and supplemented with new information derived from some new publications.

5 Barthold, "Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii," 482.

6 Iu. A. Li and S. F. Oreshkova, *Sektor Turtsii Instituta vostokovedeniia RAN (k poluvekovoi istorii sushchestvovaniia)* [Turkish Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (On Anniversary of Half-Century of Existence)], (Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, 2009), 5-8.

mulated in *Posolskiy Prikaz* (the Department of Foreign Affairs). From this, Russian popular literature on this subject began to emerge, attracting the sympathetic attention of certain circles in the Russian public. However, it did not seriously affect the Russian rulers and the general public until the mid-17th century.⁷

Before the 17th century, the Russian and Ottoman Empires had each developed in their own geopolitical niches. There were not yet definite borders between the two empires, but trade relations had begun to develop. In 1492, the first exchange of state documents took place and in 1497 exchange at the diplomatic level was initiated.⁸ The Russian and Ottoman states came into direct territorial contact only in the second half of the 17th century. After a century-long struggle over territorial delimitation (six wars were waged during the period), a new geopolitical balance was established. The Russian rulers were not focused on defeating the Ottoman Empire and conquering Constantinople, as it came to be believed later. On the contrary, the Russian rulers approached the issue of Russian-Ottoman relations pragmatically, having neither the ambition nor the intention to encroach on the Ottoman Empire's geopolitical space. As late as 1802, V. P. Kochubei, a prominent Russian statesman close to Emperor Alexander I, wrote, "Russia does not need to expand, and the Turks are the most peaceful neighbours." He also underlined that the maintenance of the Ottoman state "must henceforth be the fundamental rule of our policy."⁹

However, since the 18th and especially during the 19th century Russia was affected by European politics and diplomatic activity related to the so-called "Eastern Question." All four Russian-Ottoman wars waged in the 19th century were not directly caused by any irreconcilable discord between the two states. Rather, the wars were caused by European conflicts and diplomatic intrigues. European diplomatic circles manipulated the issue of the Ottoman legacy as a political tool, trying to keep the Russian state out of European affairs.¹⁰

Step by step, the Russian state was pushed towards the Ottoman's geopolitical space, while becoming increasingly involved in the struggle of the Ottoman Christian minorities. Meanwhile, the Russian public was increasingly affected by the European imagery of the Ottoman State. European and then Russian popular literature depicted the Ottoman state as the enemy, while the "inexorable push southwards" and "quest

7 S. F. Oreshkova, "Osmano-Rossiiskie otnosheniia: nekotorye oshibochnye stereotipy i neobhodimost' ih preodoleniia [Ottoman-Russian Relations: Some Erroneous Stereotypes and the Need of Getting Over Them]," (Paper presented at the International Conference "Rossiisko-turetskie otnosheniia v istoricheskoi perspektive [Russian-Turkish Relations in Historical Perspective]," under the auspices of the Institute of Asian and African Studies, Moscow State University and The Ottoman Bank Archives and Research Center, Moscow, (December 3, 2008): 2-3.

8 Ibid., 1-2.

9 S. F. Oreshkova, "Nekotorye razmyshleniia o razvitiu tiurkologii i osmanistiki [Some Thoughts On Development of Turkology and Ottoman Studies]," *Turcica et Ottomanica: sbornik v chest' 70-letiiia M. S. Meiera* [Turcica et Ottomanica: A Collection On the 70th Anniversary of M. S. Meier's Birth], (Moscow, 2006), 20-21.

10 See: S. F. Oreshkova, "Osmanskaya imperiia i Rossiia v svete ih geopoliticheskogo razgranicheniia [The Ottoman Empire and Russia in the Light of Their Geopolitical Demarcation]," *Voprosy istorii*, 3 (2005): 34-46.

for warm seas” came to be viewed as “a natural need” and even “the destiny” of the Russian state. Separate warnings, issued by B. N. Chicherin (1828-1904), a liberal Russian thinker, and K. N. Leontiev (1831-1891), a conservative Russian thinker and literary critic, that Istanbul was a “fatal” city for Russia and that uniting all Slavs would mark “the beginning of Russia’s decay” were not understood by the general public.

In the late 19th century, the proponents of “healthy militarism”¹¹ started to advocate the acquisition of new territory; in particular, they wanted the Straits and a considerable part of Anatolia. This attitude, which became popular among the Russian bourgeoisie, resulted in Russia’s participation in the First World War, which ultimately ruined both empires.¹²

Contemporary popular literature on the Ottoman Empire significantly affected the study of Turkology. Popular works focused mainly on the Russian-Ottoman wars and the related political, diplomatic, military problems while neglecting other issues. Many authors did not pay much attention to the peaceful dimension of Russian-Ottoman relations and were not very concerned with facilitating a better understanding of Ottoman society and culture. Moreover, they were heavily affected by the anti-Ottoman writings of Balkan and Central European authors. In many of these writings the Ottoman state was deliberately depicted as weak and corrupt, and the misery of the Ottoman Christians was stressed.

Many Orientalists were influenced by the general attitude of the public, which contributed to the proliferation of biased political literature on the Ottoman Empire. Others, who tried to avoid political issues and maintain an objective view, focused on the study of sources.¹³

Russian Turkologists note that in Soviet times the field of Ottoman studies experienced similar difficulties. The European popular understanding of Russian-Ottoman relations and the Eastern Question were reflected in the writings of Marx and Engels; via these sources, this understanding continued to persist in Soviet studies. It resulted in a one-sided and limited Soviet interpretation of the Ottoman Empire and Russian-Ottoman relations. Moreover, medieval history, which includes Ottoman history, was largely neglected in the late Soviet era, as Soviet Oriental studies concentrated on contemporary times and socioeconomic issues. There were few medievalists, and even fewer Ottomanists, in the Soviet period.¹⁴

In the post-Soviet period, Russian Turkologists began to argue that the notion of both the “eternal hostility” between the Russian and Ottoman empires and of Russia’s “preordained push southwards” were severely outdated. It is argued today that the history of Russian-Ottoman relations ought to be reconsidered and freed from political and ideological distortions. Moreover, Russian scholars have started to speak about the parallels between the Russian and Ottoman empires. Turkologists have pointed out the

11 The phrase was coined by V. P. Riabushinskii, the Russian industrialist and banker.

12 Li and Oreshkova, *Sektor Turtsii*, 7; Oreshkova, “Nekotorye razmyshleniia,” 22.

13 Li and Oreshkova, *Sektor Turtsii*, 8.

14 Oreshkova, “Nekotorye razmyshleniia,” 22-23.

need to explore the history of the Ottoman state as a multiethnic and multiconfessional entity which “developed synchronously with and somewhat similarly to Russia.”¹⁵

In the 20th century, relations between the two neighbors were strikingly transformed. After the First World War, the Russian and Ottoman empires ceased to exist. Two newly-founded states –Bolshevik Russia and Atatürk’s Turkey– were both in isolated and dangerously weak positions in the international arena and opposed by the same enemy – the West. Turkey quickly became considered by the Bolsheviks to be the most promising country in the East with regard to its revolutionary potential. By the end of 1920, the Bolshevik leadership was firmly convinced that Turkey was a center for revolutionary movements in the East; therefore, Turkey was to be kept on the Soviet side at any cost. Despite some fluctuations in the evaluation of the Kemalist policies, the policy of extending support to Turkey continued during the early Soviet period.¹⁶

Relations with the Soviet state, which culminated with the 1925 Treaty of Friendship and Non-Aggression, helped Turkey in its diplomatic dealings with the West. On a more concrete level, the Soviets provided considerable material aid to Turkey.¹⁷ Friendly relations with Turkey permitted the Soviet state to stabilize control of Transcaucasia. However, beyond the shared struggle against foreign domination, Turkey and the Soviet state had divergent concerns and interests. Beyond the 1925 Treaty, Atatürk refrained from making any significant commitment to the Soviets.¹⁸ In the late 1930s, Soviet-Turkish relations deteriorated and after the Second World War became hostile.¹⁹ From that time onward, the Cold War atmosphere prevented the establishment of normal contacts between the two societies, although Soviet-Turkish relations did experience a diplomatic thaw between the mid-1960s and 1980. The Soviet economic aid to Turkey, which began in 1963, grew rapidly and soon made Turkey a major recipient of Soviet aid. The Soviet-Turkish link was also reinforced in connection with the Cyprus crisis in 1974.²⁰

Turkey’s long-standing importance for Soviet foreign policy concerns – in the beginning, as a friendly country, then as a NATO member on the Soviet border – is reflected in the development of Turkological studies, which became one of the most developed and, at the same time, politically biased field in Soviet Oriental studies. For

15 Ibid., 19.

16 Harish Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia, 1917-1927: A Study of Soviet Policy Towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan*, (Geneva: Mischael Joseph Limited, 1966), 103; 142.

17 Besides the aid provided during the period of the National Struggle, credits were provided to Turkey for its program of industrial construction and several industrial complexes were built with Soviet assistance (*SSSR i Turtsiia, 1917-1979* [The USSR and Turkey], (Moscow, 1981), 47.

18 Erica Schoenberger and Stephanie Reich, “Soviet Policy in the Middle East,” *MERIP Reports*, no. 39 (July, 1975): 4.

19 On peculiarities of relations between Turkey, the USA and the USSR in the immediate after-war period, see Melvyn P. Leffler, “Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952,” *The Journal of American History*, 71, no. 4 (March, 1985): 807-825.

20 See: Aaron S. Klieman, *Soviet Russia and the Middle East* (Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970); Olav Fagelund Knudsen, “Did Accomodation Work? Two Soviet Neighbors, 1964-88,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 29, no. 1 (February, 1992): 53-69.

instance, anti-Turkish propaganda was predominant in the late Stalin years.²¹ The end of the Stalin era and the ensuing de-stalinization relaxed the Soviet attitude toward Turkey, and Turkologists benefitted from working in a more tranquil and untroubled environment.²²

As Soviet Turkologists acknowledged, Turkey's experience provided Soviet scholars and statesmen with important material based on which many important theoretical and practical problems of Soviet Oriental studies and Soviet foreign policy were expanded on for the first time. For example, early Soviet-Turkish relations were the first test of Soviet foreign policy practices in the East and the first example of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socioeconomic systems. In relations with Turkey, the practice of Soviet diplomacy was formulated and then successfully applied in other countries. Moreover, it was the early Soviet-Turkish relations that served later as the pattern for the formation of the system of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries. Credit given to Turkey in 1934 for its program of industrialization was, in fact, the first Soviet credit supplied to a developing country, and the textile factories in Kayseri and Nazilli were the first industrial complexes built with Soviet assistance on a developing state's territory.²³

Moreover, the peculiarities of Turkey's historical development offered Soviet scholars rich material for advancing the Soviets' socioeconomic analysis. To quote from one Soviet source:

The specificity of Turkey's social development consists in the fact that although, since the second half of the 19th century Turkey had, in fact, been turned by the Western powers into a semi-colony, it had never *de jure* lost its national sovereignty. What is more, Turkey, unlike the overwhelming majority of Asian and African countries, accomplished its anti-imperialist national liberation revolution and won political independence in the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism immediately after the October Revolution. As a result, Turkey had the opportunity to start the struggle for economic independence long before the other colonial and dependent countries and, thus, it has had a longer experience in capitalist development.²⁴

Judging from this passage, the following two focuses of Soviet interest with regard to Turkey can be pointed out: the Turkish struggle for national liberation and the Turkish experience with capitalism. The latter was of particular concern and value for the Soviets because, as another Soviet source indicated, in the Republican period Turkey tried practically all the models and strategies of socioeconomic development that had been attempted in other developing countries.²⁵ As evidenced by the bibliogra-

21 This can also be traced in the contents of works written on Turkey in the late 1940s. For instance, N. Muratov's *Turtsiia v tiskakh vnutrennei i vneshnei reaktsii* [Turkey in the Grip of Domestic and Foreign Reaction], (Moscow, 1949) and I. Vasiliev's *O turetskom "neitralitete" vo vtoroi mirovoi voine* [On Turkish "Neutrality" during the Second World War], (Moscow, 1951) represent two examples of the anti-Turkish polemic of the late Stalin years.

22 Oreshkova, "Nekotorye razmyshleniia," 23.

23 *SSSR i Turtsiia*, 283.

24 *Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik)* [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)], (Moscow, 1975), 56.

25 *Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitiie v 50-80-e gg.* [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development between the 1950s and 1980s], (Moscow, 1987), 4.

phies on Soviet Turkology (see Appendix B, Tables 3 and 4), the majority of scholarly work on Turkey dealt with these two subjects – the Turkish national struggle and socio-economic development.

The post-Soviet era brought about significant changes in the international position of both countries as well as in their attitudes toward each other. Today, the world is observing the rapprochement between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey. The post-Soviet Russian authorities attribute great importance to Turkey, indicating its strengthened geopolitical position in the region as well as its growing economic importance for Russia. In a recent study on Turkey, the country is characterized as a “great economic partner and influential rival of Russia in Eurasia.”²⁶

It is asserted by Russian Turkologists that learning from the Turkish socioeconomic experience can offer useful advice for Russia in its post-Soviet transformation.²⁷

Russian Turkology: Institutional Development and Personalities

I. Tsarist Times

As mentioned above, the Russian public has been interested in the Ottoman Empire since the 15th century. Various material on the Ottoman state existed in the *Posolskii Prikaz* (the Department of Foreign Affairs). Besides the Balkan and Central European accounts on the Ottomans, there was also material of Russian origin – reports by Russian pilgrims to the Holy Land, travelers and former captives. The first work containing considerable information on the Ottomans was *Scythian History* by Andrei Lyzlov.²⁸

The origins of scientific activities in Russia date to the reign of Peter the Great, during which major reforms aimed at Westernization were implemented. Peter the Great wanted Russia to become a European empire. Among other issues, he was aware of Russia's need for institutions of education and science. Peter the Great launched the radical secularization of the educational system, opened Russia's first public library and first museum (the *Kunstammer*), sponsored expeditions to remote regions, and initiated the collection of Oriental manuscripts and ethnographic objects. To round off these efforts, he decreed the establishment of an Academy of Sciences based on the model of the Royal Society in London and appointed foreigners to jump-start the process. A university and a *gimnaziia* (grammar school) were part of the academy.²⁹ Under Peter the Great, the first official measures aimed at preparing specialists on the East were also taken. For example, as early as 1716 a decree was issued to select five students to be attached to the *Posolskii Prikaz* and be trained in Ottoman Turkish, Arabic and Persian.³⁰

26 *Turtsiia mejdu Evropoi i Aziei. Itogi evropeizatsii na iskhode XX veka [Turkey between Europe and Asia. Results of Europeanization in the End of the 20th Century]*, (Moscow: Institute vostokovedeniia RAN – Kraft+, 2001), 5.

27 *Musul'manskie strany u granits SNG (Afganistan, Pakistan, Iran i Turtsiia – sovremennoe sostoianie, istoriia i perspektivy) [Muslim Countries Along the Borders of CIS (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey – Contemporary State, History and Perspectives)]*, (Moscow: IVRAN-“Kraft+”, 2002), 288.

28 Li and Oreshkova, *Sektor Turtsii*, 5. See: A. Lyzlov, *Skifskaia istoriia*, (Moscow, 1990).

29 Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia and the Russians: A History*, (London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 2001), 207-208.

30 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar' otechestvennykh tiurkologov [Biobibliographical Reference Book of Native Turkologists]*, (Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1974), 10.

Peter the Great's counsellor on the Ottoman Empire was Dmitri Kantemir (1673-1723), a Moldavian who had spent 22 years (1688-1710) in Istanbul. Encouraged by Peter the Great, Kantemir completed in 1716 his work entitled *The Rise and Fall of the Ottoman Kingdom*,³¹ the first systematic account of the political and military conditions of the Ottoman Empire. In 1720, Kantemir wrote *The Turkish Empire's System of Religion and State*.³² On Peter the Great's order, Kantemir also established a printing house with Arabic typeset during the course of the Persian campaign of 1722. In this printing house Peter's manifesto, directed at the Turkic population in the area where military operations were being conducted, was printed in Ottoman Turkish.³³

In 1724, on the occasion of the departure of the Russian mission to Istanbul, Peter the Great ordered the selection of four students from the academy to be sent to Istanbul to study Ottoman Turkish.³⁴ After that, the staff of the Russian mission in Istanbul included students who were being trained in languages; in 1741, they numbered six. As evident in its financial reports, the mission regularly paid wages to teachers of Ottoman Turkish and Greek.³⁵

A significant contribution to the development of Russian Oriental studies was made by the European scholars invited to Russia. For example, George J. Kehr (1692-1740), a prominent specialist in Eastern languages, arrived in St. Petersburg in 1732 following the invitation of Russian officials. Kehr trained five specialists who later served as officials in Turkey and Persia.³⁶

After Peter the Great, the general state of affairs in Russia was not favourable for the development of the sciences and a marked stagnation in scientific activities related to Oriental issues was evident. Throughout the 18th century, some Russian rulers attempted to train on an *ad hoc* basis a few people as translators and interpreters in Eastern languages.³⁷ In addition, one important development should be mentioned: in 1755, Moscow University was established.

Russian public interest in the Ottoman state was increasing. During the 18th century, especially in the second half, many translated and original works dealing with the Ottoman state appeared. The first Russian newspapers – *Vedomosti* [News] (since 1702), *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* (since 1727), and *Moskovskie vedomosti* (since 1756) – frequently published reports and articles on the Ottoman state. *Sankt-Peterburgskie*

31 The work was written in Latin (original title - *Incrementa atque decrementa aulae Othomanicae*), published in English translation (1734-1735, 1756), then in French (1743), German (1745), and Romanian (1872).

32 This work was also written in Latin (original title – *Systema de religione et statu Imperii Turcicii*) and translated into Russian by I. Iu. Il'inskii, Kantemir's secretary. Published in 1722.

33 A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izucheniia tiurkskikh iazykov v Rossii* [History of the Study of Turkic Languages in Russia], (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972), 29-30.

34 *Ibid.*, 28.

35 *Ibid.*, 43.

36 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 14.

37 Vera Tolz, "European, National, and (Anti-) Imperial: The Formation of Academic Oriental Studies in Late Tsarist and Early Soviet Russia," in *Orientalism and Empire in Russia*, eds. Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist, and Alexander Martin, *Kritika Historical Studies* 3, (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2006), 110.

vedomosti was supplemented between 1727 and 1742 by *Primechaniia* [Notes]; in fact, it was the first Russian journal in which articles on Ottoman history and geography frequently appeared.³⁸ Soon after the conclusion of the 1774 Peace Treaty with the Ottoman Empire, the first explanation of Ottoman Turkish grammar was published (in 1776 in Moscow and in 1777 in St. Petersburg), translated from the French original.³⁹ The development of Turkology was marked with steady growth. As a Soviet Orientalist put it, “Preparing translators in Constantinople, translating books on Turkey, attention to Turkish literature – all this showed clearly that not only an intense interest in Turkey, in its history, language, literature and contemporary conditions was present, but also that persons able to satisfy this interest were existent.”⁴⁰

The trend continued in the 19th century. The Russian public’s sustained high interest in the Ottomans and the appearance of numerous descriptive, compilatory and translated works on the Ottoman Empire ran in parallel with the establishment of Oriental academic and scholarly centers in which Turkology began.⁴¹

The First Half of the 19th Century: In this period, academic activities in Moscow, Kazan, Odessa and St. Petersburg attracted attention.

First, the Asiatic Museum of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg should be mentioned. Founded in 1818 as a center for the storage and study of Oriental objects, it was the first specialized Oriental academic institution in Russia where the scholarly Oriental studies began.⁴² The museum’s collection included oriental manuscripts, various objects of ethnographic interest, Oriental coins and curiosa. It became the sole state center for the storage and study of Oriental manuscripts, which guaranteed the safety of and access to these documents for scientific and practical purposes. The first director, who served from 1818 to 1842, was C. D. von Frähn,⁴³ who was the first to analyze the museum’s Arabian, Persian and Turkic manuscripts. The second director of the Asiatic Museum (between 1842 and 1881) was B. A. Dorn⁴⁴ who detailed the St. Petersburg Public Library’s manuscripts.⁴⁵

During the 19th century, the field of Oriental studies developed in universities and other educational institutions. The University Statute of 1804 ordered the establishment of faculties of Oriental languages at the reorganized Moscow University and the newly

38 A. K. Sverchevskaia and T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, (Moscow: Izd-vo vostochnoi literatury, 1961), 6.

39 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar’*, 18. The French original was J. B. D. Holdermann’s *Grammaire turque* published in 1730.

40 Kononov, 44.

41 A. S. Tveritina, “V. D. Smirnov – istorik Turtsii [V. D. Smirnov, Historian of Turkey],” *Sovetskaia tiurkologiia*, no. 4 (1971): 105.

42 L. N. Karskaia, *Annotirovannaia bibliografiia otechestvennykh rabot po arabistike, iranistike i tiurkologii. 1818-1917 gg.* [*The Annotated Bibliography of the Native Works on Arabic, Persian and Turkic Studies*], (Moscow: “Vostochnaia literatura” RAN, 2000), 11.

43 Christian Danilovich Frähn (1782-1851), the German orientalist who had been invited to Russia. Prominent Arabist, Iranist, Türkologist, professor of Kazan University from 1807 to 1817.

44 Boris Andreevich Dorn (1805-1881), professor of Oriental languages, historian and geographer of the Caucasus and the Near East.

45 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar’*, 21-22; Kononov, 100-101.

established Kazan and Kharkov Universities. However, the study of Ottoman Turkish was officially introduced not in universities, but in educational institutions founded based on the practical objectives of the government. Ottoman Turkish as a subject of study at university appeared only in the mid-1830s.⁴⁶

The first institution to teach Ottoman Turkish was the Educational Institution of Eastern Languages in the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg,⁴⁷ which in 1823 established two year courses with a specific practical aim: to prepare dragomans for the Russian missions in Turkey and Persia. The number of students was limited to six. In the beginning, three Eastern languages (Persian, Ottoman Turkish, and Arabic) and two European languages (French and English) were taught.⁴⁸

In the 1820s, the teaching of Ottoman Turkish began at the Lazarev Institute of Eastern Languages in Moscow and the Eastern Institute at Rishelievskii High School in Odessa. The Lazarev Institute was founded in Moscow in 1815 as a private Armenian school, supported by the wealthy Armenian Lazarian family. In 1828, the school was officially designated as an institute and placed under the supervision of the Ministry of Public Education. In the beginning, Armenian, Arabic, Persian, and Ottoman Turkish were taught, and a “general perspective on the history, geography and literature of Armenians, Arabs, Persians, and Turks and other Eastern peoples” was also provided. In 1835, the Lazarev Institute was designated as an educational institution with the purpose of “firstly, providing experienced translators of the Eastern languages with theoretical and practical knowledge; secondly, preparing teachers for the other Armenian educational institutions and educated priests for the Christians of the Gregorian Church.”⁴⁹

The Eastern Institute at the Rishelievskii High School in Odessa (1828-1854) was established in order to train translators. Similar to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’

46 Kononov, 126; 140.

47 It was usually named as the Oriental Institute (L’Institut des langues orientales du Ministère des affaires étrangères) and existed between 1823 and 1918 (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar’*, 30).

48 Kononov, 161-162. Later some new disciplines were also added: Italian language (1835), Greek language (1851), Islamic law (1873), international law (1883), and Tatar language (1888). In 1835 the first sub-faculty of history of the Muslim East was created, during all period of its existence (1835-1843) the course on Asian history and geography was taught by B. A. Dorn. Turkish was taught by F. B. Sharmua between 1823 and 1835 and P. I. Desmaisons between 1836 and 1872. Practical training in Turkish was conducted between 1823-1844 by Chorbadzhioglu, a Greek from Istanbul. He was replaced by Okhannes Amidi (1844-1949), an Armenian from Istanbul. The following trainers were Turks: Vehbi Efendi (1852-1856), Akif Efendi (1857-1859), and Osman Nuri (1862-1877). Since 1878 practical training on Turkish was conducted by Fardis and later by Vamvaki, Greeks from Istanbul. In 1883, three-year courses of Eastern languages for officers were created. Among the students of these courses there was P. P. Tsvetkov who compiled Turkish-Russian and Russian-Turkish dictionaries (St. P., 1902) and a four-volume compilative work *Islamism* (Ashkhabad, 1912-1913).

49 Kononov, 154. The first teacher of Eastern languages was Mikhail Salatian. In the early 1830s Turkish and Arabian were taught by Arakel Shakhumov, an Ottoman Armenian and commercial agent. The 1848 Regulation turned the Lazarev Institute to a High School where the following Eastern languages were taught: Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Georgian, Tatar. Since 1850 Turkish was taught by L. E. Lazarev (1822-1884), the author of a Turkish grammar and reader (1864). Later he became the first head of the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty which was established in the Lazarev Institute in 1872. After Lazarev’s death, the Turko-Tatar sub-faculty was headed by S. Ie. Sakov (1846-1921), a Greek of Anatolian origins, who taught Turkish between 1871 and 1908. Since 1885, practical training in Turkish was conducted by S. G. Tserunian (1860-1931), the author of a textbook on colloquial Turkish (1909) (Kononov, 155-158).

Oriental institute, the number of students was limited to six young men. Arabic, Persian and Ottoman Turkish were taught.⁵⁰

Kazan University: In 1835, the implementation of a new statute for universities led to the reorganization of the universities and, among other improvements, the teaching of the Ottoman Turkish language was introduced. Kazan University had already had a department of Turko-Tatar Philology, which had been part of the Oriental Department in the Faculty of Philosophy since 1828. M. A. Kazem-Bek,⁵¹ head of the department, taught Arabic and Persian at Kazan University since 1826 and Tatar since 1829. In 1836, Kazem-Bek started to teach the “Turko-Tatar language in all its details.” He taught Turkish in a comparative light, “pointing out the differences between Turkish and Tatar and the other Turkic dialects,” gave broad information about the etymology and syntax, and trained students in translation from Turkish to Russian and from Russian to Turkish for eight hours a week. Kazem-Bek also taught at the First Kazan High School (established in 1758), where the study of Turkish was introduced by a special regulation in 1836.⁵² In the same year, Kazem-Bek prepared a methodological textbook and program for teachers of Arabic, Persian and Turko-Tatar languages, approved by the Ministry of Public Education, which was used to determine the methodology followed in the First Kazan High School for fifteen years.⁵³

50 B. M. Dantsig, *Blizhnii Vostok v russkoi nauke i literature [The Near East in Russian Science and Literature]*, (Moscow, 1973), 234-237. The first teacher of Turkish was G. Rhasis, the author of the French-Turkish dictionary (St. Petersburg, 1828). After his departure to Istanbul as the Russian mission's dragoman, Eastern languages were taught by V. V. Grigoriev (1838-1843), V. N. Kuzmin (1845-1852) and I. N. Kholmogorov (1852-1854).

51 Mirza Muhammad Ali (Aleksandr Kasimovich) Kazem-Bek (1802-1870). One of the most prominent Russian Orientalists (of Azeri origin), the distinguished Arabist, Iranist and Türkologist. Was born in Iran. Adopted Christianity in 1823. From 1826 to 1849 taught at Kazan University, became a professor in 1836. In 1849 moved to St. Petersburg and became the head of the Sub-Faculty of Persian Philology at St. Petersburg University. In 1855, became the first dean of the newly established Faculty of Eastern Languages at St. Petersburg University. Produced works on history of the Caucasus, Iran, Central Asia, Crimea as well as history of Islam and Iranian and Turkic languages. Published a range of Eastern manuscripts. Was the first scholar in Russia to publish an essay on Babism and works on the grammar of Eastern languages.

52 The regulation by which Turkish was introduced to The First Kazan High School are worth citation at some length for it demonstrates the Russian state's practical objectives in regard to Oriental education. The regulation “On Teaching Oriental Languages in the First Kazan High School,” approved on January 2, 1836 by Nikolai II, ordered:

1. It is prescribed to teach in The First Kazan High School beyond the disciplines stated in the 1828 Educational Regulation the following subjects: a) Arabic, b) Persian, c) Turko-Tatar, d) Mongolian.
2. Instruction in Oriental languages aims at preparing officials mastering these languages in order to appoint them to: a) the Ministry of National Education as teachers of Oriental languages; b) the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as translators and dragomans; c) the Ministry of Internal Affairs as translators and officials attached to governors of areas extending along Asian border, to khans and sultans who are Russian subjects, and to governors of non-Christians; d) the Ministry of Finance to be attached to the heads of custom-houses along the Eastern frontier of Russia and to treasure houses of provinces adjacent to Asian lands (Quoted in Kononov, 121).

53 Kononov, 121-122; 130-131. Kazem-Bek also taught Tatar, Turkish and Arabic at Kazan Religious Academy in which two sub-faculties (Mongol-Kalmyk and Turko-Tatar) existed since 1845 (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 35). It is interesting to note that Kazem-Bek trained Russian classic Lev Nikoloi-evich Tolstoy in Turkish and Arabic in order to prepare him for the entrance examinations at Kazan University. In 1844, Tolstoy passed the examinations and was admitted to the Oriental department of the Faculty of Philosophy. But after a year he moved to the Faculty of Law (Kononov, 130).

M. A. Kazem-Bek was highly respected by contemporary Orientalists as a scholar who “combined an excellent Muslim education with a sound knowledge of European scholarship.”⁵⁴ As post-Soviet Turkologists came to assert, his work laid the ground for the emergence of Ottoman studies as a separate field of research.⁵⁵ His *Grammatika turetsko-tatarskogo yazıka* [Grammar of the Turko-Tatar Language] (1839) was the second Turkish grammar book written in Russian (the first was written by O. I. Senkovskii in 1828) and the first grammar book dealing with the Ottoman Turkish language in comparison with the other Turkic languages. This book was used as a textbook in all Russian universities until the beginning of the 20th century. Moreover, it was translated into German in 1848 and used at foreign universities as well.⁵⁶

Kazem-Bek was not only an outstanding linguist with deep knowledge of the Arabic, Persian and Turkic languages, but also a specialist in the literature and history of the East. As a report prepared in the early 1840s on Kazan University noted, Kazem-Bek lectured in the following manner:

He explained to his students the broad Turko-Tatar grammar based on his own work; read selected parts from *Kabusname*, *The History of Chingis-khan*, the works of Abulghazi Bakhadur Khan, Muhammad Riza’s *History of the Seven Planets*, the works of Ragib Pasha, Rami Efendi and Ageli; had them to read newspapers from Constantinople and Alexandria and translate them into Turkish; and gave lectures on the history of Turkish literature and the history of education and science in the East based on his own notes six hours a week.⁵⁷

Kazem-Bek’s publication of Muhammad Riza’s *Seven Planets*⁵⁸ and his other works augmented the sources available on Ottoman studies and demonstrated the importance of Eastern sources in studying Russian history.⁵⁹

By the mid-19th century, Kazan University became one of the most developed centers of Oriental education and science in Russia. According to the list of courses approved by the Ministry of National Education on March 26, 1843, in the Department of Turko-Tatar Philology the following courses were taught:

I year. Main courses: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabic; Auxiliary courses: 1) English, 2) History of Religion, 3) Ancient History, 4) General History.

II year. Main courses: 1) Arabic, 2) Turkish, 3) History of Ancient Turkic Peoples; Auxiliary courses: 1) English, 2) Contemplative Theology, 3) Medieval and Modern History, 4) History of General Literature.

III year. Main courses: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabic, 3) Political History of the Ottoman State; Auxiliary courses: 1) English, 2) Moral Theology, 3) History of Russia, 4) History of General Literature.

⁵⁴ Quoted from V. V. Grigoriev in Oreshkova, “Nekotorye razmyshleniia,” 25.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁵⁶ Kononov, 190-191.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁵⁸ M. A. Kazem-Bek, *Asseb as Seiiar, ili Sem’ Planet, sodержashchii istoriiu Krymskikh khanov* [*Asseb as Seiiar, or Seven Planets, Containing History of Crimean Khans*], (Kazan, 1832).

⁵⁹ Oreshkova, “Nekotorye razmyshleniia,” 25.

IV year. Main courses: 1) Turkish, 2) Arabic, 3) History of Ottoman Philology; Auxiliary courses: 1) English, 2) History of Philosophical Systems, 3) History of General Literature. Elective courses: 1) Persian, 2) French.⁶⁰

The high quality of the education in Oriental Studies at Kazan University is evidenced by the fact that the Board of Kazan University had prescribed each professor to present annual “historical surveys on the developments his discipline underwent in Europe and the achievements obtained in the field.” Students were encouraged to take part in essay competitions on specific topics⁶¹ and were sent to Eastern countries to study. For example, in 1842, Kazem-Bek’s students I. N. Berezin⁶² and V. F. Dittel⁶³ were sent on a three-year journey throughout the Middle East during which they followed a program prepared by their teacher.⁶⁴

In 1846, Berezin became the head of the Turko-Tatar Department after Kazem-Bek was appointed to the Department of Arabian and Persian Philology. He taught students in a way similar to Kazem-Bek:

He translated –alternately with students– selected parts of *Tutiname*, *Iuss-i Zafer*, the works of Evliya Chelebi, *The Book of Forty Viziers*, travel accounts of Mohammad Seid Vakhit Efendi, Baki’s *Divan*, official Ottoman documents, and the Khans’ *iarlyks*; trained students to translate from Russian and French to Turkish and from literary Turkish into colloquial Turkish; and gave lectures on the history of the Turkic peoples, the history of the Ottoman Empire, and the history of Turkish literature for eight hours a week.⁶⁵

At St. Petersburg University, founded in 1819, the Department of Turkish Philology was established in 1835 and headed by O. I. Senkovskii.⁶⁶ Senkovskii had already started to teach Turkish (along with Arabic) in 1822, but the lessons were “so to speak,

60 Kononov, 132-133.

61 For example, the following topic were proposed for the 1840-41 academic year: “The Causes and the Course of Migration of Turkic and Mongolian Peoples from the East to the West.”

62 Ilia Nikolaievich Berezin (1818-1896), would later become a distinguished Türkolog and Iranist, professor at Kazan (1846-55) and St. Petersburg (from 1855) universities. From 1842 to 1845 made journeys through Daghestan, Transcaucasus, Turkey and Iran; it resulted in his book *Travels in the East* (vol. 1-2, 1850-52). Berezin’s main works were on history, philology, and archaeology of the Near and Middle East. He published the *Library of Eastern Historians* (1849-54); the *Collection of Chronicles* of Rashid Al-Din with Russian translation and notes (1858-88); the *Turkish Reader* (vol. 1-3, 1857-90); and the *Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary* (vol. 1-16, 1873-79). Berezin compiled the first handbook of the Persian language in Russia (*Grammar of the Persian Language*, 1853).

63 Viliam Frantsevich Dittel (1816-1848) graduated from Kazan University, taught Turkish at St. Petersburg University between 1846-1848. Died early from cholera.

64 Kononov, 135.

65 Kononov, 133.

66 Osip Ivanovich Senkovskii (Josef Julian Sekowski) (1800-1858), the prominent Russian Orientalist of Polish origin. Graduated from Vilnius University in 1819. The same year he travelled throughout the Near East. In 1820, he was appointed as the dragoman of Russian embassy in Istanbul. In 1822, was offered professor position at St. Petersburg University.

of private character"; Senkovskii only gave lessons twice a week to students in their final year. In 1835, Turkish was officially introduced into the university program.⁶⁷

Senkovskii was very talented, with a multifaceted and contradictory personality. On the one hand, he was an outstanding scholar with impeccable knowledge of Arabic and Turkish and well-informed on the lifestyle and culture of the Eastern people as well as on Eastern literature. Senkovskii was an excellent teacher and provided students with sound and in-depth knowledge of Eastern literature and society, while paying the utmost attention to the active usage of Eastern languages. He also demanded his students always base their work on sources.⁶⁸ When teaching Turkish, Senkovskii used his own *Karmannaia kniga dlia russkikh voenov v turetskikh pokhodakh* [Pocket Book for Russian Soldiers in Turkish Campaigns] (published in two volumes, St. Petersburg, 1828-29) as a textbook. The book contains a Russian-Turkish conversational textbook, a Russian-Turkish dictionary and lessons on Turkish grammar. It was the first Russian-Turkish dictionary and the first Turkish grammar book in Russian.⁶⁹

On the other hand, Senkovskii was a talented writer (his pen-name was Baron Brambeus); he was the author of many popular literary works, which showcased his knowledge of the East. As the editor of the journal *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* [Library for Reading] (founded in 1834), he also published ethnographic and travel accounts, translations, and book reviews.⁷⁰ Starting in 1834, Senkovskii became increasingly involved in journalism and eventually abandoned his scholarly activities, although he continued to teach Turkish at St. Petersburg University until 1838⁷¹ and made a significant contribution to the popularization of Ottoman studies with his translations of Ottoman sources. Unfortunately, his use of a vivid literary style made many of these translations unreliable for use by scholars.⁷²

Nevertheless, Russian scholars have acknowledged Senkovskii's significant contribution to the establishment of the academic discipline of Russian Oriental studies, and in particular Ottoman studies. Today, Russian Turkologists assert that scholarly Turkology began with two names – Senkovskii and Kazem-Bek.⁷³ It should be noted that Barthold referred to them as the founders of the wider field of Russian Oriental studies. As Barthold put it, "Senkovskii and Kazem-Bek created Russian Orientology with their lectures; almost all Russian Orientalists of the following generations were their students or students of their students."⁷⁴

67 Kononov, 140.

68 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 259.

69 Kononov, 141; 188.

70 Dantsig, 128-129.

71 After him, Turkish was taught by A. O. Mukhlinskii (1839-45), M. D. Topchibashev (1845-46; 48-49), V. F. Dittel (1846-48), Mukhlinskii again (1849-1866), A. O. Maksimov (1866-1867), L. Z. Budagov (1868-1869), I. N. Berezin (1869-1873), V. D. Smirnov (1873-1919). Between 1886 and 1897 Smirnov was assisted by Abdurakhman Shevket, a Turk from Salonika. Between 1898 and 1908 colloquial Turkish and Turkish calligraphy were taught by Ilias Murza Baraganskii who had obtained his secondary education in Istanbul (Kononov, 143-145; 150).

72 Oreshkova, "Nekotorye razmyshleniia," 25.

73 *Ibid.*, 25.

74 V. V. Barthold, "Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii [History of Oriental Studies in Europe and Russia]," *Sochineniia* [Works], v. IX (Moscow, 1979), 283.

The second half of the 19th Century: In 1854-55, Oriental studies went through radical reforms aimed at centralization. In 1854, the Faculty of Oriental Languages was established at St. Petersburg University, and all the other existing departments of Oriental studies in Kazan and Odessa were shut down and most of their staff, students and resources were transferred to St. Petersburg.⁷⁵

Some Soviet scholars refer to this reorganization rather vaguely as a result of the “crisis” experienced in the 1840s by the departments of Oriental studies at the Kazan and St. Petersburg universities due to the “deficiency of qualified lecturers and the uncertainty of the objectives of Oriental studies which was reflected in the difficulties the graduates faced in searching for jobs.”⁷⁶ Others noted that this abrupt discontinuation of education in Oriental studies in Kazan occurred just at the moment when “teaching Oriental languages in Kazan had become widespread.”⁷⁷ In the mid-1840s, M. A. Castren, a distinguished Finnish philologist, remarked that, “there is no other university in the world in which Oriental literature is so vigorously studied as in Kazan... There are scholars of European reputation among the Orientalists of Kazan University and I believe that, in the near future, the most important scholarly questions concerning the East will be solved right here.”⁷⁸ It may well be the case that the Russian authorities were worried about the advance of Oriental studies in Kazan, the acknowledged spiritual center of the Russian Muslims, which had established ties with the Muslim world outside Russia, and the Ottomans in particular. This fact and its political implications are among the factors that influenced the Russian authorities’ decision to move the center of Oriental studies to St. Petersburg.⁷⁹

The Faculty of Eastern Languages at St. Petersburg University was established in 1854 with the following departments: 1) Arabic, 2) Persian, 3) Turko-Tatar, 4) Mongolian and Kalmyk, 5) Chinese, 6) Hebrew, 7) Armenian, 8) Georgian, and 9) Manchu.⁸⁰ M. A. Kazem-Bek was the first dean of the faculty.⁸¹ Ottoman Turkish was taught in the Department of Turko-Tatar Philology, which was headed by A. O. Mukhlinskii⁸² until 1866. Mukhlinskii taught Ottoman Turkish, Ottoman literature, and

⁷⁵ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 27.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁷⁷ Kononov, 125.

⁷⁸ Quoted in Kononov, 136.

⁷⁹ This move nearly ruined the newly emerging Kazan school of Oriental studies. In Kazan, only Tatar language teaching was preserved “with attention to local circumstances.” Teaching Turkish and Arabic “for the interested” was organized again in 1861 (the lecturer was N. I. Il'minskii), but after the professor’s appointment to another position in 1872, the sub-faculty ceased to exist. It was reestablished only in 1888 (existed until 1919), with two divisions: Turkic and Finnic languages. Since 1894, professor N. F. Katanov (1862-1922), the student of V. V. Radlov, I. N. Berezin and V. D. Smirnov, taught Tatar language, history of Turkic peoples, history of Turko-Tatar literature (Ottoman, Chagatai and general Turkic literatures), the comparative grammar of Turkic languages (Kononov, 136-138).

⁸⁰ *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 27.

⁸¹ Kazem-Bek had moved to St. Petersburg University in 1849 to head the sub-faculty of Persian Philology.

⁸² Anton Osipovich Mukhlinskii (1808-1977) graduated from Vilnius and St. Petersburg Universities, took courses in the Oriental Institute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1839, he was appointed as the head of the Department of Turkish Philology and started to teach Ottoman Turkish. Later he also gave lectures on Ottoman literature (1843-44) and the history of Turkish and Turkic languages (1844-45).

the history and geography of the Ottoman state.⁸³ Courses on general Türkology were taught by I. N. Berezin, who also taught Ottoman Turkish from 1869 to 1873.⁸⁴

In 1863, the Department of the History of the East, the first in the world, was established; thus, the history of the East became a separate discipline. The first head of the department was V. V. Grigoriev (1816-1881).⁸⁵

In 1873, V. D. Smirnov⁸⁶ began teaching courses on Ottoman Turkish, Ottoman literature and history; he taught in the department until 1919. It is acknowledged by Turkologists that Smirnov was the first Russian Türkologist who specifically focused on Ottoman studies. Due to his efforts, Turkology was established as a separate branch of Russian Oriental studies.⁸⁷

Some remarks on the development of the Lazarev Institute in Moscow should be made. In 1872, the Lazarev Institute was reorganized so as to combine two educational institutions, a high school and a three-year course, equivalent to college, which consisted of the following departments: 1) Armenian philology, 2) Arabic philology, 3) Persian philology, 4) Turko-Tatar Language, 5) History of the East, 6) Russian philology, and 7) Georgian language.⁸⁸ Toward the end of the 19th century the Lazarev Institute made significant advances due to its outstanding professors, such as V. F. Miller (1878-1913), the eminent Iranist and Slavist, director of the Institute between 1897 and 1911; F. Ie. Korsh (1843-1915), Iranist, Slavist, Arabist, Türkologist, and Sanskritist; A. Ie. Krymskii (1871-1942), Arabist, Iranist, and Türkologist; V. I. Guerrier (1837-1919), historian of the East; and V. A. Gordlevskii (1876-1956), specialist in Turkish language, literature, and ethnography.⁸⁹ The Institute had its own print shop and published the *Emin Ethnographical Anthology* (6 issues) and *Papers in Oriental Studies* (1899-1917).⁹⁰

83 Kononov, 145-146; 190.

84 Ibid., 146-148. Though Berezin was primarily interested in Central Asia and Iran, he also made a significant contribution to Ottoman studies. In particular, his study of Crimean khans' official documents should be mentioned (195).

85 Ibid., 4. According to Kononov, the Russian school of history of the East began with this event. This school was represented in Türkology by V. V. Grigoriev, P. S. Saveliev, I. N. Berezin, V. G. Tizengauzen, V. V. Veliaminov-Zernov, N. I. Veselovskii, V. V. Barthold, V. D. Smirnov, A. Iu. Iakubovskii, A. A. Semenov and others.

86 Vasilii Dmitrievich Smirnov (1846-1922), the student of V. V. Grigoriev and I. N. Berezin. Graduated from St. Petersburg University in 1870. In 1873 received his master's degree, submitting the dissertation *Kuchubei Gumurdzhinskii and Other Ottoman Writers of the Seventeenth Century on Causes of Turkey's Decline* (published in 1873 in St. Petersburg). In 1875, made his first journey to Turkey. In 1887 received his doctorate degree submitting the dissertation *Crimean Khanate under the Ottoman Domination until the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century* (St. Petersburg, 1887). The author of many important works on Turkish literature and history such as *Crimean Khanate under the Ottoman Domination During the Eighteenth Century* (Odessa, 1889), *Exemplary Works of Ottoman Literature and Essays on the History of Turkish Literature* (St. Petersburg, 1891), *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of the Educational Branch of Eastern Languages of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs* and others.

87 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 261.

88 Kononov, 156.

89 *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 30.

90 *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 14, (New York: Macmillan, Inc.; London: Collier Macmillan Publishers), 1977, 308.

By the end of the 19th century, the Lazarev Institute and the Faculty of Oriental Languages at St. Petersburg University had become the two most advanced institutions related to Oriental studies in Russia.⁹¹ The two institutions served different purposes: the Faculty of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg was scholarly oriented, while the primary objective of the Lazarev Institute was to train diplomats, civil servants and translators. Whereas St. Petersburg University focused on classical philology, ancient and medieval literature, and the culture of the Oriental peoples, the Lazarev Institute's program contained a greater proportion of juridical and economics courses. Scholars of the Lazarev Institute paid much attention to the contemporary realities and colloquial form of the modern Oriental languages while their research interests were in the Near and Middle East countries: the Arabian countries, Iran, Turkey, Transcaucasia and Central Asia.⁹²

Among the scholars of the Lazarev Institute, the greatest contribution to the field of Ottoman philological and historical studies was made by A. Ie. Krymskii⁹³ and V. A. Gordlevskii.⁹⁴ Gordlevskii is said to be the founder of the Moscow school in Turkology, who maintained the traditions of Russian Oriental studies during the Soviet period.⁹⁵

In conclusion, it can be stated that the development of Oriental studies and scholarly activities, particularly since the 1830s, led to the gradual formation of Turkology (Ottoman studies) as a separate branch of Türkology. Although it cannot be said that Turkology was established as a completely separate discipline with its own institutions and specialists, there are at least some scholars who focused their research exclusively

91 In Moscow University, teaching Oriental languages started in 1811 (Arabic and Hebrew between 1811 and 1837, and Arabic, Persian and Hebrew since 1852). Instruction in Turkic languages began only in the Soviet period (Kononov, 138-139).

92 Li and Oreshkova, 14-15.

93 Agafangel Iefimovich Krymskii (1871-1942) graduated from the Lazarev Institute (1892) and from the Faculty of History and Philology of Moscow University (1896). Between 1898 and 1918 taught at the Lazarev Institute, where he became a professor in 1900. From 1918 to 1941 was a professor at Kiev University. Was one of the founders of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Was a scholar with broad scholarly interests – Arabist, Iranist, Türkolog, Slavist, Islamist, historian, literator and poet. Wrote many books on Islam, on history, literature, and culture of Arabian countries, Iran, Turkey, Ukraine, and on Ukrainian grammar and other aspects of Slavic studies. The author of numerous literary translations from Arabian, Persian, Turkish authors. Krymskii was one of the first Russian Orientalists to regard the history of the East as a part of world history. (*Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 198-199; *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 13 (New York: MacMillan, Inc.; London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1976), 532. Krymskii is the author of *History of Turkey and Its Literature* (published in 1910 in Russian, and in 1924-27 in Ukrainian). His essay *Tsargrad* (Moscow, 1915) had offered a new understanding of the Ottoman history, which contradicted the general public's Turkophobic attitude (Li and Oreshkova, 14).

94 Vladimir Aleksandrovich Gordlevskii (1876-1956) graduated from the Lazarev Institute (1899) and from the Faculty of History and Philology of Moscow University (1904). Two years between 1905 and 1907 spent in Anatolia, Syria and France. Since 1907 taught Turkish language and literature at the Lazarev Institute. Since 1905 became interested in Turkish folklor and ethnography, later also in Turkish literature and history. Was the first investigator of Russian-Turkish literary relations: *Tolstoi in Turkey, Moscow*, 1911. (In Soviet time, he continued his work in this direction: *Chekhov in Turkey, Moscow*, 1944; *Pushkin in Turkey. Moscow*, 1961). In 1912, published *Essays on Modern Ottoman Literature* in which Ottoman literature was analyzed in comparison with Russian and Western literature. Scholarly and educational activities of Gordlevskii developed mainly in the Soviet period. (*Azerbaijan Sovet Entsiklopediasy*, vol. 2 (Baku, 1979), 207; *Biobibliograficheskii slovar'*, 148-149; Li and Oreshkova, 71).

95 Li and Oreshkova, 14.

on Turkish philology, literature and history. By the end of the 19th century, V. D. Smirnov rose to prominence as an outstanding Turkologist, and in the beginning of the 20th century, V. A. Gordlevskii began his career in the same field.

II. The Soviet Era

Almost every aspect of life was profoundly changed after the establishment of Soviet rule. Perhaps intellectual and scholarly activities were the fields which were most affected by the abrupt and radical changes. One Western scholar describes the situation in the field of Oriental studies immediately after the establishment of Bolshevik rule as follows:

During the First World War and immediately afterward, a number of Russian Orientalists died. Some left Russia as political refugees to continue their work abroad. Many of those who remained were thwarted by the unsettled conditions, by their inability to conform to the communist ideological requirements and to secure institutional sponsorship, and by the limited opportunities for publication. The few who were able to adjust to the new circumstances became the founders and pillars of contemporary Soviet Oriental studies.⁹⁶

1917 - the 1920s: From the very beginning, the Soviet government was greatly interested in developing Oriental studies and the first Soviet institutions on Oriental studies were created, restructured from the already existing Tsarist institutions or newly established as early as during the years of civil war and foreign intervention. Thus, the Institute of Eastern Languages was founded in Kiev in 1918, an Oriental division was created in the People's Commissariat of Education in 1919, and the College of Orientalists was founded at the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad in 1921. While some of these centers were attached to academic institutions, others were affiliated with the government, the Communist party, or the army.⁹⁷ From the very beginning, the field of Oriental studies became markedly divided into the so-called "Comintern school" of Oriental studies – the politicized field of activities aimed at achieving the practical objectives of the Soviet state and represented mostly by Soviet officials and functionaries without any education in this field, and academic, or "classical," Oriental studies which was represented mainly by the scholars of the pre-Soviet generation who strove to continue scholarly traditions of the previous era.

During the 1920s, the number of institutions and organizations focused on Oriental studies increased considerably. In 1922, the All-Russian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies (VNAV) was set up with *Novyi Vostok* (New East) as its mouthpiece (published from 1922 to 1930); it was attached to the People's Commissariat of Nationalities. One Western scholar described this group of Soviet Orientalists as "communists without academic training, but with academic ambitions, some quite capable

96 Wayne S. Vucinich, "Soviet Studies on the Middle East," in *The Soviet Union and the Middle East: The Post-World War II Era*, eds. Ivo J. Lederer and Wayne S. Vucinich, (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1974), 177.

97 Ibid., 178.

and others of no distinction whatever.”⁹⁸ Following the establishment of VNAV, the Institute of the Peoples of the USSR East, the A. S. Ehlukidze Institute of Living Oriental Languages, the Museum of Oriental Culture, the Yafetic Institute, and the Institute of Buddhist Culture were formed. Meanwhile, in 1921 the Asiatic Museum was expanded and the former Lazarev Institute was renamed the Moscow Oriental Institute.⁹⁹ A special department of Oriental studies was also created at the Military Academy. In order to “establish contacts with the working masses of the East,” the Communist University of the Toilers of the East and the Sun Yat-Sen University of the Toilers of China, along with their corresponding scientific research institutes, were created. Several institutes for Oriental studies were set up in the borderlands as well: the Department of Oriental Studies was founded at Azerbaijan State University in 1922 and Erivan State University began teaching Eastern languages and literature in 1923. The All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Orientology (VUNAV) was established in 1926 with divisions in Kharkov, Kiev and Odessa.¹⁰⁰

In the 1920s, educational activities aimed at training Soviet functionaries in Eastern languages (which included Turkish) prevailed. Ukraine was particularly advanced in this area. In 1918, the Institute of Eastern Languages was founded in Kiev; it was soon restructured as the Institute of the Near East, which consisted of two departments – consular and commercial. In 1920, the Institute was again reorganized as the Institute of Foreign Relations, divided into two departments, Oriental and Anglo-Saxon. The departments consisted of two divisions, consular and foreign trade.¹⁰¹ Both the difficulties in the post-war era as well as the frequent reorganizations of the institutions hindered the normal development of the field of Oriental studies. In the end, the Institute of Foreign Relations became the Technical Trade School, in which the field of Oriental studies receded. But the Orientalist department was still active, and in 1924 became the Higher Seminar of Oriental Studies, part of the Technical Trade School. The activities of the Seminar were mainly concerned with studying Soviet trade relations with the East.¹⁰²

A. Ie. Krymskii made a significant contribution to the development of academic activities in Ukraine. He moved to Kiev in 1918 and in February 1919, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was established; Krymskii occupied the post of secretary of the

98 Walter L. Laqueur, “The Shifting Line in Soviet Orientology,” *Problems of Communism*, no. 2 (March-April 1956): 21. Quoted in Nisha Sahai-Achuthan, “Soviet Indologists and the Institute of Oriental Studies: Works on Contemporary India in the Soviet Union,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 2 (February, 1983): 325.

99 In 1919, by a decree of the Council of People’s Commissars of the RSFSR, the Lazarev Institute was renamed the Armenian Institute, then the Southwest Asian Institute, in 1920 the Central Institute of Living Oriental Languages, and in 1921, the Moscow Oriental Institute (*Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 14, 308).

100 N. I. Borozdin, “Inter-Racial Study in Asia: The Progress of Orientology in the USSR,” *Pacific Affairs* 2, no. 6 (June, 1929): 323-328; *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Gruzii, Ukraina)* [Centers of Oriental Studies in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine)], (Moscow, 1988), 9; 50; 91.

101 Turkish was taught by V. S. Shcherbina and T. G. Kezma. These two teachers prepared a textbook of the Turkish language in 1918.

102 *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, 91.

Academy from 1919 to 1928. At the same time, he headed the Philological department in the academy, which included a division of Türkology. Krymskii's task was not easy since only three specialists in Oriental studies –Arabist T. G. Kezma, Iranist P. N. Loziev, and Türkolog T. I. Grunin– assisted him at that time. Another challenge was related to the lack of sources. Krymskii began to assemble an Oriental library, the base of which was his own personal collection. He found many useful resources in the Kiev University library. As he wrote to V. V. Bartold:

I was greatly surprised to discover that a considerable collection of works on the East had been collected in the library of Kiev University during the ninety years of its existence. There are complete collections of Oriental journals, proceedings of European academies with their Oriental parts, European translations from historians and geographers (frequently accompanied with Oriental texts, for instance, Masudi), and general works on Oriental literature. In particular, history of Turkey promises many pleasant surprises.¹⁰³

Besides the materials found in the university library, the former Religious Academy's sources and some private collections were used by scholars. In 1919, a separate department of "Orientalia" was founded in the library of the Academy of Sciences.

The first years of Soviet rule were devoted mainly to organizational activities; scientific work was suspended for a while. Starting in the mid-1920s, Krymskii published a number of important works, several of which were devoted to Turkey.¹⁰⁴

In 1925, the All-Ukrainian Scientific Center of Oriental Studies, headed by Krymskii, was established in Kiev. After the establishment of the All-Ukrainian Academic Association of Oriental Studies (VUNAV), the Ukrainian branch of VNAV, in Kharkov (1926), the Center in Kiev became its headquarters. Another location was set up in Odessa. Research conducted by VUNAV focused mainly on the problems of contemporary life, in particular, the economic problems of the peoples of the East, which had practical meaning for the development of trade relations between the USSR and the Eastern countries. The association consisted of two departments: Politics and Economics (subdivided into sections: Economics and Politics of the Soviet and Foreign East; Law in Eastern Countries) and History and Ethnology (sections: History;

¹⁰³ Ibid., 95.

¹⁰⁴ *Istoriia Turechchini z 13 maliunkami, shcho ikh uziato pobilshe iz starodrukiv XVI – XVIII vv. Zvidki pochalasia Osmanska derzhava, iak vona zrostala rozvivalasia i iak dosiagla apogeiu svoei slavi i mogutnosti* (Kiev, 1924); *Khodzha Nasreddin i iogo "Zharti"*. *Storinka z istorii turetskogo pismenstva XIV – XV vv., iak material dlia folkloristiv* [Khodzha Nasreddin and His "Jokes." A Page From History of Turkish Literature in the 14-15th Centuries as a Material for Folklorists], (Kiev, 1926); *Vstup do istorii Turechchini. Vip. 3. Evropeiski dzherela XVI v.* [Introduction to History of Turkey. European Writings], (Kiev, 1926); *Istoriia Turechchini ta ii pismenstva. Ch. 2. Vip. 2. Pismenstvo XIV- XV vv.* [History of Turkey and Its Literature], (Kiev, 1927); *Z istorii turetskogo pismenstva XIV v. (Z privedu vidannia turetskogo tekstu poemi "Siukheil ve Nevbekhar" 1350-1378 rr., shcho opublikuvav I. Mordtman u 1925 r.)* [From History of Turkish Literature in the 14th Century (On the Occasion of Publication of Turkish Text of the Poem "Siukheil and Nevbekhar" Which Was Published by I. Mordtman in 1925)], (Kiev, 1927); *Tiurki, ikh movi ta liiteraturi. 1. Tiurksi movi. Vip. 2.* [Turkic Peoples, Their Languages and Literatures. Turkic Languages], (Kiev, 1930).

Languages and Literature; Art; Archaeology). During a trip to Turkey, an agreement was made with Turkish scholars to establish a commission on Ukrainian-Turkish relations; the Commission was established in 1928. In order to assist its work, the Leningrad Orientalists sent the Ukrainian Central Historical Archive copies of materials related to Ukrainian-Turkish relations.

VUNAV had 193 full members and 158 correspondent members in 1929. It held congresses in 1927 and 1929 and published 17 issues of its journal *Skhidnii svit* [Eastern Light] (*Chervonii skhid* [Red East] after 1930) between 1927 and 1931.¹⁰⁵

VUNAV was supported by monthly subsidies from the Odessa branch of the Russian Chamber of Eastern Commerce, which issued a bulletin *Torgovlia Ukrainy s Vostokom* [Ukrainian Trade with the East]. VUNAV conducted research on some of the economic issues in which the chamber was interested. Many articles by VUNAV members on political and economic issues were based on material provided by the chamber.

Teaching Eastern languages was one of the main activities of VUNAV. Three-year courses began in 1925 in Kiev (Arabic, Persian, Turkish) and in 1926 in Kharkov (Japanese, Persian, Turkish). The Ukrainian Evening School of Oriental Studies and Eastern Languages, which was based on VUNAV's courses, offered a three-year program in Kharkov starting in May 1930. This school was granted college status and trained economists specializing in the countries of the East and workers in the cultural and educational fields (teachers, translators, journalists and others). Turkish, Persian, English, French, and Arabic (optional) as well as Uzbek, Turkmen, and Tadzhik were taught. In order to provide the instructors with teaching material, VUNAV members prepared several textbooks on the Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Japanese languages. Out of these books, two Turkish textbooks¹⁰⁶ stood out.¹⁰⁷

Meanwhile, in Moscow the reorganized Lazarev Institute (the Moscow Oriental Institute) started to work under new circumstances. V. A. Gordlevskii, who was a professor at the Institute from 1918 to 1948, made major contributions to the advance of Turkological studies in Moscow. As early as in 1918, Gordlevskii started to teach a course titled "The History of Ottoman literature: Ottoman Turkish." Practical lessons on Turkish were taught by S. G. Tserunian.¹⁰⁸ Gordlevskii also gave lectures, mostly on the Turkish language, at many other educational institutions. During the 1920s, he pub-

105 There is the bibliography of this journal in Ukrainian: R. S. Livshits and Kh. S. Nadel, comp., *Sistematichnii pokazhchik do zhurnalu "Skhidnii svit" – Chervonii Skhid (1927-1931)*, Kharkov, 1964. Each issue of the journal contained 250-300 pages (some issues over 400 pages) and consisted of the following parts: 1) Economics, Politics, Law; 2) History, Ethnography, Literature; 3) Papers; 4) Bibliography; 5) Latest News about Oriental Studies. The geographical scope of the journal was wide, but articles on the Near and Middle East prevailed (*Vostokovednye tseniry v SSSR*, 92).

106 *Prakticheskii uchebnik turetskogo iazyka*, Kharkov, 1928; T. I. Grunin, *Turetskii iazyk. Elementarnaia grammatika i novyi alfavit*, Kharkov, 1930.

107 *Vostokovednye tseniry v SSSR*, 93-94.

108 Semion Grigorievich Tserunian (1860-1931) was born in Constantinople. Conducted practical lessons of Turkish at the Lazarev Institute since 1885. The author of an interesting textbook on colloquial Turkish (published in 1909 and 1924).

lished important books and articles on Turkish linguistics, medieval Ottoman history, Ottoman literature, geography, ethnography, and translated Turkish literature into Russian as well as Russian classics into Turkish.¹⁰⁹

In Leningrad, the Türkological Cabinet was created in 1927. The founder and director of the cabinet (between 1928 and 30) was V. V. Barthold. The Türkological Cabinet was engaged with the problem of the new Turkic alphabets.¹¹⁰

It can be concluded that in the early years of Soviet rule, the study of Turkology developed mainly in accordance with the practical needs of the Soviet state; language training was the emphasis. Apart from the state institutions, academic and scholarly activities related to Turkology also began in the eastern Soviet republics. In particular, the study of Turkology in Ukraine was advanced, while displaying an apparent inclination to the study of economic issues in line with the practical interests of the Soviet state. At the same time, scholarly Türkological studies continued in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev, mostly due to the efforts of the Orientalists of the pre-Soviet generation.

The 1930-40s: The restructuring of Oriental studies in the late 1920s resulted in the closure of many Oriental institutions and the move of the center of Oriental studies to the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad. These changes were accompanied by the emergence of a more militant and politicized scholarly discourse. It should be underlined that these changes coincided with Stalin's accession to power.

In 1928, the Central Committee of the Communist Party expressed dissatisfaction with the work of VNAV. As a result, VNAV was dissolved and replaced by the new Association of Marxist Orientalists (which in turn was brought to a sudden end in 1937).¹¹¹

In 1930 it was decided by the Communist Party that the field of Oriental studies no longer required separate academic, governmental, and party institutions. The Asiatic Museum, the College of Orientalists, the Institute of Buddhist Culture, and the Türkological Cabinet were merged into the Institute of Oriental Studies (IVAN) at the Academy of Sciences, headquartered in Leningrad. Afterwards, most of the basic research in Oriental studies was conducted at this institute, some other institutes of the Academy of Sciences, and academies in the other republics.¹¹²

To start, IVAN had the following geographic divisions: Caucasian, Arab countries, Jewish-Turkish, Iranian, Indo-Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian, and Japanese-Korean. By 1937 it had added two more divisions, Modern Indian and Ancient East.¹¹³ Planned scholarly activities focused on modern and recent history, national liberation move-

109 Li and Oreshkova, 18-21; 70-71. Gordlevskii's most important publications: *Grammatika turetskogo iazyka* [Grammar of the Turkish Language], (Moscow, 1928); *Iz zhizni tsekhov v Turtsii* [From the Life of the Turkish Guilds], (Moscow, 1927); *Vnutrennee sostoianie Turtsii vo vtoroi polovine XVI veka* [The Internal Conditions of Turkey in the Second Half of the XVIth Century], (Moscow, 1940); *Gosudarstvo sel'dzhukidov Maloi Azii* [The Seljuk State of Asia Minor], (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941). Gordlevskii also edited the Turkish-Russian dictionary, the first in history of Russian Turkology (Moscow, 1931).

110 Li and Oreshkova, 21.

111 Sahai-Achuthan, 325-326.

112 Vucinich, 178.

113 Sahai-Achuthan, 327.

ments, and the economic problems of Eastern countries. From 1930 to 1934, the number of IVAN staff increased from 18 to 47. In 1940, the number of scholars was 110.¹¹⁴

Within the Jewish-Turkish division, the Turkish Cabinet was created.¹¹⁵ Nine Turkologists – the majority of whom were young – worked together in this cabinet: A. A. Alimov,¹¹⁶ Kh. M. Tsovikian, Kh. I. Muratov,¹¹⁷ A. Ie. Mochanov,¹¹⁸ A. N. Kononov, A. D. Novichev,¹¹⁹ T. P. Cherman, A. S. Tveretina,¹²⁰ and A. A. Adzhian.¹²¹ It should be underlined that for the first time in Russian Oriental studies the specialists on Turkey were grouped separately.¹²²

114 *Vostokovedy Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga: Osnovnye napravleniia sovremennykh issledovaniia. Vostokovednye nauchnye tsentry. Personalii* [Orientalists of Moscow and St. Petersburg: Major Directions of Current Research. Oriental Scientific Centers. Personalities], (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, 2000), 76.

115 A special essay is devoted to activities of this group: A. D. Zheltiakov, "Izuchenie istorii Turtsii" [Studying History of Turkey], in *Aziatskii muzei – Leningradskoe otdelenie instituta vostokovedeniia AN SSSR* [Asiatic Museum – The Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences], (Moscow, 1972), 428-434.

116 Alimov elaborated and organized the first in IVAN and Leningrad University course on Turkish general history based on the Marxist doctrine. In 1934 he published a sketch of Turkish history from the 1860s to the 1930s: "Turtsiia;" *Ocherki iz istorii Vostoka v epokhu imperializma* [Essays on History of the East in the Era of Imperialism], (Moscow, 1934), 3-92. After a year, Alimov's special study on the Young Turk Revolution was published: "Revoliutsiia 1908 goda v Turtsii," *Probuzhdenie Azii. 1905 god i revoliutsiia na Vostoke* [The Awakening of Asia. The Year of 1905 and Revolutions in the East], (Moscow, 1935), 1-93.

117 Alimov's students, Tsovikian and Muratov, studied history of the Ottoman Empire on the basis of numerous archival materials, paying special attention to social movements in the last quarter of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century. Muratov wrote a chapter on the Ottoman Empire from 1870 to 1917 in the first Soviet textbook on modern history of colonial and dependent countries designed for higher educational institutions: *Novaia istoriia kolonial'nykh i zavisimykh stran* [Modern History of Colonial and Dependent Countries], (Moscow, 1940), 421-452. In 1937, Tsovikian completed his dissertation *The Young Turk Revolution and National Question*, from which only a small part was published: "Vliianie russkoi revoliutsii 1905 g. na revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Turtsii" [The Impact of the 1905 Revolution on Revolutionary Movement in Turkey], *SB*, 1945, vol. III, 15-35. After the death of these three scholars (Alimov died before the war, Muratov died in the war and Tsovikian died from starvation in sieged Leningrad), studies on the history of constitutional movement in the Ottoman Empire and the Young Turk Revolution were disrupted for a long while.

118 Mochanov published in 1929 an essay on the struggle between Tsarist Russia and the Ottoman Empire for Crimea: *Bor'ba tsarskoi Rossii i Turtsii za obladanie Krymskim khanstvom* [The Struggle between Tsarist Russia and Turkey for the Possession of Crimean Khanate], (Simferopol, 1929). He completed in 1939 his dissertation on Patrona Khalil's revolt in Istanbul in 1730, but, unfortunately, the author's death precluded its publication.

119 Novichev, a specialist on economy and history of Turkey, worked in the Turkish Cabinet after 1932. During the 1930s, apart from a number of articles on Turkish industry, transport, countryside, and agrarian system, Novichev published two big monographies on Turkish economics from the Tanzimat reforms to the First World War: *Ekonomika Turtsii v period pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Turkish Economics During the First World War], (Moscow, Leningrad, 1935) and *Ocherki ekonomiki Turtsii do mirovoi voiny* [Essays on Turkish Economics until the World War], (Moscow, Leningrad, 1937). These works represented the first attempt to create generalizing works based on the Marxist doctrine. In his following works, Novichev gave much attention to the examination of Turkish politics: *Turtsiia. Politiko-ekonomicheskie ocherki* [Turkey. An Politicoeconomic Essay], (Tbilisi, 1941); *Turtsiia. Gosudartstvennyi stroi, ekonomika, etnografiia* [Turkey. State System, Economics, Ethnography], (Tbilisi, 1942), and *Agrarnoe zakonodatel'stvo sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian Legislation of Contemporary Turkey], (Tbilisi, 1942).

120 In 1939, Tveretina completed her dissertation which was published after the war: *Vostanie Kara-lazydhi-Deli Khasana v Turtsii (1599-1603)* [Kara-lazydhi-Deli Khasan Revolt in Turkey], (Moscow, Leningrad, 1946).

121 Adzhian defended in 1936 his dissertation on handicrafts in Istanbul in the first half of the 17th century, written on the base of critical analysis of Evliya Chelebi's travel accounts.

122 Comparing the number of Turkologists to the overall number of scholars in 1940 (9 to 110) and taking into consideration the fact that these 110 scholars were divided among ten divisions, some of which

After the dissolution of the All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientalology (VNAV) in 1930, its Ukrainian branch (VUNAV) also ceased to exist.¹²³ As a result, in Ukraine Oriental studies, and Turkological studies as a part of Oriental studies, suffered a serious blow. However, studies in this area continued in Armenia and Georgia and even advanced to a certain extent there during the 1930s.¹²⁴

The Moscow Oriental Institute continued its work. In 1936, the institute was transformed into an academy-type institute that accepted only individuals who had completed university education; in 1940 it became more of a general institute. Faculties in Near Eastern and Far Eastern studies were established at the institute with the following departments: Arabic, Turkish, Iranian, Afghan, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and Mongolian. The institute published seven issues of the special series *Transactions of the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies* between 1939 and 1953.¹²⁵ Gordlevskii continued his academic activities and in 1946 became a full member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.¹²⁶

Gordlevskii was concerned about certain changes that Oriental studies underwent under Soviet rule. He complained in 1947 that the Moscow Oriental Institute had begun to focus exclusively on language instruction without providing students with fundamental theoretical knowledge in linguistics, history and economics of the Eastern countries. As Gordlevskii put it, "The previous emphasis on integrity is abandoned."¹²⁷ At the same time, Gordlevskii acknowledged that, "Oriental studies ... is moving toward differentiation, toward the separation of Eastern philology, history, economics."¹²⁸ Another reason for concern was the lack of contact with the countries being studied as well as with the Western scholars and the deficiency of foreign literature, both Eastern and Western.¹²⁹

Oriental studies in the Soviet Union were disrupted by the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941-1942. The Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad was evacuated to Tashkent, but only some of its staff went there; others went to Moscow, and still others were drawn into government, military, or party service. Those who went to Moscow organized the Moscow Group of IVAN.¹³⁰ The Moscow Group, which was, according to Sahai-Achuthan, formed by "politically oriented scholars," was afforded official status and established as a branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies in 1943.¹³¹

uniting specialists of several countries or peoples (the Turkish Cabinet itself existed within the Jewish-Turkish division), it can be concluded that in the pre-war period Turkology in Leningrad was represented by a comparatively large group.

123 *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, 94.

124 In 1936, the Sub-faculty of Eastern Languages was established at Tbilisi State University and the Department of Oriental Studies was established at the Institute of Linguistics, History and Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR. The Department of Oriental Studies was established in the Philological Faculty of Erivan University in 1940 (*Ibid.*, 50; 73).

125 *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 17 (1978), 162.

126 *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 7 (1975), 283.

127 V. A. Gordlevskii, "Moskovskoe vostokovedenie posle Oktiabria [Moscow Oriental Studies After the October]," *Izbrannye sochineniia* [Selected Works], vol. IV, (Moscow, 1968), 345. Quoted in Li and Oreshkova, 15.

128 Gordlevskii, 346. Quoted in Li and Oreshkova, 23.

129 Li and Oreshkova, 15.

130 Vucinich, 179.

131 Sahai-Achuthan, 328.

After the war IVAN returned to Leningrad, but not all the Orientalists made the move. Those who remained in Moscow were joined in sufficient numbers by their colleagues who had spent the duration of the war in Central Asia; there were now more Orientalists in Moscow than in Leningrad.¹³²

During the war, important developments in Oriental education occurred. Two Oriental departments were created at Moscow University: the Oriental Department of the Faculty of Philology with Türkological and Iranian divisions (1943) and the Department of the History of Eastern Countries in the Faculty of History with Near-Eastern, Middle Eastern and Far Eastern divisions (1944).¹³³ In 1944, the Faculty of Oriental Studies was reestablished at Leningrad University with thirteen philological and three historical departments.¹³⁴ In 1945, the Faculty of Oriental Studies was established at Tbilisi University in Georgia with following departments: Semitology, Türkology, Persian philology, and Armenian studies.¹³⁵

In Leningrad, the work of the Turkish Cabinet was interrupted as many Turkologists died during the war. The post-war activities of the Cabinet were conducted by the surviving scholars: T. P. Cherman,¹³⁶ A. D. Novichev, and A. S. Tveretina.¹³⁷

From the 1950s onward: The existence of the Leningrad branch of IVAN, given its mostly political orientation and perhaps its proximity to the Kremlin, became the justification for the reorganization of IVAN in 1950 and also for its move to Moscow.¹³⁸ This event was closely related to the major developments in the international arena – decolonization and the start of the Cold War.

The 1950 reorganization was the first step in the process of restructuring that Soviet Oriental studies underwent in the 1950s. At the same time, the scope of Oriental studies was greatly expanded. The following developments occurred between 1950 and 1972:

1950 IVAN was reorganized and relocated from Leningrad to Moscow. The following divisions were established: China; Mongolia and Korea; Japan; South East Asia; India and Afghanistan; Iran; Turkey and Arab Countries; Soviet East. The Division of Oriental Manuscripts remained in Leningrad.

1953 IVAN was reorganized. This time it was divided into three regional divisions: Far East; Near and Middle East and India; South East Asia.

1954 The Moscow Oriental Institute (the former Lazarev Institute) was dissolved.¹³⁹ The

132 Vucinich, 179.

133 www.iaas.msu.ru

134 *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie,"* 41.

135 *Vostokovednye tsentry v SSSR*, 73.

136 In 1947 he submitted his dissertation on the 1945 agrarian reform in Turkey and started to compile a bibliography of Türkological works.

137 Zheltikov, 432.

138 Sahai-Achuthan, 328.

139 On this issue see: P. M. Shastitko, *Vek ush'ol: stseny iz istorii otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia* [*Time is Gone: Scenes from Native Oriental Studies*], (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 2009), 43-57. The decision was made by the Soviet government. Soviet Orientalists protested this decision and regretted the abrupt end of the old institution which had successfully conducted Oriental studies and offered Oriental education since 1828. At the moment, the institute had 896 students. They were transferred to other Oriental institutions.

- same year, two Oriental centers that focused exclusively on the Near East were created in two Caucasian republics: the Department of the History of Foreign Eastern Countries at the Institute of History at the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences and the Group on the Study of the History and Economics of Near and Middle East Countries at the Institute of History at the Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- 1955 IVAN was reorganized once more, this time into twelve divisions.¹⁴⁰ One division was devoted to the Near and Middle East. The publishing of a regular journal on Soviet Oriental studies, *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, began (it later changed its name to *Problemy vostokovedeniia* in 1959 and to *Narody Azii i Afriki* in 1961).
- 1956 IVAN was reorganized again into six departments. The Department of the Near and Middle East was split into three sections – Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan. The Division of Oriental Manuscripts in Leningrad was renamed the Leningrad Branch of IVAN.¹⁴¹ The Türko-Mongolian Cabinet was created within the Leningrad Branch. The Oriental Languages Institute was created at Moscow University following the merger of the Oriental Philological and Historical departments. The Institute of Sinology and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO) were established at the Academy of Sciences.
- 1957 The specialized publishing house for Oriental literature was established.¹⁴² The journal *Sovremennyi Vostok* (in Russian and English) was created.¹⁴³
- 1958 The Near and Middle East Institute at the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences was established. The Division of Oriental Studies at the Armenian Academy of Sciences was created.
- 1959 The Institute of African Studies was established in Moscow.
- 1960 The Institute of Oriental Studies at the Georgian Academy of Sciences was established.
- 1961 IVAN was restructured yet again. The Department of the Near and Middle East was reorganized to exclude Pakistan and was subdivided into two sections: Economy and Contemporary Problems and History. The Leningrad Branch was also reorganized into three sectors, one of which was in charge of research on the Near and Middle East.
- 1964 The Department of the History of the Near and Middle East Countries was established at the Institute of History at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.
- 1966 The Far East Institute was established, which has its origin in the previous Institute of Sinology.
- 1971 The Institute of Oriental Studies at the Armenian Academy of Sciences was established.
- 1972 The Oriental Languages Institute at Moscow University was enlarged, reorganized and renamed the Institute of Asian and African Studies (ISAA), affiliated with Moscow University.

140 In 1955, the institute staff numbered 220, among them 105 historians, 37 economists, 25 literators, and 50 linguists (Shastitko, 40).

141 Afterwards, the Leningrad Branch dealt predominantly with ancient and medieval history, whereas the Moscow Institute became concentrated on contemporary socioeconomic issues.

142 It was publishing approximately 200 books a year. In 1964, it became the Chief Editorial Office of Oriental Literature for the Nauka Publishing House.

143 Changed to *Azii i Afrika segodnia* in 1961; today published as *Vostok/Oriens*.

How did Turkological studies develop?

After the 1950 reorganization, Turkological studies in Leningrad came to a halt, as Novichev moved to Dagestan and Tveretinova to Moscow. As one Soviet Turkologist explained, the renewal of studies on Turkey in Leningrad became possible only after the 1956 reorganization and the establishment of the Türko-Mongolian Cabinet. In 1958, the following specialists were conducting research on Turkey: A. N. Kononov,¹⁴⁴ T. P. Cherman,¹⁴⁵ A. K. Sverchevskaia, Iu. A. Petrosian,¹⁴⁶ and A. D. Zheltiakov.¹⁴⁷

Upon the 1950 reorganization, the Division of Turkey and Arab Countries was created in the Moscow IVAN, headed by V. A. Gordlevskii. The division dealt mainly with linguistics, literature, and to a lesser degree with the history of Arab countries and Turkey. Gordlevskii headed the section until his death in 1956.¹⁴⁸

In 1956, the long-lived tradition of combining various disciplines in one unit was abandoned and a separate Turkish division was created within the Department of the Near and Middle East. This department began to pay more attention to the history, economics, and contemporary problems of Turkey. It became the center of Turkological studies in the Soviet state and prepared many post-graduate students for work at IVAN and in Oriental institutions in the Turkic and Caucasian republics.¹⁴⁹

In the mid-1950s, Turkological studies began to develop in the Caucasian Soviet republics. In Azerbaijan, the Department of the History of Foreign Eastern Countries was founded in 1954. It dealt exclusively with Iran and Turkey, as it was tasked with studying the history of the two countries.¹⁵⁰ In Armenia, the Group on Studying the History and Economics of the Near and Middle East Countries (1954) was devoted to

144 Kononov concentrated mainly on Türkological linguistic issues and produced several works about some peculiarities of the Turkish grammar. He also headed the work on describing and studying Turkic manuscripts. As a result, an annotated catalogue of Turkic manuscripts related to history of the peoples of the USSR, Arabic countries, Iran, and Turkey was prepared: L. V. Dmitrieva, A. M. Muginov, S. N. Muratov, *Opisanie tiurkskikh rukopisei Instituta narodov Azii, t. I, Istoriia* [Description of Turkic Manuscripts of the Institute of Peoples of Asia vol. 1, History], (Moscow, 1965).

145 Cherman together with A. K. Sverchevskaia prepared two bibliographical reference books on Turkey: *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)*, (Moscow, 1959), and *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, (Moscow, 1961).

146 In 1956, Petrosian completed his dissertation on the Young Ottomans: “*Novye osmany*” *i bor’ba za konstitutsiiu 1876 g. v Turtsii* [“Young Ottomans” and the Struggle for the 1876 Constitution in Turkey], (Moscow, 1958). Together with Tveretinova prepared for publication an unique Turkish manuscript representing the most complete account of the history of the Ottoman state until 1520: Khusein, *Bada’i ul-veka’i*, vol. I-II., Moscow, 1961.

147 Zheltiakov prepared together with Petrosian a book on history of education in Turkey: *Istoriia prosveshcheniia v Turtsii (konets XVIII – nachalo XX veka)* [History of Education in Turkey (the End of the 18th Century – the Beginning of the 20th Century)], (Moscow, 1965).

148 Li and Oreshkova, 72-73. After Gordlevskii’s death, a commission was created to study his academic legacy. Gordlevskii’s selected works were published in four volumes. I. Historical works, II. Studies on the Turkish language and literature, III. Writings on Turkish culture and society, IV. Works on ethnography, history of Oriental studies, and reviews (V. A. Gordlevskii, *Izbrannye sochineniia* [Selected Works], 4 vols., [Moscow, 1960-68]). In 1958, the V. A. Gordlevskii Memorial Cabinet-Library was created on the base of Gordlevskii’s personal library. Since 1958, Türkological seminars were held here on a regular basis (Li and Oreshkova, 73-75).

149 Ibid., 44.

150 *Vostokovednye tsenry*, 10.

studying the history and economics of Iran, Turkey and the Arab countries.¹⁵¹ In 1958, the department in Azerbaijan became the Near and Middle East Institute which was divided into four departments: Arab countries; Iran; Turkey; and Textual Studies and the Publication of Sources.¹⁵² The group in Armenia became the Division of Oriental Studies, which was separated into three groups: Arab countries; Iran; Turkey (in 1959 Kurdology was added).¹⁵³

In the mid-1960s, Turkological studies were reestablished in Ukraine. In 1964, the Department of the History of the Near and Middle East Countries was created at the Institute of History at the Academy of Sciences of Ukrainian SSR.¹⁵⁴ There, Turkological studies focused on the Ukrainian-Ottoman and Russian-Ottoman relations and the Balkan question.¹⁵⁵ In 1970, the department was renamed the Department of the History of Foreign Eastern Countries and began to concentrate on the following research areas: the participation of Ukraine in the political, economic, and cultural relations between the USSR and foreign eastern countries, the development of Oriental studies in Ukraine, the development of the newly independent countries and their cooperation with the socialist countries. In 1978, the department became the Institute of Social and Economic Problems of Foreign Countries and shifted its focus to two main issues: socioeconomic changes in developing countries under the conditions of the struggle against neo-colonialism and the laws and peculiarities of the contemporary stage of socioeconomic and political development of the new independent countries (in the Near and Middle East).¹⁵⁶

During the late Soviet era, three Caucasian republics began to specialize in different fields of Oriental studies. While all of them were focused on Caucasia and the Near and Middle East and researched a broad range of issues, Azerbaijani Oriental studies was especially advanced in philological and source studies, Islamic studies, and the publication of manuscripts. As for Turkology, issues in modern history, economics, sociopolitical development, ideology, education and literature were studied. In 1988, the Institute contained the following departments: the History of Medieval East; the History of Iran; the History of Turkey; the History of Arab Countries; Economics; Iranian Philology; Turkish Philology; Arabic Philology; Ideological Problems; the Study and Publishing of Eastern Manuscripts.¹⁵⁷

Georgian Oriental studies became particularly advanced in philological and linguistic studies. Georgian Turkologists studied the Turkish language, problems of medieval and modern history and some topics in recent history (in particular, agrarian development). In 1988, the institute consisted of the following departments: Ancient Eastern Languages; Semitology; Türkology; Persian Philology; Indo-Iranian Languages; Byzantology; the Medieval History of Near East Countries; the Modern and Recent

151 Ibid., 51.

152 O. Edmund Clubb, "Soviet Oriental Studies and the Asian Revolution," *Pacific Affairs* 31, no. 4 (December, 1958): 387.

153 *Vostokovednye tsentry*, 51.

154 Ibid., 102.

155 Ibid., 103.

156 Ibid., 102.

157 Ibid., 10.

History of Near East Countries; Information Science; and the Laboratory of the General Phonetics and Typology of Eastern Languages.¹⁵⁸

In Armenia, studies on history, economics, philology, and ethnography were conducted. In 1971, the division was restructured as the Institute of Oriental Studies with three new departments: the Ancient East (1971), Caucasian and Byzantine Studies (1978), and Eastern Sources (1983). In the area of Turkological studies, the medieval and modern history of the Ottoman Empire, the history of the Republic of Turkey, the nationalities question, and Turkish domestic politics were studied.¹⁵⁹

Post-Soviet Russian Turkologists note that in Soviet Armenia and Soviet Georgia Turkish history was studied mostly in relation to Armenian and Georgian national history; this determined the somewhat narrow thematic scope of Turkological studies in these two republics. In Azerbaijan, Turkological studies had a wider scope, as the staff of the institute in Baku included specialists in economics and the ideology of contemporary Turkey, so a larger range of historical topics were covered. Close official and personal ties were established between the Moscow Turkologists and the Caucasian Turkologists and regular inter-institutional conferences were held in Moscow and the Caucasian capitals.¹⁶⁰

To conclude, by the end of the Soviet era Turkological studies existed not only in the centers of the USSR (Moscow and Leningrad), but also in some Soviet republics (the Caucasian republics and Ukraine). In Moscow, apart from the Turkish division of IVAN, several other academic and educational institutions dealing with Near Eastern countries – such as the Institute of Asian and African Studies at Moscow University (ISAA) and the Institute of World Economics and International Relations (IMEMO) at the Academy of Sciences – contributed to the advance of Turkological studies. Turkology was also studied at universities in Leningrad, Baku, Erivan, Tbilisi, and Tashkent. As bibliographical data shows, the academic output of the Turkologists greatly expanded after the early 1950s.¹⁶¹ It can be asserted that Turkology benefited from the organized growth of Oriental studies in the late Soviet era.

At the same time, some issues that occurred during Soviet times should be pointed out. Besides the ideological pressure and the Soviet authorities' bureaucratic approach to science, Soviet Oriental studies were greatly affected by the antagonism between the Soviet Union and the West. The Iron Curtain between the two blocs hindered the development of normal contacts between Soviet scholars and their Western counterparts. Scholarly relations with the countries studied were also underdeveloped. Turkologists were among those who suffered the most, as relations between the Soviet state and Turkey had been deteriorating since the late 1930s and grew worse after Turkey joined the Western bloc after the Second World War. As Gordlevskii complained in 1947, Turkological studies were conducted in isolation from reality.

158 Ibid., 73-74.

159 Ibid., 51-52.

160 Li and Oreshkova, 37.

161 See: A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)*, (Moscow, 1959); the same authors, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1975)*, (Moscow, 1982).

From the 1930s until the late 1950s, Turkologists were unable to travel to Turkey and remained ignorant, for example, about the changes the Turkish language had undergone following the establishment of the Turkish Republic. In 1958, a group of Soviet Turkologists made the first journey to Turkey and became familiar with the changes in the language.¹⁶²

Li and Oreshkova maintain that until 1960 scholars of the Turkish studies had seen only one Turkish person – Nazim Hikmet, the outstanding Turkish poet. Hikmet frequently visited the Turkish division and showed great interest in the work of the Turkologists. He presented the Turkish division of IVAN with a typewriter with Turkish letters.¹⁶³

In 1960, the 25th International Congress of Orientalists was held in Moscow. For the first time, Soviet scholars had the opportunity to meet their foreign colleagues. A large delegation from Turkey participated in the congress. After the event, contact between the scholars was established and the exchange of academic literature began. Soviet Turkologists began to attend, although rarely, conferences in Turkey. However, the interaction between the two groups developed very slowly and the relations with the Turkish scholars were far from satisfactory. On rare occasions Soviet Turkologists traveled to Turkey; after each visit they conducted seminars so as to provide their colleagues with the latest information.¹⁶⁴

Lastly, some names should be mentioned. In the second half of the 20th century, the following scholars worked –and some of them continue to work today– in the field of Turkish history studies in Leningrad (St. Petersburg) and Moscow:

In the Leningrad Branch of IVAN and at Leningrad (St. Petersburg) University: N. K. Dulina, S. M. Ivanov, A. Farzaliev, A. D. Novichev, Iu. A. Petrosian, I. Ie. Petrosian, A. B. Vitol, A. D. Zheltiakov, K. A. Zhukov, and others.

In the Moscow IVAN (The Turkish divisions and other divisions of IVAN): Iu. A. Averianov, A. P. Baziant, V. I. Danilov, B. M. Dantsig, M. A. Gasratian, I. I. Ivanova, N. G. Kireev, M. A. Kerimov, R. P. Kornienko, Iu. A. Li, P. P. Moiseev, S. F. Oreshkova, B. M. Potskhveria, Iu. N. Rozaliev, A. M. Shamsutdinov, V. I. Sheremet, G. O. Starchenkov, A. K. Sverchevskaia, V. V. Tsybulskii, A. S. Tveretina, N. Iu. Ulchenko, E. I. Urazova, A. M. Valuiskii, and others.

At Moscow University (ISAA and other departments): D. E. Eremeev, M. S. Meier, A. F. Miller, V. I. Shlykov, N. A. Smirnov, and others.¹⁶⁵

III. Post-Soviet times.

Perestroika set off fundamental changes in the Soviet Union, which soon brought about largely unexpected results, which greatly affected the lives of the Soviet citizens. The disintegration of the Soviet state was accompanied by political and ethnic conflicts

¹⁶² Li and Oreshkova, 26.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 75; 89. Nazim Hikmet was awarded an honorary doctorate by IVAN.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 78; 89.

¹⁶⁵ The source of information: Li and Oreshkova; Oreshkova, “Nekotorye razmyshleniia;” *Vostokovedy Moskvyy i Sankt-Peterburga*.

and ideological collapse. Suddenly, ex-Soviet citizens found themselves in the midst of political and economic chaos and an ideological vacuum.

The academic world was radically affected by the developments. As state financing practically ceased, many academic institutions were paralyzed and entire fields of research withered away. Many scholars, especially the young, abandoned the sciences for unscholarly activities. Those who stayed had to confront heavy economic as well as intellectual difficulties, as the unexpected changes posed many urgent practical and theoretical problems.

At the same time, the ideological constraints and state censorship ceased to exist; this was the most appreciated change. Scholars became at liberty to choose research topics and methodological approaches, and publications that would have been unthinkable in the Soviet era began to emerge. Moreover, Russia was fully opened to the outside world and closer contacts with scholars abroad, and, most importantly, with the countries being studied were established.

In the 2000s, the economic and political situation largely stabilized. At the same time, the authoritarian tendency of the government started to gather strength. The future of the Russian society and Russian science are still largely uncertain, as both are still going through fundamental transformations.

Today, Russian Orientalists consider their discipline to be in a state of transition. As the scholars say, Oriental studies survived the major crisis of the 1990s. The material and financial condition of the scholars has somewhat improved, as the state partially renewed its support of science and education and other sources of support for science emerged. However, the conditions are far from perfect. Scholars still lack the adequate means to advance their fields of research. It is difficult today to publish a book and the number of copies printed is few (generally 300-500), compared to Soviet times when hundreds of thousands of copies were printed and distributed throughout the Soviet Union. Scholars complain that today, for the most part, works published in Moscow and St. Petersburg do not reach the regional libraries and *vice versa*. The shortage of funding also hinders the Russian scholars' regular access to Western scholarly literature.

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the emergence of independent states in Central Asia and Caucasia, interaction between the Orientalist institutions in Russia and those in the independent states was largely disrupted. Similarly, connections between the central and peripheral institutions within Russia itself have become rather loose, as the centralized coordinating practices of the Soviet period came to an end.

Russian Orientalists are also very concerned with the insufficient amount of young scholars and speak about the current gap in generations, which is similar to that which occurred in the 1920-30s. The unwarranted proliferation of academic institutions -mostly commercial and private sector- and the decline in the quality of educational and scholarly activities are other matters of concern.

Lastly, the need for the comprehensive and critical reassessment of the achievements and shortcomings of Russian Oriental studies from the past to present must be pointed out. This issue should be considered in connection with the need for the reeval-

uation of Russia's relations with the East. It is interesting that Orientalists today stress that Russia needs to learn from the developing Eastern countries, as their historical experiences offer useful insights for Russia in its post-Soviet transformation.¹⁶⁶

Turkology has experienced the similar changes. Today, Russian Turkologists are still concerned about the continuing financial difficulties and their negative effect on the development of their field. Although relations with Turkish scholars have become much more fruitful in comparison to the Soviet period,¹⁶⁷ Turkologists still complain that the level of scholarly interaction between Russia and Turkey is far from satisfactory.¹⁶⁸ Moscow Turkologists are also worried about the insufficient amount of young scholars and the unsatisfactory level of contact with the Caucasian and Central Asian centers of Oriental studies.

As for the Oriental institutions, the branch of IVAN in the former Leningrad became a separate institution called the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2007.¹⁶⁹ The Institute of Oriental Studies at the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow (formerly IVAN, known as IVRAN today),¹⁷⁰ and the Institute of Asian and African Studies at Moscow University (ISAA)¹⁷¹ are continuing their work. The Turkish language is taught and Ottoman and Turkological studies are carried out in the Oriental Faculty at St. Petersburg University (the departments: Turkic Philology and the History of Near East Countries).¹⁷²

The Kazan school of Turkology is emerging today at Kazan University. In 1989, the Faculty of Tatar Philology and History was established. In 1990, the Department of Oriental Languages was created within this faculty; the Institute of Oriental Studies grew out of this department in 2000. Today, the Institute has the following divisions: Oriental Languages; Türkology; History and Culture of the East; and International

166 For post-Soviet evaluations of Russian Oriental studies' past and present see: *Nauchno-metodicheskaiia konferentsiia "Vostokovednoe obrazovanie v universitetakh Rossii"* (Moskva, 29-31 maia 2000 g.): *Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* [Scientific and Methodological Conference "Oriental Education in Universities of Russia" (Moscow, May of 29-31, 2000): *Theses of Presentations and Reports*], (Moscow), 2000; *Vostokovednye Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga: Osnovnye napravleniia sovremennykh issledovaniia. Vostokovednye nauchnye tsentry. Personalii* [Orientalists of Moscow and St. Petersburg: Major Directions of Current Research. Oriental Scientific Centers. Personalities], (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, 2000); P. M. Shastitko, *Vek ush'ol: stseny iz istorii otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia* [Time is Gone: Scenes from Native Oriental Studies], (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 2009).

167 For example, in 2001 the International Conference "Russian-Turkish Relations: History, Contemporary State and Perspectives" was held under the auspices of IVAN, ISAA and the Bilgi University (Istanbul). The papers of the conference were published in 2003 in Russian and Turkish. It was the first compilation prepared by Russian and Turkish scholars together. After the conference, the Turkish International Co-operation and Development Agency (TIKA) sent to IVAN the collections of the *Islamic Encyclopedia* and the *Ottoman Encyclopedia* as well as over one hundred books on Turkish arts (Li and Oreshkova, 40; 74).

168 Russian Turkologists notice that contacts between historians of the two countries remain particularly underdeveloped (Li and Oreshkova, 91).

169 See the Institute's website: <http://www.orientalstudies.ru/>

170 See the Institute's website: <http://www.ivran.ru/>

171 See the Institute's website: <http://www.iaas.msu.ru/>

172 See the website of the Oriental faculty: <http://www.orient.pu.ru/>

Relations. Turkish is taught and Turkological studies are conducted in Türkology and International Relations.¹⁷³

Despite all the difficulties, Russian scholars look to the future with hope. Moreover, they argue that Oriental studies today offer exciting perspectives due to the change in the scholars' worldview. As awareness of the interconnectedness of Russian history with the history of the East grows, research agendas are shifting. A need to learn from the experience of the Eastern peoples and to develop a new look at Russian history is emerging. As professor R. B. Rybakov explained at the opening session of the 37th International Congress of Orientalists (held in Moscow in August 2004), Oriental studies of the 21st century is ceasing to be the "Western science about the East."¹⁷⁴ Indeed, it is fundamentally changing its orientation.

Appendix A

Bibliographical Information about the Russian Turkology of the Tsarist Period

Publications on the Ottoman Empire by Russian authors were compiled in two bibliographies published in 1961 and 2000. The first bibliography¹⁷⁵ contains 4,789 titles of academic and popular works, including books, chapters of books, journals and bulletin articles,¹⁷⁶ and other works published between 1713 and 1917. The titles are thematically divided into the following groups:

Table 1: The Thematic Division of Works on the Ottoman Empire by Russian Authors (1713-1917)

Subjects		Titles
General works		48
Geography		91
Population and ethnography		86
Travel accounts		332
Economics		
	General works	38
	Agriculture	21
	Industry	13
	Foreign trade	180
	Finance	73
	Means of communication	77
	Economic relations between Russia and Turkey	64
History		
	Turkey in the Middle Ages	77
	Turkey in modern time	404
	Young Turk revolution	91
	Ottoman-Persian War	25

¹⁷³ Li and Oreshkova, 40; <http://www.ksu.ru/fl6/index.php>

¹⁷⁴ Quoted in Shastitko, 93.

¹⁷⁵ A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, (Moscow, 1961).

¹⁷⁶ Titles of 120 journals and bulletins are listed in the list of abbreviations.

	Balkan Wars	122
	Turkey in the First World War	118
	Russia and Turkey	272
	Russian-Ottoman Wars in general	155
	Russian-Ottoman Wars before 1768	62
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1768-1774	64
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1787-1791	72
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1806-1812	65
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1828-1829	152
	Crimean War of 1853-1856	156
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1877-1878	673
Nationalities question		
	Armenians	94
	Balkan people	393
	Kurds	47
	Other nationalities	37
The status of women		18
Political system and legislation		28
Military forces		263
Philology		
	Language, writing	19
	Grammar, textbooks	23
	Dictionaries, conversational books	28
	Literature	64
Religion – Islam		164
Education, press		41
Art		38
Total		4,789

The second bibliography published in 2000¹⁷⁷ provides additional information about Russian scholarship on Turkey during the Tsarist period. This bibliography is devoted to Arabic, Persian and Turkic studies in Russia and presents a list of articles from 1818 to 1917 compiled from academic periodicals (journals, bulletins, annuals, reports) and various scholarly reference books, compilations, and surveys.¹⁷⁸ The part devoted to Turkey includes 539 titles, which are thematically divided into the following groups:

177 L. N. Karskaia, *Annotirovannaia bibliografiia otechestvennykh rabot po arabistike, iranistike i tiurkologii. 1818-1917 gg.* [*The Annotated Bibliography of the Native Works on Arabic, Persian and Turkic Studies*], (Moscow, "Vostochnaia literatura" RAN, 2000).

178 In total, about 170 various periodicals and compilations were examined.

Table 2: The Thematic Division of Scholarly Articles on the Ottoman Empire by Russian Authors (1818-1917)

Subjects	Titles
Ottoman Turkish language	26
Ottoman literature, folklore	42
Pre-Ottoman history of Asia Minor	13
History of the Ottoman Empire	214
Turkish army	37
Archaeology, numismatics, epigraphy	11
Geography, travel accounts	76
Population statistics	19
Ethnography, anthropology	28
Economics, trade	38
Education, press	22
Art, theatre and architecture	13
Total	539

It is clear that while the Russian intellectual and scholarly circles of the Tsarist era were interested in a rather broad range of topics in relation to the Ottoman Empire, they devoted the majority of their attention to the Russian-Ottoman wars, Ottoman minorities, geography, economics, Ottoman military forces, and religion.

Appendix B

Bibliographical Information on Soviet Turkology

Soviet publications on contemporary Turkey were compiled in two bibliographies published in 1959 and 1982.¹⁷⁹ The first bibliography lists 3,262 titles of scholarly and popular works (books, chapters of books, journal articles, brochures, dissertations, articles from various collections and periodicals, and translations of Turkish and Western European authors' works) published from 1917 to 1958. They were compiled from catalogues of the V. I. Lenin State Library, the Fundamental Library of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Moscow and the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Leningrad. In addition, *The Bibliography of the Orient*,¹⁸⁰ *Books Annals*, *Journal Articles Annals* and *Reviews Annals* were used as sources. Not only works devoted specifically to Turkey, but also those, which cover other subjects but include information on Turkey were covered. It is noted by the authors that the bibliography does not pretend to be absolutely comprehensive. The titles are grouped thematically as follows:

179 A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1958)*, (Moscow, 1959); the same authors, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1917-1975)*, (Moscow, 1982).

180 The first and sole volume was published in 1928.

Table 3: The Thematic Division of Works on Turkey by Soviet Authors (1917-1958)

Subjects		Titles
V. I. Lenin about Turkey		86
Soviet statesmen about Turkey ¹⁸¹		58
General works		35
Physical and economic geography		36
Population, ethnography		27
Travel accounts		37
Economics		
	General works	200
	Agrarian question, peasant conditions and peasant movements	54
	Industry, handicrafts	45
	Foreign trade	116
	Finance	51
	Transport and communication	26
	Economic relations between the USSR and Turkey	160
History		
	Turkey in the Middle Ages (the end of the 13 th century – the first half of the 17 th century)	43
	Turkey in modern time (the second half of the 17 th century – 1917)	73
	The condition of the Balkan peoples, national liberation movements, Balkan wars	59
	Young Turk revolution	28
	Turkey and the First World War	76
	Turkey in contemporary times (1917-1958)	636
	The Straits (history of the question; its role in international relations)	42
	Russia and Turkey	111
	Russian-Ottoman Wars, general works	59
	Russian-Ottoman Wars before 1768	15
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1768-1774	29
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1787-1791	11
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1806-1812	11
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1828-1829	7
	Crimean War of 1853-1856	49
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1877-1878	23
	The USSR and Turkey	169
	Nationalities question	47
	Working class conditions, trade union movements	67
	Conditions of women, children and youth	23

181 The works and speeches of S. M. Kirov, M. Litvinov, G. K. Ordzhanikidze, I. V. Stalin, M. V. Frunze, N. S. Khrushchev, and G. V. Chicherin are listed.

Political system, legislation	24
Military forces	66
Political parties	
Communist party	18
Bourgeois parties	15
Philology	
Language, writing system	92
Grammar, textbooks	23
Dictionaries, conversational books	18
Literature	66
Translations of the work of Turkish writers ¹⁸²	239
Education, press	22
Art	29
Cultural and scholarly relations	18
Reference books, encyclopedias, statistical collections	66
Total	3,262

The appearance of a reference book on Turkey was an important event in the development of Soviet Turkology, signifying, on the one hand, that a considerable amount of work on Turkey had been completed by 1958 and, therefore, it needed to be systematized and classified. On the other hand, this development was a sign of the Soviet state's close attention to the state of Turkological studies and its desire to comprehend the scope of achievements in this field. It is important to note that the bibliography was compiled and published in the midst of the reorganization of Soviet Oriental studies.

In 1961, two years later, the same compilers produced another reference book on Turkey this time covering the achievements of the pre-Soviet period, as mentioned above.¹⁸³ So, two reference books on Turkey, which cover the overall development of Turkology from its early stage until the end of the 1950s, were produced rather quickly during the most intense phase of the restructuring of Oriental studies. This can be considered as evidence of the good state of Soviet Turkology at that time, especially in light of the fact that the bibliographies on Turkey appeared earlier than similar compilations on other countries in the Near and Middle East. For instance, a bibliography on Afghanistan was produced in 1962 and two bibliographies on Iran were published in 1967.¹⁸⁴ A bibliography on India, a country of great significance for the Soviets especially after its independence in 1947, was published in 1965.¹⁸⁵

182 Aziz Nesin, Melih Cevdet Anday, Nazım Hikmet, Oktay Rıfat, Ömer Seyfeddin, Orhan Veli, Orhan Kemal, Orhan Hancerlioğlu, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Sebhattin Ali, Sadri Ertem, Suad Derviş, Fahri Erdinç and others.

183 A. K. Sverchevskaia, T. P. Cherman, *Bibliografiia Turtsii (1713-1917)*, (Moscow, 1961).

184 T. I. Kukhtin, *Bibliografiia Afganistana, literatura na russkom iazyke* [Bibliography of Afghanistan, Literature in Russian Language], (Moscow, 1962); *Bibliografiia Irana*, (Moscow, 1967); N. A. Kuznetsova, *Bibliografiia Irana, literatura na russkom iazyke*, (Moscow, 1967).

185 *Bibliografiia Indii*, (Moscow, 1965. This bibliography covered the period from the eighteenth century to 1961 and included over 9,000 titles (Sahai-Achuthan, 331).

It can be inferred from the 1959 bibliography that the primary subjects of interest in the Tsarist period, such as geographical descriptions, travel accounts, and studies of military forces, became less significant in Soviet times, while religious issues disappeared altogether, or at least they were not included in the bibliography.¹⁸⁶ Philological studies continued to develop but, like in the Tsarist times, did not form the bulk of research on Turkey. Soviet authors showed great interest in translating works by Turkish authors and in compiling various reference books and statistical anthologies.

The second bibliography was compiled by the same authors and published in 1982. Actually, it was the second edition –improved and significantly supplemented– of the first bibliography. Like the first edition, it covers both scholarly and popular works, including books, chapters of books, journal articles, brochures, dissertations, articles from various collections and periodicals, and translations of Turkish and Western European authors' works. In addition, a certain number of newspaper articles (only literary translations) were also included. Not only works devoted specifically to Turkey, but also those on other subjects, which included information on Turkey, were covered. The works, which deal with a wide range of issues, are listed under the rubric to which the greater part of the work is connected.

The titles are grouped thematically as follows:

Table 4: The Thematic Division of the Works on Turkey by Soviet Authors (1917-1975)

Subjects	Titles
The Founders of Marxism-Leninism and Soviet Statesmen about Turkey	
K. Marx and F. Engels	16
K. Marx	125
F. Engels	67
Correspondence between K. Marx and F. Engels	56
Chronological extracts	7
V. I. Lenin	140
Soviet statesmen on Turkey ¹⁸⁷	61
Soviet authors on the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism on Turkey	94
Statements of V. I. Lenin on Turkey. Turkish statesmen and public figures about V. I. Lenin	7
General Works and Reference Literature	
General works	52
Reference books (encyclopedias, periodicals)	77
History of Turkological Studies in Russia and the USSR	
General works	23
Turkological studies in Russia	48

186 Actually, religious issues continued to be studied, as it is evidenced by the content of the later bibliography. Evidently, works on religious issues were not included to the first bibliography because of ideological concerns. However, this attitude changed after 1959 and the rubric "Religion" reappeared in the second bibliography.

187 The works and speeches of L. I. Brezhnev, V. V. Vorovskii, S. M. Kirov, A. N. Kosygin, M. Litvinov, G. K. Ordzhaniidze, M. V. Frunze, and G. V. Chicherin are listed.

Turkological studies in the USSR		153
Turkological studies in other countries		3
Russian and Soviet scholars		
	General works	5
	Personalities ¹⁸⁸	227
Travel Accounts, Essays on Turkey, Stories about Turkey by Soviet Artists		108
Geography		
Physical geography		
	General works	27
	Geology, seismicity, relief	10
	Mineral resources	58
	Flora and fauna	5
Economic geography		26
Population and ethnography		90
Political System		
General works, legislation, parliament		56
Political parties		
	Communist, socialist and workers' parties	62
	Mustafa Subhi	13
	Bourgeois parties	33
Military forces		103
History		
General works		20
Turkey in the Middle Ages (the end of the 13 th century - the first half of the 17 th century)		
	Sources and materials	73
	General works	129
Turkey in modern time (the second half of the 17 th century – 1918)		
	Sources and documents	37
	General works	228
	The impact of the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907 on revolutionary movement in Turkey. The Young Turk Revolution (1908-1911)	78
	Turkey on the eve of and during the First World War	140
	Balkan peoples' conditions, national liberation movements in Balkans	162
	Russia and Turkey	
	Sources and documents on Russian-Turkish relations	34
	General works	191

188 The following scholars are listed: Sh. S. Ailiarov, G. M. Arasly, M. O. Auezov, N. A. Baskakov, I. N. Be-rezin, A. K. Borovkov, A. M. Valuiskii, V. A. Gordlevskii, B. M. Dantsig, S. S. Dzhiikiia, N. K. Dmitriev, A. Kazem-Bek, N. F. Katanov, M. A. Kerimov, A. N. Kononov, A. Ie. Krymskii, Ie. F. Ludshuveit, D. A. Magazanik, S. S. Maizel, S. Ie. Malov, A. Ie. Martyntsev, P. M. Melioranskii, A. F. Miller, M. S. Mikha-ilov, P. P. Moiseev, A. D. Novichev, M. P. Pavlovich, V. V. Radlov, A. N. Samoilovich, V. D. Smirnov, A. S. Tveritina, P. A. Chikhachev, A. M. Shamsutdinov, M. Sh. Shiraliev.

Russian-Ottoman wars		
	General works	23
	Russian-Ottoman wars before 1768	71
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1768-1774	37
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1787-1791	32
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1806-1812	28
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1828-1829	20
	Crimean War of 1853-1856	61
	Russian-Ottoman War of 1877-1878	37
	Military operations between Russia and Turkey in 1914-1918	39
	Balkan countries in Russian-Turkish relations	153
	Economic relations between Russia and Turkey	15
Turkey in contemporary times (1917-1975)		
	Sources and documents	27
	General works	12
	The Great October Socialist Revolution's impact on Turkish national liberation struggle	62
	Turkish national liberation struggle (1918-1923), establishment of the Republic of Turkey	388
	Turkey from the establishment of the Republic to the Second World War (1923-1939)	189
	Turkey during the Second World War (1939-1945)	74
	Turkey after the Second World War (1945-1975)	372
	The 1960 coup, the military's role in political life of the country	39
	Working masses' conditions, workers' and trade-union movements	204
	Turkish women's conditions, women's movements	26
	Conditions of children and youth, youth movements	25
	National minorities' conditions, nationalities question	48
	Cyprus problem	76
	Turkey's participation in NATO and CENTO	97
	Turkish statesmen and politicians	
	Mustafa Kemal Atatürk	8
	Others	23
The USSR and Turkey		
	Documents and materials	7
	General works	21
	Soviet-Turkish relations during Turkish national liberation struggle (1918-1923)	144
	Soviet-Turkish relations from the establishment of the Republic to the end of the Second World War (1923-1945)	42
	Soviet-Turkish relations after the Second World War (1945-1975)	75
	Scholarly and cultural relations	
	General works	18

	Scholarly relations	36
	Cultural relations	14
	Sport relations	9
The Straits (Their role in international relations)		54
Auxiliary historical disciplines		
	Historiography	151
	Numismatics, epigraphy, calendars	28
Economics		
Economic legislation		68
The Turkish economy from the establishment of the republic to the Second World War (1923-1939)		145
	Fiscal monopolies	83
The Turkish economy during and after the Second World War (1939-1975)		153
The state sector's role in the Turkish economy		36
Agrarian question and agrarian relations, conditions of peasants, peasant movements		90
Agriculture		213
	Grain	46
	Tobacco	60
	Cotton	49
Industry		
	General works	73
	Power engineering, construction of hydroelectric power stations	41
	Extractive industry	82
	Manufacturing industry	
	Food industry	94
	Textile and carpet industry	75
	Building materials industry	46
	Oil and chemical industries	68
	Metallurgical industry	32
	Machine-building, electrical engineering, atomic power engineering	44
	Timber industry, cellulose and paper industry	35
	Leather industry, shoe industry	12
Foreign trade		
	General works	168
	Contract and customs policies	61
	Import	109
	Export	170
	Commodity markets	118
Turkey and foreign capital		146
	Foreign capital's struggle for Turkish oil	38
	Economic relations between Turkey and capitalist countries	

	Turkey and England	84
	Turkey and Germany (until 1945)	74
	Turkey and FRG	74
	Regional economic cooperation between Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan	34
	Turkey and Italy	43
	Turkey and USA	163
	Turkey and France	41
	Turkey and Japan	59
	Turkey and other countries	275
Finance		
	General works	118
	Budget	88
	Taxes and tax system	46
	Foreign debt	34
	Banks	113
	Financial exchange, credit, insurance	10
Transport and communications		
	General works	13
	Automobile transport, roads	27
	Railways	120
	Merchant marine, ports	68
	Public transportation	9
	Post, telegraph, telephone	20
Economic relations between the USSR and Turkey		
	From the establishment of the republic to the Second World War (1923-1939)	331
	During and after the Second World War (1939-1975)	70
	Trade contracts, agreements, and conventions	23
Economic relations between Turkey and socialist countries		53
Culture and Science		
Ideology in contemporary Turkey		28
	Dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas	7
Religion		94
Development of sciences in Turkey		12
Linguistics		
	Language, writing system	
	General works	332
	Grammar, textbooks	29
	Dictionaries, conversational books	38
Literature		
	General works	11
	Medieval literature (The 13 th century – the first half of the 17 th century)	68

	Translations from medieval authors, literature on the authors ¹⁸⁹	114
	Literature in modern and contemporary times	
	(The second half of the 17 th century – the 20 th century)	170
	Poetry	
	Collected verses	4
	Translations of separate verses, literature about poets ¹⁹⁰	1863
	Prose	
	Collected stories	7
	Translations of individual works, literature about writers ¹⁹¹	1340
	Dramaturgy	
	Translations of dramaturgical works, literature about dramaturgy ¹⁹²	37
	Folklore	
	General works	24
	Translations	
	Tales, popular stories, folk songs	23
	Proverbs and sayings	11
	Russian-Turkish literary relations	37
	Turkish writers' statements, interviews and talks with writers	27
	Art	
	General works	8
	Turkish art in the Middle Ages and modern time	35
	Contemporary Turkish art	21
	Exhibitions of Turkish art, guidebooks of museums and exhibitions, catalogues	29
	Architecture, historical monuments	14
	Music	10
	Theater	26
	Cinema	9
	Education	67
	Reform of writing system	19
	History of printing, press	34
	Public health	12
Total		14,600

189 The following authors are listed: Aşık Paşa, Celaleddin Rumi, Mihri Hatun, Ömer Nefi, Ruhi Bağdadi, Şeyhi (Yusuf Sinaneddin).

190 93 Turkish poets in total are listed. The most numerous translations were made from and literature created about Nazım Hikmet (833), Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca (194), Orhan Veli Kanık (144), Oktay Rıfat (106), Tefvik Fikret (104), Melih Cevdet Anday (98), Nevzat Üstün (52), and Rıfat Ilgaz (47).

191 77 Turkish writers in total are listed. The most numerous translations were made from and literature created about Aziz Nesin (325), Sabahattin Ali (107), Sait Faik Abasıyanık (93), Orhan Kemal (91), Ömer Seyfeddin (79), Fahri Erdiç (69), Nazım Hikmet (67), Reşad Nuri Güntekin (39), and Haldun Taner (37).

192 Five Turkish dramaturgs are listed: Aziz Nesin, Vastf Öngiren, Cengiz Tuncer, Nazım Hikmet, and Fehmi Cevat Başkurt.

Some important shifts are evident between 1958 and 1975. First of all, the amount of literature on Turkey quickly grew: while the first bibliography contains 3,262 titles, this number increased to 14,600 in the second bibliography. There are several reasons for this growth. Firstly, in the second bibliography the authors achieved more comprehensiveness, covering sources not used in the first edition. For instance, the category titled “Economics” was significantly larger in the second edition because of material taken from *Torgovyi biulleten* (Trade Bulletin), the journal of the Soviet Trade Agency in Istanbul published during the 1920s. The content of the second bibliography was also expanded due to the introduction of some new rubrics such as the “History of Turkological studies in Russia and the USSR,” “Public Health”, and others. However, undoubtedly, the main reason for the growth in the amount of literature covered by the second bibliography is the increased output by the Soviet Turkologists after the 1950s. The emergence of specialized journals and other factors that brought about increased academic publication on Oriental issues seem to have positively affected the scholarly work on Turkey.

As for shifts in the content of the work on Turkey, it can be observed that, in general, the thematic priorities did not significantly change from 1958 to 1975; the same emphasis on history and economics continued. However, after the 1950s, when compared with the previous period, economics was more of a priority than history, whereas in the field of history contemporary developments gained importance. Furthermore, judging from the composition of the second bibliography –which lists the works in a much more specified and detailed manner than the first bibliography– within fifteen years all the fields in Turkological studies became much more detailed. In particular, the advance shown in the category of cultural studies attracts attention. The compilers even felt the need to categorize the work on cultural issues under a separate rubric titled “Culture and Science.”¹⁹³ Linguistic and literary studies are particularly advanced within this field. The attention Soviet scholars paid to literary translation continued and a considerable amount of Turkish literature was translated. Significantly, religion reappeared as an area of study.¹⁹⁴

193 Though this rubric is the largest in the bibliography (it contains 4,560 references, while “Economics” covers 4,345 and “History” 3,943), this overwhelming quantity does not signify overwhelming character of cultural studies, as this amount emerges simply from numerous titles of translated verses and pieces of prose and dramaturgy listed item by item. For example, each translated Turkish verse is referred separately and the whole list of verses includes about 1,500 titles many of which are of the same book. Similarly, there are about 1,000 titles of translated pieces of prose which are listed separately though many of them are grouped in one book. In other words, the number of literary titles does not correspond to the number of books (It was not the case in the first bibliography, where only separate literary works were listed).

194 Judging from the second bibliography which covers not only works devoted to Turkey but also a range of general works on Islam, study of religious issues advanced especially after the late 1950s. Changed attitude toward study of religious issues can be evaluated as a sign of more objective and less militant stand of Soviet scholars in the late Soviet era and the more attention they started to pay to cultural issues. As to religion in Turkey, interest in this subject was, evidently, also related to the growing role religion started to play in this country after the Ataturk period.

Appendix C

Selected Bibliography of Turkological Works (1918-2008)*

1918

M. Pavlovitch, *Aziia i eio rol' v mirovoi voine* [Asia and Its Role in the World War], St. Petersburg, 1918.

1920s

M. Pavlovich (M. Veltman), *Revoliutsionnaia Turtsiia. Velichie i padenie Ottomanskoi imperii (staraia Turtsiia). Turtsiia Enver-beia i Akhmed-Rizy. Turtsiia Kemalia. Kommunisticheskoe dvizhenie v Turtsii* [Revolutionary Turkey. The Grandeur and Fall of the Ottoman Empire (Old Turkey). Turkey of Enver Bey and Akhmet Riza. Turkey of Kemal. Communist Movement in Turkey], Moscow, 1921.

Arslan, *Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1923.

V. A. Gurko-Kriazhin, *Istoriia revoliutsii v Turtsii* [History of the Revolution in Turkey], Moscow, 1923.

Ie. A. Adamova (ed.), *Razdel Aziatskoi Turtsii: po sekretnym dokumentam byvshego ministerstva inostrannykh del* [Partition of Asian Turkey: According to Secret Documents of the Former Ministry of Foreign Affairs], Moscow, 1924.

V. Lirau, *Novaia Turtsiia, ee ekonomicheskoe sostoenie i vidy na budushchee* [New Turkey, Its Economic Situation and Future Prospects], Moscow, Leningrad, 1924.

Ie. A. Adamova (ed.), *Konstantinopol' i prolivy: po sekretnym dokumentam byvshego ministerstva inostrannykh del* [Constantinople and the Straits: According to Secret Documents of the Former Ministry of Foreign Affairs], vol. I-II. Moscow, 1925-1926.

I. Butaev, *Natsional'naia revoliutsia na Vostoke. Problema Turtsii* [National Revolution in the East. The Question of Turkey], Moscow, 1925.

V. A. Gurko-Kriazhin, *Blizhnii Vostok i derzhavy* [The Near East and Great Powers], Moscow, 1925.

V. Kasparova, *Zhenshchiny Vostoka* [Women of the East], Leningrad, 1925.

P. Kitaigorodskii, *Ot kolonial'nogo rabstva k natsional'noi nezavisimosti. Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Perednei Azii i Severnoi Afrike* [From Colonial Slavery to National Independence. Revolutionary Movement in Asia Minor and North Africa], Moscow, 1925.

M. Pavlovich and V. Gurko-Kriazhin, *Turtsiia v bor'be za nezavisimost'* [Turkey in the Struggle for Independence], Moscow, 1925.

L. Seifullina, *V strane ukhodiashchego islama. Poezdka v Turtsiiu* [In the Country of Passing Islam. A Journey to Turkey], Moscow, 1925.

G. Astakhov, *Ot sultanata k demokraticeskoi Turtsii. Ocherki iz istorii kemalizma* [From Sultanate to Democratic Turkey. Essays on History of Kemalism], Moscow, Leningrad, 1926.

*Only books (individual monographs, collective works, compilations of articles) and only those published in Moscow and Leningrad (St. Petersburg) are covered. Besides scholarly works, certain representative examples of popular literature are also included. It should be underlined that this bibliography is not intended to be comprehensive in any way. The only aim is to provide some notion about main areas of interest of Soviet and post-Soviet Turkologists.

- Mustafa Kemal-Pasha *Vosmominaniia prezidenta Turetskoi Respubliki* [Memoirs of the President of the Republic of Turkey], Moscow, 1927.
- K. Grankur, *Taktika na Blizhnem Vostoke* [Tactics in the Near East], Moscow, Leningrad, 1928.
- Iran dust, *Dvizhushchie sily kemalistkoi revoliutsii* [The Driving Forces of Kemalist Revolution], Moscow, Leningrad, 1928.
- V. Melikov, *Marna 1914 g. – Visla 1920 g. – Smirna 1922 g.*, Moscow, Leningrad, 1928.
- A. Melnik, *Respublikanskaia Turtsiia* [Republican Turkey], Moscow, Leningrad, 1928.
- M. V. Frunze, *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], vol. I, Moscow, 1929.
- A. Melnik, *Turtsiia, eio istoricheskoe proshloe i nastoiashchee* [Turkey, Its Historical Past and Present], Moscow, Leningrad, 1929.
- Mustafa Kemal, *Put' novoi Turtsii* [New Turkey's Way], vol. I-IV, Moscow, 1929-1934.
- A. Shnurov, *Turetskii proletariat* [Turkish Proletariat], Moscow, Leningrad, 1929.

1930s

- B. M. Dantsig, *Ocherki po ekonomicheskoi geografii Turtsii* [Essays on Economic Geography of Turkey], Moscow, 1930.
- P. Pavlenko, *Stambul i Turtsiia* [Istanbul and Turkey], Moscow, 1930.
- P. M. Zhukovskii, *Zemel'cheskaia Turtsiia* [Peasant Turkey], Moscow, Leningrad, 1933.
- Probuzhdenie Azii. 1905 god i revoliutsiia na Vostoke* [Awakening of Asia. The Year of 1905 and Revolution in the East], Leningrad, 1935.
- L. Nikulin, *Stambul, Ankara, Izmir*, Moscow, 1935.
- A. D. Novichev, *Ekonomika Turtsii v period mirovoi voiny* [Turkish Economics During the World War], Moscow, Leningrad, 1935.
- H. Z. Gabidullin, *Mladoturetskaia revoliutsiia: istoricheskie ocherki* [Young Turk Revolution: Historical Essays], Moscow, 1936.
- N. G. Korsun, *Sarykamyshkaia operatsiia na Kavkazskom fronte mirovoi voiny v 1914-1915 gg.* [The Sarykamysh Operation in the Caucasian Front of the World War between 1914 and 1915], Moscow, 1937.
- G. Lorei, *Operatsii germano-turetskikh morskikh sil v 1914-1918 gg.* [German-Turkish Naval Forces' Operations between 1914 and 1918], Moscow, 1937.
- A. Melnik, *Turtsiia*, Moscow, 1937.
- A. Kolenskovich, *Dardanellskaia operatsiia* [The Dardanelles Operation], Moscow, 1938.
- N. G. Korsun, *Erzerumskaia operatsiia na Kavkazskom fronte v 1915-1916 gg* [The Erzurum Operation in the Caucasian Front between 1915 and 1916], Moscow, 1938.
- N. G. Korsun, *Balkanski Front mirovoi voiny 1914-1918 gg.* [The Balkan Front of the World War between 1914 and 1918], Moscow, 1938.

1940s

- N. G. Korsun, *Greko-turetskaia voina 1919-1922 gg. Operativno-strategicheskii ocherk* [The Greek-Turkish War between 1919 and 1922. An Operational-Strategical Essay], Moscow, 1940.
- N. G. Korsun, *Pervaia mirovaia voina na Kavkazskom fronte. Operativno-strategicheskii ocherk* [The First World War in the Caucasian Front. An Operational-Strategical Essay], Moscow, 1946.

- N. A. Smirnov, *Rossiia i Turtsiia v XVI-XVII vv.* [Russia and Turkey in the XVI-XVIIth Centuries], 2 vols., Moscow, 1946.
- I. M. Lemin, *Vneshniaia politika Velikobritanii ot Versalia do Lokarno: 1919-1925* [Great Britain's Foreign Policy from Versailles to Locarno: 1919-1925], Moscow, 1947.
- A. F. Miller, *Mustafa Pasha Bairaktar*, Moscow, 1947.
- Sovetsko-turetskie otnosheniia. Sbornik dokumentov. T. 1 (1917-1926 gg.)* [Soviet-Turkish Relations. Collected Documents. vol. 1], Moscow, 1947.
- B. A. Dranov, *Chernomorskie prolivy. Mezhdunarodno-pravovoi rezhim* [The Straits. The International Legal Regime], Moscow, 1948.
- A. F. Miller, *Ocherki noveishei istorii Turtsii* [Essays on Recent Turkish History], Moscow, Leningrad, 1948.
- B. M. Dantsig, *Turtsiia*, Moscow, 1949.
- N. Muratov, *Turtsiia v tiskakh vnutrennei i vneshnei reaktsii* [Turkey in the Grip of Domestic and Foreign Reaction], Moscow, 1949.

1950s

- I. Vasiliev, *O turetskom "neitralitete" vo vtoroi mirovoi voine* [On Turkish "Neutrality" during the Second World War], Moscow, 1951.
- A. Ie Kunina, *Proval amerikanskikh planov zavoevaniia mirovogo gospodstva v 1919-1920 gg.* [The Failure of American Plans of World Domination in 1919-1920], Moscow, 1954.
- Ie. F. Ludshuweit, *Turtsiia: ekonomiko-geograficheskii ocherk* [Turkey: An Economic and Geographical Essay], Moscow, 1955.
- B. M. Dantsig, *Ekonomika Turtsii* [Turkish Economics], Moscow, 1956.
- M. A. Kerimov, *Gosudarstvennyi stroi Turtsii* [State System of Turkey], Moscow, 1956.
- Iu. N. Rozaliev, *Ocherki polozeniia promyshlennogo proletariata Turtsii posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* [Essays on the Condition of Industrial Proletariat in Turkey after the Second World War], Moscow, 1956.
- V. P. Smirnov, *Turtsiia: ekonomika i vneshniaia torgovlia* [Turkey: Economics and Foreign Trade], Moscow, 1956.
- A. F. Miller, *Piatidesiatiletie mladoturetskoi revoliutsii* [On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Young Turk Revolution], Moscow, 1958.
- P. P. Moiseev and Iu. N. Rozaliev, *K istorii sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii* [On History of Soviet-Turkish Relations], Moscow, 1958.
- A. D. Novichev, *Istoriia rabochego classa Turtsii* [History of Turkish Working Class], Leningrad, 1958.
- Iu. A. Petrosian, *"Novye osmany" i bor'ba za konstitutsiiu 1876 g. v Turtsii* ["Young Ottomans" and the Struggle for the 1876 Constitution in Turkey], Moscow, 1958.
- N. A. Smirnov, *Politika Rossii na Kavkaze v XVI-XIX vv.* [Russian Policy in Caucasia in the XVI-XIXth Centuries], Moscow, 1958.
- Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1958.
- Turetskii sbornik. Istoriia, ekonomika, literatura, yazyk* [The Turkish Collection. History, Economics, Literature, Language], Moscow, 1958.
- Turtsiia – aktivnyi uchastnik agressivnykh blokov* [Turkey, the Active Participant of Aggressive Blocs], Moscow, 1958.

A. D. Novichev, *Krestianstvo Turtsii v noveisheie vremia* [Turkish Peasants in Recent Times], Moscow, 1959.

1960s

S. I. Aralov,* *Vospominaniia sovetskogo diplomata* [Memoirs of a Soviet Diplomat], Moscow, 1960.

A. Glebov, *Liniia druzhby. Rasskazy o Turtsii* [The Line of Friendship. Stories about Turkey], Moscow, 1960.

V.V. Gotlib, *Tainaia diplomatiia vo vremia pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Secret Diplomacy During the First World War], Moscow, 1960.

A. N. Kheifets, *Lenin velikii drug narodov Vostoka* [Lenin, the Great Friend of Peoples of the East], Moscow, 1960.

M. S. Lazarev, *Krushenie turetskogo gospodstva na Arabskom Vostoke (1914-1918 gg.)* [The Downfall of Turkish Domination in the Arab East], Moscow, 1960.

P. P. Moiseev, *Agrarnye otnosheniia v sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian Relations in Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1960.

Politika SShA na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke [The USA's Policies in the Near and Middle East], Moscow, 1960.

V. I. Shpilkova, *Imperialisticheskaia politika SShA v otnoshenii Turtsii (1914-1920gg)* [Imperialistic Politics of the USA toward Turkey], Moscow, 1960.

V. M. Alekseev, *Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1961.

V. M. Alekseev and M. A. Kerimov, *Vneshniaia politika Turtsii* [Turkish Foreign Policy], Moscow, 1961.

S. I. Kuznetsova, *Ustanovlenie sovetsko-turetskikh otnoshenii (K 40-letiiu Moskovskogo dogovora mezhdur RSFSR i Turtsiei)* [Establishment of Soviet-Turkish Relations (On the 40th Anniversary of the Moscow Treaty between RSFSR and Turkey)], Moscow, 1961.

Iu. V. Marunov and Iu. V. Potemkin, *Arabo-turetskie otnosheniia na sovremennom etape. 1946-1960 gg.* [Arabian-Turkish Relations at Contemporary Stage], Moscow, 1961.

A. P. Baziant, *Turtsiia*, Moscow, 1962.

Iu. N. Rozaliev, *Osobennosti razvitiia kapitalizma v Turtsii (1923-1960 gg)* [The Peculiarities of Capitalist Development in Turkey], Moscow, 1962.

A. M. Shamsutdinov, *Turetskaia Respublika. Kratkii ocherk istorii, 1923-1961* [The Republic of Turkey. A Short Historical Essay], Moscow, 1962.

D. I. Vdovichenko, *Natsional'naia burzhuaziia Turtsii* [Turkish National Bourgeoisie], Moscow, 1962.

M. Gasratian and P. Moiseiev, *Turtsiia zhdiet peremen* [Turkey is Waiting for Changes], Moscow, 1963.

Problemy sovremennoi Turtsii [Problems of Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1963.

A. N. Kheifets, *Sovetskaia Rossiia i sopredel'nye strany Vostoka v gody grazhdanskoi voiny (1918-1920)* [Soviet Russia and Adjacent Eastern Countries in the Years of the Civil War], Moscow, 1964.

M. A. Gasratian, *Turtsiia v 1960-1963 godakh. Ocherk vnutrennei politiki* [Turkey between 1960 and 1963. An Essay on Domestic Policies], Moscow, 1965.

* The plenipotentiary of RSFSR in Turkey between 1922 and 1923.

- A. K. Ibragimov, *Pechat' Turtsii* [Turkish Press], Moscow, 1965.
- R. P. Kornienko, *Rabochee dvizhenie v Turtsii v 1918-1963 gg.* [Worker Movement in Turkey between 1918 and 1963], Moscow, 1965.
- Iu. A. Miller, *Iskusstvo Turtsii* [Turkish Art], Leningrad, 1965.
- P. P. Moiseev and M. A. Gasratian, *Turtsiia: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskii ocherk* [Turkey: An Socioeconomic Essay], Moscow, 1965.
- A. D. Novichev, *Turtsiia. Kratkaia istoriia* [Turkey. A Short History], Moscow, 1965.
- Sovremennaia Turtsiia* [Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1965.
- I. V. Alibekov, *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Turtsii* [State Capitalism in Turkey], Moscow, 1966.
- Kemal Ataturk, *Izbrannye rechi i vystupleniia* [Selected Speeches], Moscow, 1966.
- Ie. F. Ludshuveit, *Turtsiia v gody pervoi mirovoi voiny* [Turkey During the First World War], Moscow, 1966.
- A. F. Miller, *Chanakskii krizis i vopros o Prolivakh* [The Dardanelles Crisis and the Straits Question], Moscow, 1966.
- Iu. N. Rozaliev, *Klassy i klassovaia bor'ba v Turtsii (burzhuaizii i proletariat)* [Classes and Class Struggle in Turkey (Bourgeoisie and Proletariat)], Moscow, 1966.
- A. M. Shamsutdinov, *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naia bor'ba v Turtsii. 1918-1923 gg.* [The National Liberation Struggle in Turkey], Moscow, 1966.
- B. M. Dantsig, *Istoriia, ekonomika i geografiia Turtsii* [History, Economics and Geography of Turkey], Moscow, 1967.
- D. I. Vdovichenko, *Bor'ba politicheskikh partii v Turtsii (1944-1965 gg.)* [The Struggle between Political Parties in Turkey], Moscow, 1967.
- N. A. Aizenshtein, *Iz istorii turetskogo realizma. Zametki o turetskoi proze (70-e gody XIX v. – 30-e gody XXv.)* [From History of Turkish Realism. Notes on Turkish Prose (1870s – 1930s)], Moscow, 1968.
- V. I. Danilov, *Srednie sloi v politicheskoi zhizni sovremennoi Turtsii* [Middle Stratum in the Political Life of Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1968.
- A. N. Kheifets, *Sovetskaia diplomatiia i narody Vostoka. 1921-1927* [Soviet Diplomacy and Eastern Peoples], Moscow, 1968.
- N. G. Kireev, *Natsional'nyi i inostrannyi kapital vo vneshnei torgovle Turtsii* [National and Foreign Capital in Turkish Foreign Trade], Moscow, 1968.
- Noveishaia istoriia Turtsii* [Recent History of Turkey], Moscow, 1968.
- D. E. Eremeev, *Iuryki (turetskie kochevniki i polukochevniki)* [Iuryks (Turkish Nomads and Seminomads)], Moscow, 1969.
- Kh. K. Kiamilev, *U istokov sovremennoi turetskoi literatury* [Origins of Contemporary Turkish Literature], Moscow, 1969.
- Kipr* [Cyprus], Moscow, 1969.
- V. T. Veselov, *Transport sovremennoi Turtsii* [Transportation in Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1969.

1970s

- P. P. Moiseev, *Agrarnyi stroi sovremennoi Turtsii* [Agrarian System of Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1970.

- Iu. A. Petrosian, *Mladoturetskoe dvizhenie* [Young Turk Movement], Moscow, 1971.
- G. Z. Aliev, *Turtsiia v period pravleniia mladoturok (1908-1914)* [Turkey Under the Young Turks' Rule], Moscow, 1972.
- T. P. Dadashev, *Prosveshchenie v Turtsii v noveishee vremia (1923-1960 gg.)* [Education in Turkey in Recent Times], Moscow, 1972.
- N. G. Kireev, *Ankara*, Moscow, 1972.
- Iu. A. Petrosian, *Mladoturetskoe dvizhenie (vtoraia polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.* [Young Turk Movement (The Second Half of the XIXth Century – the Beginning of the XXth Century)], Moscow, 1972.
- I. V. Komzin,* *Ia veriu v mechtu* [I Believe in Dream], Moscow, 1973.
- Iu. A. Petrosian and A. P. Iusupov, *Izmir*, Moscow, 1973.
- Polveka mirnogo sotrudnichestva. K piatidesiatiletiu dogovorov sovetskogo gosudarstva s Afganistanom, Iranom i Turtsiei* [The Half Century of Peaceful Cooperation. On the 50th Anniversary of Treaties between Soviet State and Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey], Moscow, 1973.
- A. A. Guseinov, *Profsoiuzy v Turtsii (1960-1970)* [Trade Unions in Turkey], Moscow, 1974.
- Ie. I. Urazova, *Turtsiia: problemy finansirovaniia ekonomicheskogo razvitiia* [Turkey: Financial Problems of Economic Development], Moscow, 1974.
- E. A. Georgiian, *Turetskaia Respublika. Osnovnye instituty gosudarstvennogo stroia* [The Republic of Turkey. Basic Institutions of State System], Moscow, 1975.
- G. I. Starchenkov, *Problemy zaniatosti i migratsii naseleniia Turtsii* [Problems of Employment and Population Migration in Turkey], Moscow, 1975.
- Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik)* [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)], Moscow, 1975.
- L. Zhivkova, *Anglo-turetskie otnosheniia 1933-1939 gg.* [Anglo-Turkish Relations between 1933 and 1939], Moscow, 1975.
- Politika i ekonomika sovremennoi Turtsii* [Politics and Economics of Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1977.
- A. A. Guseinov, *Turetskoe kino: istoriia i sovremennye problemy* [Turkish Cinema: History and Contemporary Problems], Moscow, 1978.
- Problemy istorii Turtsii* [Problems of Turkish History], Moscow, 1978.
- Turtsiia: istoriia, ekonomika* [Turkey: History, Economics], Moscow, 1978.
- A. M. Vasiliev, *Most cherez Bosfor* [The Bridge across the Bosphorus], Moscow, 1979.

1980s

- Iu. N. Rozaliev, *Ekonomicheskaia istoriia Turetskoi Respubliki* [Economic History of the Republic of Turkey], Moscow, 1980.
- A. A. Guseinov, *Sredstva massovoi informatsii v obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni Turtsii* [Mass Media in the Sociopolitical Life of Turkey], Moscow, 1981.
- SSSR i Turtsiia. 1917-1979* [The USSR and Turkey], Moscow, 1981.
- G. I. Starchenkov, *Trudovye resursy Turtsii. Demograficheskii, ekonomicheskii i sotsial'nyi aspekty* [Labor Resources of Turkey. Demographic, Economic and Social Aspects], Moscow, 1981.

* The manager of the Soviet building company which built the textile factories in Kaiseri and Nazilli

- N. G. Kireev, *Razvitie kapitalizma v Turtsii: k kritike teorii "smeshanoi ekonomiki"* [Development of Capitalism in Turkey: On the Critique of the Theory of "Mixed Economics"], Moscow, 1982.
- Ekonomicheskoe razvitie sovremennoi Turtsii* [Economic Development of Contemporary Turkey], Moscow, 1983.
- M. A. Gasratian, S. F. Oreshkova and Iu. A. Petrosian, *Ocherki istorii Turtsii* [Essays on Turkish History], Moscow, 1983.
- A. K. Sverchevskaia, *Sovetsko-turetskie kultur'nye sviazi (1925-1981 gg.)* [Soviet-Turkish Cultural Relations], Moscow, 1983.
- Turetskaia Respublika v 60-70e gody: voprosy obshchestvenno-politicheskogo razvitiia* [The Republic of Turkey in the 1960-1970s: Problems of Sociopolitical Development], Moscow, 1984.
- Turtsiia. Istoriiia, ekonomika, politika* [Turkey. History, Economics, Politics], Moscow, 1984.
- V. I. Danilov, *Politicheskaiia bor'ba v Turtsii v 50-e – nachale 80-kh godov XX veka: politicheskie partii i armiia* [Political Struggle in Turkey between the 1950s and the Beginning of the 1980s: Political Parties and the Army], Moscow, 1985.
- I. I. Ivanova, *Turetsko-arabskie otnosheniia i ikh mesto v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh sviazei na Blizhnem Vostoke: 1945-1983* [Turkish-Arabian Relations and Their Place in the System of International Relations in the Near East: 1945-1983], Moscow, 1985.
- A. F. Miller, *Turtsiia. Aktual'nye problemy novoi i noveishei istorii* [Turkey. Actual Problems of Modern and Recent History], Moscow, 1986.
- Osmanskaia imperiia: sistema gosudarstvennogo upravleniia, sotsial'nye i etnoreligioznye problemy* [The Ottoman Empire: System of State Administration, Social and Ethnoreligious Problems], Moscow, 1986.
- Kapitalizm v Turtsii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe razvitie v 50-80-e gg.* [Capitalism in Turkey: Socioeconomic Development in the 1950s-1980s], Moscow, 1987.
- Kurdskoe dvizhenie v novoe i noveishee vremia* [Kurdish Movement in Modern and Recent Times], Moscow, 1987.

1990s

- Osmanskaia imperiia: gosudartstvennaia vlast' i sotsial'no-politicheskaiia struktura* [The Ottoman Empire: State Power and Sociopolitical Structure], Moscow, 1990.
- G. I. Starchenkov, *Naselenie Turetskoi Respubliki: demograficheskoe-ekonomicheskii ocherk* [The population of the Republic of Turkey: A Demographic and Economic Essay], Moscow, 1990.
- Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik)* [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)], Moscow, 1990.
- V. I. Danilov, *Turtsiia 80-kh: ot voennogo rezhima do "ogranichennoi demokratii"* [Turkey of the 1980s: from the Military Regime to "Restricted Democracy"], Moscow, 1991.
- N. G. Kireev, *Istoriiia etatizma v Turtsii* [History of Etatism in Turkey], Moscow, 1991.
- Turtsiia: novye tendentsii ekonomicheskogo razvitiia v 80-e gg.* [Turkey: New Tendencies of Economic Development in the 1980s], Moscow, 1991.
- D. E. Ereemeev and M. S. Meier, *Istoriiia Turtsii v srednie veka i novoe vremia* [Turkish Medieval and Modern History], Moscow, 1992.

- B. M. Potskhveria, *Turtsiia mezhdv dvumia mirovymi voynami: ocherki vneshnei politiki* [Turkey between Two World Wars: Essays on Foreign Policy], Moscow, 1992.
- M. S. Lazarev (ed.), *Zapadnaia Aziia: etnopoliticheskaia situatsiia* [The Western Asia: Ethnopolitical Situation], Moscow, 1993.
- Ie. I. Urazova, *Ekonomika Turtsii. Ot etatizma k rynku (Vnutrennie v vneshnie istochniki ekonomicheskogo rosta)* [Turkish Economics. From Etatism to Market (Internal and External Sources of Economic Growth)], Moscow, 1993.
- Kurdistan: na perekrestkakh istorii i politiki* [Kurdistan: On the Crossroads of History and Politics], Moscow, 1994.
- I. I. Ivanova, Ie. S. Melkumian and R. M. Mukimdzhanova. *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia v Iugo-Zapadnoi Azii (Turtsiia, Pakistan, gosudarstva Persidskogo Zaliva, konets 70-kh – nachalo 90-kh gg.)* [International Relations in the Southwest Asia (Turkey, Pakistan, the Countries of the Persian Gulf, the End of 1970s – the Beginning of 1990s)], Moscow, 1994.
- A. M. Khazanov and I. Peev (ed.), *Vostochnoe Sredizemnomorie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia v 80-e gody* [The Eastern Mediterranean Area. International Relations in the 1980s], Moscow, 1994.
- P. P. Moiseev, *Turetskaia Respublika: krestianstvo i sotsial'no-politicheskie protsessy v derevne* [The Republic of Turkey: Peasantry and Sociopolitical Processes in the Countryside], Moscow, 1994.
- V. I. Maksimenko (ed.), *Zapadnaia Aziia, Tsentral'naia Aziia i Zakavkazie: integratsiia i konflikty* [Western Asia, Central Asia and Transcaucasia: Integration and Conflicts], Moscow, 1995.
- Iu. N. Rozaliev, *Mustafa Kemal' Atatiurk. Ocherk zhizni i deiatel'nosti* [Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. An Essay on the Life and Activities], Moscow, 1995.
- Sovremennyi Kurdistan. Problemy natsional'nogo dvizheniia* [The Contemporary Kurdistan. Problems of Nationalist Movement], Moscow, 1995.
- R. Kazandzhian, *Bol'sheviki i Mladoturki. Novye dokumenty o rossiisko-turetskikh otnosheniakh (1920-1922 gg.)* [Bolsheviks and Young Turks. New Documents on Russian-Turkish Relations], Moscow, 1996.
- Osmanskaia imperiia: problemy vneshnei politiki i otnosheniia s Rossiei* [The Ottoman Empire: Problems of Foreign Policy and Relations with Russia], Moscow, 1996.
- V. Ia. Belokrinitskii and I. L. Fadeeva (ed.), *Osobennosti modernizatsii na musul'manskom Vostoke: opyt Turtsii, Irana, Afghanistana, Pakistana* [The Peculiarities of Modernization in the Muslim East: The Experience of Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan], Moscow, 1997.
- G. I. Starchenkov, *Trudovye migratsii mezhdv Vostokom i Zapadom. II polovina XX stoletii* [Labor Migration between the East and the West. The Second Half of the XXth Century], Moscow, 1997.
- Turtsiia: sovremennye problemy ekonomiki i politiki* [Turkey: Contemporary Economic and Political Problems], Moscow, 1997.
- V. I. Danilov (ed.), *Evolutsiia politicheskikh sistem na Vostoke. Iran, Pakistan, Turtsiia: traditsii i demokratizatsiia* [The Evolution of Political Systems in the East. Iran, Pakistan, Turkey: Traditions and Democratization], Moscow, 1999.

Istoriia Kurdistana [History of Kurdistan], Moscow, 1999.

S. F. Oreshkova and N. Iu. Ulchenko, *Rossiia i Turtsiia (problemy formirovaniia granits)* [Russia and Turkey: The Problems of Formation of Borders], Moscow, 1999.

Rossiia i Chernomorskie prolivy [Russia and the Straits], Moscow, 1999.

2000s

Osmanskaia imperiia: sobytiia i liudi. Sbornik statei k 70-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Yu. A. Petrosiana [The Ottoman Empire: Events and People. A Compilation of Articles On the 70th Anniversary of Yu. A. Petrosian's Birth], Moscow, 2000.

Turetskaia Respublika (spravochnik) [The Republic of Turkey (Reference Book)], Moscow, 2000.

M. A. Gasratian, *Kurdskaia problema v Turtsii (1986-1995)* [The Kurdish Problem in Turkey], Moscow, 2001.

Turtsiia mezhdru Evropoi i Azii: itogi evropeizatsii na iskhode XX veka [Turkey between Europe and Asia: The Results of Europeanization in the End of the XXth Century], Moscow, 2001.

Musul'manskie strany u granits SNG (Afganistan, Pakistan, Iran i Turtsiia – sovremennoe sostoianie, istoriia i perspektivy) [Muslim Countries Along the Borders of CIS (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran and Turkey – Contemporary State, History and Perspectives)], Moscow, 2002.

A. Ushakov, *Fenomen Ataturka: turetskii pravitel', tvorets i diktator* [The Phenomenon of Ataturk: Turkish Ruler, Creator and Dictator], Moscow, 2002.

Ot Stambula do Moskvy. Sbornik statei v chest' 100-letiiu professora A. F. Millera [From Istanbul to Moscow. A Compilation of Articles on the 100th Anniversary of Professor A. F. Miller's Birth], Moscow, 2003.

Rossiisko-turetskie otnosheniia: istoriia, sovremennoe sostoianie i perspektivy [Russian-Turkish Relations: History, Contemporary State and Perspectives], Moscow, 2003.

D. E. Eremeev, *Stanovlenie respublikanskoi Turtsii (1918-1939 gody)* [Development of the Republic of Turkey], Moscow, 2004.

Turtsiia v XX veke (sbornik statei) [Turkey in the XXth Century (Collected Articles)], Moscow, 2004.

Turcica et Ottomanica: sbornik v chest' 70-letiiu M. S. Meiera [Turcica et Ottomanica: A Compilation on the 70th Anniversary of M. S. Meier's Birth], Moscow, 2006.

Turtsiia: Rozhdenie natsional'nogo gosudarstva, 1918-1923 (Po dokumentam RGASPI) [Turkey: The Birth of a National State, 1918-1923 (According to Documents of the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History)], Moscow, 2007.

M. S. Meier and S. F. Faizov, *Pis'ma perevodchika osmanskih padishahov Zul'fikara-agi tsarizam Mihailu Fedorovichu i Alekseiu Michailovichu, 1640-1656: Turetskaia diplomatika v kontekste russko-turetskikh vzaimootnoshenii* [Letters of Zulfikar Aga, the translator of Ottoman Sultans, to Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich and Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, 1640-1656: Turkish Diplomacy in the Context of Russian-Turkish Relations], Moscow, 2008.

Russian Turkology: From Past to Present

Liaisan ŞAHİN

Abstract

Turkology is one of the oldest and most developed branches of Russian Oriental studies. The peculiarities of Russian-Turkish relations and Russia's consequent close interest in the Ottoman Empire and subsequently in the Republic of Turkey has determined this fact. This article provides detailed information about the historical development of Ottoman and Turkish studies in Russia in Tsarist, Soviet and post-Soviet periods. Institutional developments, personalities, and major trends of the scholarly studies on Turkey are studied with special focus on the field of Turkish history studies. This article shows how the development of Ottoman and Turkish studies was connected to the changes in Russian-Turkish relations and to the phases of the development of Russian Oriental studies.

Keywords: Russian Oriental Studies, Soviet Oriental Studies, Ottoman Studies, Turkish Studies, Russian-Turkish Relations