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In this article I try to summarize some basic facts of the Oghuz immigration to Anatolia. At the same time I want to demonstrate some connections between historical and linguistic developments and the role of cultural and linguistic contacts in the history of the Oghuz during their migration from Mongolia and South Siberia to Anatolia. As to the linguistic and cultural contacts I mainly focus on contacts between the Oghuz and exponents of the Persian language and culture. My aim is at least to list the various occasions, possible sources and different areas and levels of Persian influence on the glottogenesis of immigrant Oghuz into Anatolian Turkic. In addition special attention will be paid to possible contacts (or loss of such contacts) between the Seljuk Oghuz (see below) and Turks of other branches of the Turkic family.

Turks and Iranians had extensive contacts for many centuries. Iranians played a decisive role in the ethnogenesis of the Turks and in the first Turk empire in the sixth century. On the Iranian side the Soghdians were a main partner, to which the Turks maintained intensive contacts for centuries. Another probably Iranian people which lived in the vicinity of the early Turks were the Az of the Orkhon inscriptions who may be identical with the Alans. Even if we know about such early contacts, the phenomenon as a whole is still not sufficiently investigated.

Of the early Turkic groups the Oghuz played an important role in the Second Turk empire and the Uyghur steppe empire in the eighth and ninth centuries. The Orkhon inscriptions mention besides Oğuz in general the Üç Oğuz “Three Oghuz” and the Toquz Oğuz “Nine Oghuz”. The Shine-usu
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1 For the early history of the Turks in general see Golden 1992.
2 For elements of probably Soghdian origin in Old Turkic see, e.g., Clark 1977.
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inscription additionally mentions some *Sākiz Oğuz* “Eight Oghuz”. The relations between these Oghuz groups and to the ruling clans of the empires are not clear in every detail. After the collapse of the second Turk empire some Oghuz groups began to move westward. According to Ibn al-Aṯīr the *Ḡuzz* migrated to Transoxania in the days of the Caliph al-Mahdī (775–785). Parts of them may have joined the heretic rebellion of al-Muqannaʿ (776–779). At the beginning of the ninth century the Oghuz are attested north of Khorasan. Their realm stretched from the Caspian Sea in the west to the town of Isfījāb near the Tien-shan mountains. The Arab author ʿAṯ-Ṭabarī (839–923) mentions the *Toquz Ḡuzz* taking part in the assault on the Central Asian town of Uṣrana (between 820 and 825), but these were the Oghuz tribes led by the Uyghurs who established a realm in the Tien-shan region to the east. The Oghuz of the west, however, were at the borders of Transoxania where they were led by a *Yabgu* as reported, e.g., by the Arabian traveler Ibn Faḍlān for the first quarter of the tenth century. According to the Ḥudūd al-ʿālam and al-Idrīsī they were known as traders settling in the vicinity of Khwarazm. Besides nomadic Oghuz there also were town-dwelling groups quite early. In the middle of the tenth century some of their 24 or 25 tribes converted to Islam.

In Central Asia the Oghuz came in direct contact with speakers of two Iranian languages—Khwarazmian and Persian (and possibly Alan as well). In these times Khwarazm was an economically and culturally important region of the Islamic world. The old Khwarazmian language was still alive and vanished only after the Mongol conquest. Thus Khwarazm might have been a source of cultural and linguistic influences on the Oghuz at least in the ninth and tenth centuries. The Persians had influence on Central Asia since the times of Kyros the Great in the sixth century BC. The impact of the medieval forerunner of Modern Persian in this area was due to the efforts of the Samanids which ruled Khorasan and neighboring areas in the tenth century. The Samanids supported poets like Rūdakī (died in 941) and played an important role in the renaissance of Persian literature. In addition Persian functioned as a *lingua franca* in the Middle East and in parts of India—and it was the language of the Muslim missionaries in Central Asia. Even if many Islamic *termini technici* and cultural terms in “Islamic languages” in Central Asia are of ultimately Arabic origin, the direct source from which they were
copied was Persian. Furthermore Persian was the prestigious language of the “refined” sedentary courts and of their bureaucracy and administration. Thus Persian language and culture became a source of major influence on the Oghuz and other Turkic peoples which invaded Turkestan and converted to Islam.

Before the Kipchaks destroyed the realm of the Oghuz Yabgu in the middle of the tenth century the Oghuz leader Sâljuq (because of some quarrels with the Yabgu) withdrew with some tribes to the south of the middle part of the Syr-darya. There he or his son Isrâ’îl converted to Islam. After Doerfer (1990) the Oghuz tribes which followed Sâljuq to the south may be called Seljuk Oghuz. They became the ancestors of more or less all modern Oghuz groups except the modern Turkmen. The modern Turkmen go back to the Oghuz tribes which stayed in their old lands under Kipchak domination. Some basic differences between modern Turkmen and all other Oghuz languages are rooted in this configuration which took shape during the Mongol period.  

The Seljuks soon controlled large parts of Transoxania. First they cooperated with the last Samanid ruler and then with the powerful Ghaznavid Sultan Maḥmûd (998–1030). Although rulers and the military were of Turkic origin, in the Ghaznavid state as a former part of the Samanid realm Persian was used by poets and bureaucrats. After Maḥmûd’s death the Oghuz invaded Khorasan and conquered Nishapur in 1038. In 1040 they defeated Maḥmûd’s son Maṣûd who fled to India. In 1055 the Oghuz leader Toğrîl Bâg expelled the Shiite Buyids from Baghdad and– choosing Isfahan as his capital—took over control of the Abbasid Caliph.

By moving into Khorasan the Seljuk Oghuz had entered the heartland of Persian language and culture. The influence of Persian on the Oghuz language is documented in the Dīvân Luġâti ’t-Turk of Maḥmûd al-Kâšgârî. He writes: “When the Oghuz mixed with the Persians they forgot many Turkic words and used Persian instead” (DK I 115 = K 51, sub örân < Persian viran ‘ruined’). The intensive direct contact with Persian let to a Turkic-Persian bilingualism among the Oghuz up to a certain degree. As a consequence Persian literature became understandable at least for the higher educated members of the ruling clans—and became a matter of prestige. Thus Seljuk rulers and nobleman—as before the Ghaznavids—began to
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3 For the theory of (code) copying see Johanson 1992.
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sponsor Persian poets. One of the most prominent of these was the poet *Niżāmī-i Ganjāwī* (1141–1203) whose patron was Pahlawān jahān (1175–1186) of the Ildeğizid Atabeg dynasty in Azerbaijan (see below). There are no remains of any written Seljuk Oghuz literature in the Great Seljuk period. In reconstructing the linguistic situation in this period all we can do is evaluate the language remnants in Near Eastern sources (see, e.g., Doerfer 1990, 30–34).

Toğrıl Bâg’s successor *Alp Arslan* (1063–1072) defeated the Byzantine emperor Romanos IV. Diogenes in 1071. Even if the deposition of the emperor and the following internal quarrels weakened the Byzantine empire for the next years, the Great Seljuks abstained from a direct conquest of Anatolia. They were more interested in the possession of Syria and Palestine which led to conflict with the still powerful Fatimids of Egypt. Instead of conquering Anatolia the Great Seljukids used it to get rid of restless tribal groups (always interested in “holy war” and booty), disobedient princes and other renegades. These Oghuz invaders were rather successful. Soon they had conquered great parts of Anatolia and reached Iznik, the former Nikaia, in 1077. Antiochia (Antakya) resisted them until 1085. The Seljuk Sultanate of Rum (= Rome = Byzantium) was proclaimed in 1081, destroyed by the Great Seljuks in 1086, but re-founded by Qılıç Arslan I. (1092–1107) with Konya (the former Ikonion) as capital of the new sultanate. Along the northern route to Iran, the Danishmendids founded another reign which later on fell victim to the Seljuks of Rum. From the beginning of their immigration into Anatolia the Seljuk Oghuz came in contact with Kurds, Armenians, Georgians and Greeks (Greek-speaking groups). At the end of the century the crusaders together with the recovering Armenians cut off the connection between the Anatolian Seljuks and the Arabian areas. The way to Iran was unsafe because of the political situation in Eastern Anatolia. The Byzantines had neither the power nor the will to assimilate the Oghuz newcomers. Thus great numbers of the Anatolian Seljuks—the common people and the so-called “Turkmen” tribesman at the borders of the Sultanate of Rum—could preserve their traditional culture and did not loose their Oghuz language despite the Persianized culture of the ruling classes in the Sultanate of Rum.

In Azerbaijan besides the Oghuz sources also mention Kipchak groups (Golden 1992, 225). But as we shall see this was not the only opportunity for the forerunners of modern Azeri speaking people to have contacts with groups of other Turkic sub-branches.
At the beginning of the twelfth century the empire of the Great Seljukids dissolved into an ever weakening center and the states of the Atabegs, dynasties of former educators and guardians of royal princes like the Artukids in Southeast Anatolia, the Ildegizids in Azerbaijan, the Salghurids in Fars, and the Zengids in Mossul and Aleppo. The situation became more complicated with the invasion of non-Seljuk Oghuz tribes from Central Asia into Iran. In 1153 these non-Seljuk Oghuz defeated Sultan Sanjar and put an end to the already weakened sultanate of the Great Seljukids.

An important aspect of Great Seljuk cultural orientation was determined by cultural geography and geostrategic conditions. Having converted to Islam in a Sunni milieu and being direct neighbors of the (Imamitic) Shiite Buyids which held control around Baghdad the Seljukid ruling clans officially took the Sunni side in the conflict between the Islamic parties and became the military vanguard of the so-called Sunni reaction against Shiite power and influence. After the Seljuks had overcome the Buyids in 1055, the Ismaili Shiite Fatimids in Egypt overtook the Buyid’s programmatic role as Shiite heretics in the ideology of the Seljuk state. The confrontation between the different Islamic confessions led, e.g., to the foundation of higher theological schools as the Nizamîya in Baghdad—named after Sultan Malikşah’s (1072–1092) grand vizier Nizâm ul-Mulk, who had started his career in Ghaznavid bureaucracy. He was a main ideological opponent of the Shiites and was assassinated by the Ismaili Assassins in 1092. He was the author of the famous Siyâsat-nâme (“Book of Statecraft”), written in Persian and containing a lot of information about the Turks. Despite the official anti-Shiite attitude of the Great Seljukid state many Seljuk Oghuz groups became adherents of Alevisim. In brief Alevisim may be described as a religion inspired by Shiism but without a scholarly theology. Much has been written about local Christian and imported Turkic shamanistic elements as additional components. Nothing clear is known about the reasons for this development, nor about its beginning or the processes involved. But as we can tell from its modern distribution, Alevisim and other Islamic heterodoxies must have been quite attractive for many of the Seljuk Oghuz (and Kurdish) tribes.

With the conquest of Iraq, Syria and parts of Palestine the Seljuks had become neighbors also of some Christian states like Byzantium as well as the Georgian and Armenian states. Thus among the Seljuk Sultans and tribesmen
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the attitude of the sometimes heterodox gazı warriors against the Christian infidels became more and more popular and remained an important element in tribal and state ideology even in Ottoman times. This attitude was strengthened by the invasion of the crusaders at the end of the eleventh century—even if not all of the Seljukid princes fought in holy war against their infidel neighbors but had instead at least temporarily good relations to them. Kâšgarî’s encyclopedia reflects somehow the self-assessment of the Seljuks as an Sunni elite. In his introduction (p. 2–3) we find a hadîṯ (Islamic tradition), which Kâšgarî allegedly “heard from one of the trustworthy informants among the Imams of Bukhara, and from another Imam of the people of Nishapur”. According to this tradition the prophet Muhammad said: “Learn the tongue of the Turks, for their reign will be long.” Kâšgarî continues: “Now if this hadith is sound—and the burden of proof is on these two!—then learning it is a religious duty; and if it is not sound, still Wisdom demands it.” (DK I 70 = K 1). It is very probable that Kâšgarî did not believe in the correctness of this tradition. Nonetheless it is interesting to see that he dares to make Turkic rule (and consequently the rule of the Seljuks) the topic of an alleged hadîṯ (a basic element of Sunni theology) which is directly traced back to the Prophet of Islam—even if he refuses to take responsibility for the correctness of this tradition.

In 1243/44 the Seljuks of Rum were defeated by the Mongols and became vassals of the Golden Horde—an occasion for closer contacts with Kipchak Turks across the Caucasus Mountains. But when Iran and Irak were conquered by the first Ilkhan Hûlûgû (died in 1265) in the middle of the thirteenth century, his brother, the Great Khan Möngke (1251–1259), handed over the Seljuk vassals to Hûlûgû. Thus most of the Seljuk Oghuz groups were re-unified under the sovereignty of a state in which Persian played an important role. An exception were the Oghuz groups in Syria-Palestine which in the twelfth century had fallen under Ayyubid sovereignty, and then were passed on to their successors, the Egyptian Mamluks.

The center of the Ilkhanid state was Azerbaijan with Tebriz as its capital—at least for most of the time. To the east Ilkhanid influence reached Beluchistan, Afghanistan and the borders of Transoxania. In the west the Ilkhanids controlled the northern slopes of the Caucasus, Georgia, Armenia and Iraq to the Euphrates. In Anatolia Ilkhanid power reached Western Anatolia at the climax of their rule. The first Palaiolog emperors of Byzantium took advantage of this fact by establishing marital ties to their initially quite anti-
Islamic neighbors. The “Turkmen” groups at the margins of the Seljuk state could stay more or less independent (see Spuler 1939, 44, fn. 4). They founded the beylikler, aristocratic states which did not necessarily obey Mongol orders, but tried at least not to provoke military activities as long as the Ilkhans were a military factor. The former capital Konya became part of the beylik of Karaman which was for a long time the most powerful of these states. The Ilkhans finally lost control of Anatolia in the 1330s, i.e. shortly before their rule came to an end.

The distribution of Mongol loanwords in modern Anatolian and Azeri Oghuz corresponds with the spheres and networks of Ilkhanid political influence. The largest number of copies exists in its former central region, in Azerbaijan, and in the neighboring Kars region of Eastern Anatolia. The influence also was strong in the valley of River Euphrates (regions of Erzurum, Erzincan, Sivas) and reached an apex in the Amasya and Ankara regions. These are more or less the eastern provinces alongside the northern route which connects Azerbaijan with the Aegean and Western Mediterranean parts of Anatolia. In Western Anatolia Mongol loanwords crested in the Izmir-Aydın region—perhaps a reflex of the prominent position of the Aydınoğulları in the first half of the fourteenth century. The heartland of the vassal state of Rum and neighboring regions (Konya, Kayseri, Niğde, Nevşehir) also accepted a large set of copies. That some of the Mongol loanwords entered the Anatolian written language or the dialects in a Persian form is another hint of the continuing Persian influence (see Schönig 2000).

Because of the political constellations of that time—the Ilkhans were enemy to the Golden Horde and the Ulus Chagatay—most of the Seljuk Oghuz remained isolated from other Turkic groups and the forerunners of the Eastern Oghuz Turkmen. Thus great parts of Seljuk Oghuz could preserve a specific Western Oghuz set of archaisms and newly developed features, whereas Turkmen exhibits many features separating it from Western Oghuz and tying it closer to other Central Turkic and South Siberian Turkic languages (see Schönig 1997). As examples Western Oghuz along with Khalaj exhibits *qan-forms like Turkish hangi, Gagauz angi and Azeri hansi which correspond with Old Turkic qaño: ‘which’. Whereas Western Oghuz has preserved nasality of the second consonant, Turkmen has haysi with the sound change ń > y like in the corresponding form quasi in most of the other Turkic languages. The word for ‘house’ äv has preserved its old shape in Turkish. In Azeri dialects there is at least a tendency to labialize the vowel
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which is reminiscent of tendencies in Kipchak languages and Turkmen where we find öy and the like. On the other hand Turkmen has preserved long vowels, whereas in Western Oghuz they only survived sporadically although reflexes of long vowels are visible on the following consonant. Western Oghuz has labialized cognates of Old Turkic bândük ‘big, great’ (see below), whereas Turkmen has an illabial form beyik ‘tall, high’.

In Western Oghuz the participle in -mliş is not replaced by the participle in -GAN. This replacement was in an advanced state in Khwarazmian Turkic and nearly completed in Chagatay and Middle Kipchak. In Anatolian Turkic -GAN perhaps became -(y)An and took its place beside -mliş. In modern Turkish and Azeri we find an opposition -mliş : -(y)An which signifies anteriority : non-anteriority. Turkmen has developed a system which resembles that of the modern -GAN-Turkic languages in structure. In Turkmen the intraterminal participle -yAn is distinguished from the perfect participle -An by means of the same marker -y- which is used to distinguish the renewed present tense form -yAr from the aorist form -(A)r. Thus Turkmen uses the sign of intraterminality common to Oghuz and going back to *-A yorî- similar to the way Kipchak(oid) and South East Turkic languages use the marker *-A tur-. There are other features of Turkmen which are made up of Oghuz material shaped according to Central Asian Turkic patterns. Thus the Old Turkic derivation i:du ber- ‘to send’, which has no cognate in modern Western Oghuz, are represented in Turkmen by a (non-auxiliary) verb ibâr- ‘to send’ and an auxiliary verb goyber- < *goyu ber-. Furthermore Turkmen shows postvocalic -y- forms of the vocalic gerund instead of Western Oghuz -(y)A and exhibits *-mAyIn-forms instead of formally analogized negative -mA-(yI-)B-forms in syntactically free use. Turkmen has adopted at least parts of the system of bi-verbal constructions expressing kinds of action (German Aktionsarten) from other Central Asian Kipchak languages.

In the field of relative clauses Western Oghuz still uses cognates of the participle in -DUK. It shows congruence markers for the subject as in sân išlädügün işi ‘deed (accusative) which you have done’ (Banguoğlu 1938, 115) or bular varduğü yerä ‘place to which these came’; as we see the pronouns could appear in the nominative in the thirteenth and fourteenth

6 According to TS 4167–72 there existed a verb veribi- ~ biribi- ~ verbi- ~ virbi- ~ viribi- ‘to send’ in older Ottoman (13th–16th centuries), which I believe to be a spoiled form of Old Turkic i:du ber.-
centuries. Furthermore the participle in -(y)An still can appear in constructions which are the more or less exclusive domain of -DUK in Modern Turkish, but not in Azeri, e.g. in the relative construction with a subject in the nominative and no congruence marker at the head noun. In the following example the possessive suffix indicates real possession by an entity different from the referent of the subject haqq of the (y)An-relative clause: haqq yanduran čaragun yana dursun ‘your torch which God has lighted’ (Kitab-i Dede Qorqut according to Mansuroğlu 1959, 181). Even the participle in -mlš still could be used in non-subject relative clauses like ölmis yer (Banguoğlu 1938, 113). The difference between Eastern and Western Oghuz also is reflected in the distribution of the Mongol loanword for ‘cool(-ness), fresh(-ness)’. Whereas Western Oghuz together with Northeast Turkic, Sarıg Yugur and Fu-yû have forms of serigün ~ seregün,7 Chuvash, Kipchak and Southeast Turkic together with Turkmen show cognates of salqin.

Before the defeat of the Seljuks of Rum the Mongol assault on Iran in the early 1220s had driven many Turks and Persians from Iran, Khorasan and regions of Central Asia into the still prospering state of Rum in Anatolia. Thus, e.g., Bektaš (ca. 1210–1270/71), the (mythical?) forefather of the Bektaši (see below), is said to have been born in Nishapur in Khorasan, while Mevlânâ jelâleddin Rûmî, mystical poet and founder of the Mevlevî order (see below), came from Balkh to Konya in 1228. These refugees brought a new wave of Persian influence to Anatolia. As a result of the entrenched and now reinforced influence the Anatolian Turks adapted not only linguistic material from Persian, but also literary forms, style and topics. The developing Anatolian Turkic literature (including Ottoman literature) mainly depended on classical Arabian forms of the ʿarūţ mediated by Persian—even if some originally Turkic forms and techniques survived for some time or to a certain amount and became adapted to the rules of ʿarūţ (see Köprülü 1964). It may be due to Turkic literary traditions that epics in the shape of a mesnevi (Arabic maṭnawî) became popular already in Persian literature sponsored by the Seljuks. Whereas in Turkic literatures of Central Asia, Siberia, the Volga region and the Ponto-Caspian area the role of epics of traditional type in the “national” literatures was reinforced under Mongol influence, in the

7 Küürük shows an uncontracted form serägin, Sarıg Yugur has särgin. Northeast Turkic has Yakut sörüün, Sayan Turkic säriliin, Altay Turkic sörään, Khakas sırään, Shor sıran, Fu-yû sirin; Western Oghuz exhibits särin.
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Anatolian Seljuk Oghuz area epics of this type were practically given up and replaced by compositions of the *mesnevi* type.

In the thirteenth century the first texts written in Seljuk Oghuz appeared in Anatolia. The first bey who introduced Anatolian Turkic in his administration was Karamanoğlu Mehem in 1277. One reason for the elevation of Turkic to a written language in these times is that the “Turkmen” founders of the beylikler were on the “uneducated” side of the before mentioned cultural gap in Anatolia, which separated the “educated”, i.e. Persianized ruling clans from the tribesman in the countryside.

Some of the refugees from Khorasan must have been familiar with the first attempts to write Oghuz in Arabic script. These attempts were of course influenced by the Khorasan Turkic type of Oghuz spoken in this area. Thus, when the first attempts were made to write Oghuz in Arabic letters in Anatolia, Anatolian authors familiar with the “Khorasan literary norms” stimulated the emergence of a “mixed” language called *olgə bolga dili* besides an Anatolian Turkic written language of “purely” Western Oghuz type (see Doerfer 1990). *Mevlânâ Ǧelâl-ed-dîn Rûmî* (1207–1273), the founder of the Mevlevî order in Konya, wrote 35 verses in Turkic or in Turkic mixed with Persian. According to Doerfer (1990) and Doerfer–Hesche (1993, 8) the language of his Turkic verses shows traces of Khorasan Turkic; but see Johanson 1993. Rûmî’s son Sultan Veled (1226–1312) wrote 367 verses in “pure” Anatolian Turkic. Some scholars assume that Rûmî was a student of the poet Aḥmed Faqīh, who lived in Konya and was the author of the *çarxname*, a mystical *mesnevi*. Another mystic poet was *Yûimus Emre* (ca. 1250–1320) in the Sarıköy area (Northwestern Anatolia), who was the forerunner of the later *tekke*-poets. In general Islamic *süfîs* or mystics played the same crucial role in the formation of Old Anatolian literature as Aḥmed Yessevî and others played in the development of written Turkic in Central Asia. The social and political conditions in Anatolia and the Near East in the first decades after the Mongol invasion were also a fertile ground for the growth of mysticism and *süfî* orders often of heterodox character. Some of these *süfîs* tried to express their mystical feelings and sensations in poems which were often—especially in the case of not so well-educated mystics—composed in Anatolian Turkic. Another student of Ahmed Faqîh was perhaps Şeyyâd Ḥanıma, the author of the mesnevi *Yûṣuf-u Zuleyxa*. If so, he was one of the first exponents of non-religious poetry in the transition from late Rum Seljukid Anatolia to the period of the beylikler. But as Adamović (1996) has
shown, there are good reasons to assume that he lived in the fourteenth or fifteenth century. Another early exponent of Anatolian Turkic literature is Xoja Dehhani (1298–1301), who came from Khorasan to Konya and wrote—besides a Persian Şâhnâme—one qaṣide and nine ğazels in Turkic. In addition Chagatay played an important role.\(^8\)

In 1308 the last Seljukid ruler of Rum died, his vassal state dissolved, and only the beylikler remained on the scene. When Ilkhanid power had vanished completely around 1340, great parts of Anatolia were divided into a number of more or less small states. Parts of Eastern Anatolia together with Azerbaijan and parts of Irak and Iran remained at least temporarily unified under the rule of different princes or dynasties such as the Jelayirids in northwestern Iran and Mesopotamia. In Central Anatolia Karaman remained important until the fifteenth century. In Western Anatolia we find a constant increase of Ottoman power. The decentralization and political particularism of this time hindered a rapid development of the Anatolian Turkic written language. But the courts of the beylikler in towns like Aydın, Denizli, Menteşe, Eğridir, Kastamonu, and Bursa became laboratories for the preservation and further development of the Anatolian Turkic literary language. In Kütahya (beylik Germiyan) there were Şeyxoğlu Muṣṭafâ (1341–1401), Aḥmed (1335–1413), Aḥmed-i Dâ‘î (died 1417/after 1421), and Şeyxî (1389–after 1430). The nowadays insignificant provincial capital of Kirşehir was the home of two important poets, Gülşeherî (around 1300) and e‘Āṣiqaṣa (1272–1333). In Eastern Anatolia lived Mevlevî poets like Muṣṭafâ ibn Yūṣuf from Erzurum and Yūṣuf-i Meddâh of Sivas. Sivas was also the town of Qâḍî Burhâneddîn (1345–1398) whose tuyûg and other poems show linguistic influences from Kipchak Turkic used in Mamluk Egypt and stylistic influence from Central Asia. Another eastern poet was Nesîmî (killed in 1404 in Aleppo), a Hurufi ṣūfî. In the course of time the Osmanoğlu became more and more powerful, and their court became the most important literary center of the Anatolian Turks. And therefore the literary language of Anatolia became known as Ottoman Turkish.

The beylik of the Osmanoğlu (“Ottomans”) developed rapidly in the fourteenth century. Beside areas with Greek and Slavic population the Western Anatolian beylikler had been conquered, even before Bâyezîd I. (1389–1402) extended the Ottoman state deep into East Anatolia. This first

\(^8\) In general Chagatay seems to have been attractive to Anatolian Turkic poets for quite a time. Some of them even started to write in Chagatay, see Sertkaya 1970–77.
phase of Ottoman state-building ended at the beginning of the fifteenth century when Timur Lenk appeared on the scene, defeated Bāyēzīd and, for a short time, restored the political situation of Ilkhanid times in Anatolia. Again Azerbaijan and parts of Anatolia were politically unified with Irak, Iran and with Turkic-speaking areas farther away in the east including Mawarannahr, the center of Chagatay literature. Thus the Azeris and other Eastern Seljuk Oghuz again had the occasion to get in contact with Turkic-speaking groups of other sub-branches of this language family. After the collapse of Timurid power in this area first the Kara Koyunlu, then the Ak Koyunlu took control of these areas and founded short-lived states. The Ak Koyunlu entered political competition with the Ottomans. The latter had recovered from that defeat at the hands of Timur and, following a civil war, rebuilt their Euro-Asiatic sultanate and conquered Constantinople and some other Byzantine regions. In 1473 the Ottoman sultan Meḥmed II. defeated Uzun Ḥasan of the Ak Koyunlu and broke the power of this Oghuz confederation in Eastern Anatolia. The conquest of the Byzantine Trapezunt (Trabzon) opened the way to the Turkification of this remote Byzantine refuge on the eastern Black Sea coast.9

The separation of the Western Oghuz into an Eastern and Western part which originated in the Ilkhanid period today is reflected by linguistic differences between Rumeli and Western Anatolian Oghuz versus Eastern Anatolian and Azeri Oghuz. Thus Azeri has preserved low vowels where Turkish shows high ones, e.g. Turkish büyük : Azeri böyük ‘big’, T güzel : A gözül ‘beautiful’, or T gly- : A gey- ‘to dress’. The tendency to have word-initial G- where Old Turkic has K- is stronger in Azeri than in Turkish. In Azeri final velar -K often becomes the fricative -x which does not exist in Standard Turkish. Azeri contracts the present tense form going back to -A yorlr to -(y)lr, whereas Turkish has -(l)yor. Therefore in Azeri the aorist lost its allophones with high vowels and became -(y)Ar, whereas in Turkish the allophone -(l)r with high vowel dominated. The Turkish imperative form of the first person plural is still -Allm, whereas Azeri, like many Kipchak languages, has a form going back to -AyIK. It has generalized -K as the personal marker of the first person plural in verbal paradigms. Whereas Turkish exhibits -lm and -sln as personal markers of the first and second persons singular, Azeri has -ılm and -ıAn. Azeri has derived its interrogative

9 For the development of Eastern Black Sea Turkish see Brendemoen 1996 and 1997.
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*harada* 'where' (< *han+ra-*) from a cognate of Old Turkic qaño: (as in Turkish *hangi*, Azeri *hansi*, Turkmen *haysi* ‘which’, see below), whereas Turkish employs *nerede* (Turkmen *nirede*), a derivation of *ne* ‘what’. Some linguistic features connect Azeri with Turkmen and separate both from Turkish and Gagauz. In the area of morphology we find in Turkish a cognate of the Old Turkic verb *u-* ‘to be able’ preserved in the impossibility form - (*y*)AmA-, whereas Azeri shows -A *bilme-*. Unlike Turkish Azeri has generalized the vowel -A for the aorist and has developed a negative aorist suffix -mA in the first and second person, e.g. *almaram, almarığ*. Quite a number of the features common to Azeri and Turkmen also appear in most or at least in many other Turkic languages. Thus in Azeri—but not in Turkish—word-initial *b*- changes to *m-*, when a nasal follows at the first syllable border. Concerning the case suffixes Azeri has adopted a postvocalic form +nI in the accusative where Turkish has +yI. There are considerable differences with respect to the pronouns, too. Only Turkish employs *nasil* for ‘how? why?’. Azeri again follows patterns common to many other Turkic languages by using *nejî*. For ‘which’ Turkish has *han+gi*, Azeri exposes *han+sî*. The morphological structure of the latter form reminds us more of forms like *hay+sî* in Turkmen and *gay+sî* most other Turkic languages (for the stems see above). Furthermore Azeri uses *öz* as a reflexive pronoun, whereas Turkish employs a cognate of Old Turkic *kântû*. The verbs for ‘to return’ show the same distribution throughout the whole Turkic world: Turkish has *dön-*, Azeri like many other Turkic languages shows *gayt-*. Because Kâşgârı mentions the use of *tö:n-* as a typically Oghuz feature (DK II 245 = K 526), we may assume that the precursor of Azeri gained or preserved its *gayt-* in a period of contact with other Turkic languages, most probably of Kipchak type.10 There are many other lexical oppositions between Azeri and Turkish in which the Azeri features are common to many (or most) other Turkic languages, e.g., Turkish *kemik* : Azeri *sömük* ‘bone’, Turkish *bul-* : Azeri *tap-* ‘to find’, Turkish *olta* : Azeri *garmag* ‘fishing-pole’, and Turkish *iyi* : Azeri *yaxsî* ‘good’. At the same time there exist lexical differences in which Turkish shows cognates of widespread forms, e.g. Turkish *altîn* : Azeri *gizîl* ‘gold’. Another set of lexical oppositions consists of Turkish and Azeri words which have no or only a few cognates in some other Turkic languages, e.g. Turkish *çojuk* : Azeri *uşag* ‘child’. Furthermore

---

10 It can not be copied from Chagatay, because this Turkic language uses *yan-* to express ‘to return’.
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different meanings of words originating from the same etymon complement our catalogue, e.g. the well known example düüş- Turkish ‘to fall’ : Azeri ‘to fall’, but also ‘to reach, to land (airplane)’. Regarding syntax, relative clauses of the Azeri type män açan gapı ‘the door which I opened’ resemble those of the Old Anatolian period (see above) and of other Turkic languages; they do not appear in Modern Standard Turkish. The quite frequent use of subordinate clauses with finite predication (normally introduced by ki) in Azeri is another distinctive feature.

The growth of Anatolian Turkic literature continued even during the civil war, re-construction and enlargement of the Ottoman empire. But even if Sultans like Murad II. (1421-51) or his noblemen like Umur Bey supported Anatolian Turkic poets, Persian (also Arabic) still played an important role at the Ottoman court. Thus the poet Layālī had to pass himself off as a Persian to get accepted at the court (see Björkman 1964, 418). As a consequence the Anatolian poets became “more elegant”, i.e. they started to use more Persian elements. This development can clearly be seen in the divan of Ahməd Paşə (1425–97), who also translated Persian poems and wrote lots of nāzīres to works of the Chagatay poet Mūr ʿAlī Šēr Navāʾī. The latter poet, who also wrote in Persian, had considerable influence on other Anatolian poets as well.

In the sixteenth century the Ottomans conquered Eastern Anatolia, Iraq, Syria and Palestine (not to mention Egypt or other parts of Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean world), and thus could unify all the Near Eastern regions in which the Seljuks of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had played a role. Iran and the eastern regions of the former Seljuk area remained outside the sphere of Ottoman power. These regions came under the rule of the Safavids at the beginning of the sixteenth century. In our context it is of some importance that Selīm I. deported several artists and craftsmen, when he returned to Constantinople from his campaign in Azerbaijan against Šāh Ismāʿīl (see below). Some of these people were Azeris, but others had been brought from Khorasan and Transoxania to the Tebriz region by Šāh Ismāʿīl. These people probably carried with them cultural and linguistic elements of Persian and Chagatay (a strongly Persianized Southeastern Turkic) origin.

As mentioned previously Shiism, Alevism and other Islamic heterodoxies had gained great influence over Seljuk Oghuz tribes in Anatolia. Furthermore the Ilkhan Gazan converted to Sunni Islam, but also granted some favors to the Shiites. His successor Öljäitū converted to Imamītic Shiism, but Abū
Sa'dî returned to Sunni Islam. The Kara Koyunlu had a certain inclination toward Shiism or Alevism. At the turn of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century the Chagatay Bâbur-nâme offers proof of the Alevi or Shiite influence (of the later Şâh Ismâ‘îl) even on some noblemen and princes in Timurid Central Asia. In Anatolia Alevism and mystical (semi-)heterodox šûfî-orders gained more and more influence on the so-called “Turkmen” tribal units with their gâzi-ideology. Some of these groups took a more or less hostile attitude against the central power. This development may be connected with the rise of the Ottoman state and its transformation from a traditional beylik to a state with an increasing number of bureaucratic institutions, in which the importance of the tribal gâzi-warriors increasingly diminished. Of the Alevi groups the Bektaşı gained influence in the Ottoman state as spiritual leaders of the yeni çeri troops. Their influence remained even after the Alevi rebellion of Šâh Qûlû in 1511 which was probably initiated by Safavid missionaries. This event caused the Ottomans to change their official attitude towards Alevism and Shiism. Under the rule of the somewhat sinister Sultan Selîm I. (1512–1520) their state was transformed to an anti-Shiite, purely Sunni realm. However the Bektaşî were removed from their powerful position together with the yeni çeri only in the nineteenth century in connection with the rise of the Sunni Naqşbandî order.

The Safavids started as a Sunni šûfî order in Azerbaijan in the thirteenth century. They used their spiritual influence on the Oghuz groups of Eastern Anatolia and Azerbaijan to built their own sphere of political power, cooperating first with the Jalayirids, then with the Kara Koyunlu, and later with the Ak Koyunlu. They converted to Alevism under Şeyx junayd (1447-1460). This assured them of the loyalty of many of the heterodox tribesmen of Anatolia and Azerbaijan. The foundation of the Safavid state at the beginning of the fifteenth century in Iran under Şâh Ismâ‘îl and the transformation from an Alevi into a Shiite community was decisive in many respects. In our context it is of interest that from that time on the main part of speakers of Azeri Seljuk Oghuz (except those in the Kars region and neighboring areas) together with those of Southern (also Seljukid) Oghuz and Khorasan Turkic were politically and culturally separated from their relatives in the Ottoman empire. Their languages stayed in direct contact and competition with Persian as a spoken everyday language. Persian also played an important role in the Ottoman empire, but its position as official language and later on as a lingua franca had been overtaken by
Anatolian Turkic already in the centuries before. This also becomes clear from the great number of translations from Persian into Ottoman in the first centuries of Ottoman literature. Persian became something like the second language of the court and again had a profound influence on the literary language and their formal categories. A poet like Bāqī (1526-1600) represents the type of “refined”, Persianized poetry of the sixteenth century very well, and the impact of the Central Asian Persian poet Jāmī can be seen, especially in the works of Ḥamdī (1449–1503) and Lāmī (1472–1532). In the eastern regions Fużūlī (died in 1556), who himself also wrote poetry in Persian, became a subject of the Ottoman state. Only then did he come into contact with Western Anatolian Turkic poetry. He became one of the most important poets of Anatolian Turkic literature. Another significant exponent of the Eastern literary tradition remained outside the Ottoman sphere, namely Xaṭāī, also known as Șāh Ismā’īl, the first Safavid ruler of Iran.

Besides the court literature there always existed other literary circles with different degrees of Persianization. I have already mentioned the šūfī poetry which shows a wide range of linguistic and stylistic variations. Beside items with a very “refined”, i.e. Persianized, style and language there are many examples of poetry of “simple” type, as well as the folk poets like the Alevi aşıklar. Of course folk poetry was influenced at least partly by court poetry and incorporated some of their literary motifs and elements of style and language—and consequently even some Persian copies. On the other hand folk poetry always remained close to the spoken language of the area in which it was produced—and if this area was under Persian influence, these influences also appeared in folk poetry. Unfortunately this important feature of Turkish language history is not sufficiently investigated.

The Persian influence on the literary language of the Ottoman empire continued to grow in the seventeenth century. It reached its climax with poets like Nefī (died in 1635) and Nābī (died in 1712). However already in the sixteenth century appeared a tendency towards a türkī-i basīt, a simple Turkish without an excessive amount of Persian embellishments. Exponents of this tendency in the sixteenth century were poets like Mahremī (died in 1535) and Nazmī (died in 1554), and the historian Nešrī (died around 1520) whose world chronicle corresponds with the world chronicle in Persianized style of Bihištī (died around 1520). The “simple” style was finally successful with Nedīm (1681–1730) and remained the main tendency until the tanzīmāt period (beginning in 1839). A sporadic Persian influence manifested itself in
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the eighteenth century in the stylistic sector, e.g., when the fine art of composing chronograms was flourishing for a while.

The period between the tanzîmât period and the First World War mainly brought an European impact on Ottoman Turkic. With the collapse of the Ottoman state at the end of the war the anti-foreign and anti-Islamic tendencies of the language reformers became dominant in the Turkish Republic. But even if lots of Persian lexical and morphological material was removed from the Turkish language, a considerable amount of (Arabo-)Persian copies remained part of the common language of the inhabitants of the republic. Copies like memleket ‘country, homeland’ (← Persian ← Arabic mamlakat), kitap ‘book’ (← Persian ← Arabic kitâb), bazı ‘some, certain, several’ (← Persian baţ-i ← Arabic ba’d + Persian ızâfa-connector), hemsâre ‘sister’ (← Persian ham-šîra ‘foster-brother; sister (by the mother only, or a foster-sister)’) etc. have become an inseparable part of the Turkish language. The Azeris, the Southern Oghuz and the Khorasan Turks left their copies from Persian more or less untouched. In Northern Azeri some copies from Persian were replaced by Russian ones, but in most Turkic vernaculars in Iran the Persian influence remained constant or even increased.

Of course most correspondences with Persian can be found in Azeri and other Oghuz languages and dialects in Iran. Nonetheless there are some parallel derivations with the verbs for ‘to find’ in Persian and Ottoman/Turkish which I can not attest in Azeri and Turkmen, e.g. Turkish şifa bulmak : Persian šifâ’ yâftan ‘to recover’ (in both cases < “to find recovery”) or Turkish zafer bulmak : Persian zafar yâftan ‘to win’ (< “to find victory”). Such cases may go back to specific Ottoman traditions in the use of Persian. Furthermore the aspecotemporal systems of Western Oghuz and Persian exhibit common traces, see, e.g., the contribution of Windfuhr.

The question arises to what extent Persian elements survived in Rumelian and Anatolian Turkish dialects. We do not know much about the conditions under which these dialects developed. Reliable investigations on Old Anatolian Turkic dialects are still rare.11 One can assume that the Eastern Anatolian dialects close to Azerbaijan and Iran encountered more influence than those in the west. But until now even this plausible assumption lacks scientific proof. Furthermore the chronology and the way in which Persian copies were taken into the dialects (directly from Persian, from neighboring

---

11 For an attempt to define the distribution of vowels in non-first syllables see Doerfer 1985.
dialects, from the Ottoman standard language, from Kurdish, from Armenian etc.) are in most cases uninvestigated. Hopefully future scholarly efforts will help us to understand better what happened to the Oghuz and their language on their way to Anatolia.
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