Maisonneuve & Larose

The Ideal of World Domination among the Medieval Turks
Author(s): Osman Turan
Source: *Studia Islamica*, No. 4 (1955), pp. 77-90
Published by: Maisonneuve & Larose
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1595052
Accessed: 25/04/2009 15:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=mal.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Maisonneuve & Larose is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Studia Islamica.*

http://www.jstor.org

THE IDEAL OF WORLD DOMINATION AMONG THE MEDIEVAL TURKS

I

Sociology and ethnology have demonstrated that the actions, thoughts and beliefs of a people are closely related to one another, and that certain institutions survive as a remnant or a development of a former mode of life and creed. For instance, the shamanist creed which, contrary to the religions originating among the un-warlike races of India yet in line with the Islamic conception of Holy War, promises a reward in proportion to the number of foes killed in action, cannot be explained fully without considering the war-like life and spirit of the Turks. Likewise, it is only natural that the political power or impotence of peoples should leave a mark on their psychology, or that certain creeds inspiring either hope or despondency for the future should come into existence. And such ideas and tendencies, assuming the form of an ideal, can influence the course of history. The modern historian, who seeks to understand and explain the past realistically with its moral and material factors will have to dwell on these relationship and their implications.

This line of thought leads us to a study of the manner in which material power affected the psychology of the Turks who, prior to Islam, had built great empires and extended their rule over many lands and races ; of the political creeds and ideals that came into existence, or of the extent to which such moral factors influenced the course of the Turkish history. In fact, the existing sources contain an adequate amount of

records indicating that throughout the Middle Ages the Turks sincerly believed not only in an ideal of world domination, but also in their being a chosen people of God. According to the *Oghuz-nâme*, an epic reflecting the Turkish activities during the Hiong-nu, Gök-Türk, and Seljuk periods, the legendary ancestor Oghuz Khan is a hero who subdued many an ancient race and conquered China, India, Persia, Syria, the Byzantine Empire and Russia. He and his sons have a celestial origin with miraculous events attending their births. Like Jenghiz Khan's shaman Gökçe, Oghuz Khan's shaman Ulugh-Türk (also called Irkïl-Khoja and Ḳorḳut-Ata) prophesied that God would grant Oghuz domination over the world (1). According to a legal tradition of the ancient Turks Oghuz Khan, as a symbol of this world domination, sent arrows to the east and west and on his death-bed divided the realm according to the relationship supposed to exist between the arrow and the bow (2). In addition to the *Oghuz-nâme* which contains some reflections from the Hiong-nu period there are other indications that the ideal of world domination existed amoung the Hiong-nu, the ancestors of the Gök-Turks : a phrase which appears in the Chinese sources and which shows the belief in the celestial origin of their soverreignity, the existence of the ideal of and the same belief in the heavenly origin of domination among their European successors, the Huns and the Danubian Bulgars, may well be quoted as evidence (see below).

Thus, the idea of world domination that began in a legendary form and originated with the Hiong-nu acquired a prominant and historical form under the Gök-Turks (Tou-hioue). Syriac sources, in connection with an exchange of envoys (568 A. D.) between the Khan of the Gök-Turks and the Byzantine Emperor Justin, furnish the following information which does not appear in other sources : Tears, it is said, filled the eyes of the Turkish Khan on the arrival of the Byzantine envoy. When requested

(1) *Oghuz Kagan destanï*, ed. W. Bang and R. Rahmeti, Istanbul, 1936, 11, 15, 17, 21, 27, 29, 23.

(2) Osman Turan, *The use of an arrow as a juridical symbol among the ancient Turks* (in Turkish), *Belleten* XXXV (1945), 305-318.

to explain why he wept, the Khan answered : « We have been told by our ancestors that the time is ripe for us to invade the whole world » (1). This answer is important, suggesting as it does not only the existence of this ideal but also its ancient date and its extension to neighbouring peoples. The Orkhon Monuments, which were erected some 60 years later and which occupy an exceptional place in the history of nationalist ideas and tendencies, are saturated with the same ideal. In fact, this idea is expressed in the monument which begins with the sentence : « When the blue sky was created above and the black earth below, in between man was brought into being, and my ancestors Bumïn and Istemi Khans ruled over the sons of Man ». Though Turks did not subdue many different races in that time, the idea of domination over other peoples is at least implicit here. The Turkish ruler has such a firm belief in the power of his people that he thinks that the Turkish state can be destroyed not by a foreign people, but only by the disobedience of the Turkish people itself to its own laws and King. A sentence such as : « Hearken, o lords of the Oghuz and Turks and Turkish people. Unless the sky falls down and the earth is worn through by holes who can undermine your government, your Law ? I have brought so many peoples under the Law. O Turk ! So long as thou dwellest in Ötüken, thou shalt maintain an eternal empire » (2), illustrates that ideal eloquently. This political ideal of the Turks springs from the requirements of their shamanist creed, and from the belief that God has created them as a chosen people. A characteristic of this God who, like the Jehova ot fhe Jews, is possessed of the qualities of the deity as described by Celestial Creeds, is that in difficult times He rushes to the rescue of the Turks, saving them from annihilation by sending a hero of celestial origin. This belief is reflected by the statements : « To save the Turkish people from annihilation, the God of the Turks lifted up my father Il-teris, and mother Il-bilge to the top of the heavens » (3).

(1) Michel le Syrien, *Chronique,* trad. Chabot, Paris, 1905, III, 150.

(2) V. Thomsen, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon,* Helsingfors, 1896, 97, 105, 117.

(3) *Türk Tanrisi... Türk budun yok bolmasun tiyin budun bolsun tiyin* (Thomsen, *ibid.,* p. 100, 101).

Because of this divine favour bestowed on the Turkish people, Turkish kings were no ordinary mortals. Their person and their authority alike were believed to be of divine origin. A sentence from the Orkhon Monuments which reads « *Tanrï teg tanrïda bolmïş Türk Bilge kagan bu ödke olurtum* » (1), that is to say « I, Godlike and heaven-born Bilge Khan ascended my throne », as well as passages from the Tonyukuk Monument clearly reflect that belief. In the correspondence exchanged by Gök-Türk kings and Chinese emperors the formula implying the divine origin of authority was put at the top of the letters. The Chinese formula « Cha-po-lio Khan, sage empereur de l'empire des grands Tou-kioue, envoyé par le ciel (né)... », that appears at the beginning of the letter of Ishbara (Sha-po-lio) Khan (2), is indeed an exact translation of the original sentence. As the Chinese styled their emperors the son of Heaven, and as the original Turkish conception of authority was similar to it, that formula was sometimes translated to read « the Son of God » (3). The letter dated 584 A. D. by the same Khan, for instance, was translated into French in this sense by Pelliot (4). This formula is the result of a belief in the celestial origin of authority, and a record showing that it first appeared among the Hiong-nu is important as an evidence of its antiquity. In fact, Chinese sources mention that T'uman bore the title of « T'ang-li Ku-t'u Shan-yu », which meant the Son of Heaven (5). It appears that this, like the letters of Gök-Türk kings, was translated differently to suit the Chinese conception. Certain scholars, who failed to note the difference between the Turkish and the Chinese conceptions, expressed the opinion that the former, which is entirely a product of the Turkish view of religion and authority, had been transmitted to the Turks by the Chinese. The formula « Khan by (the grace of)

(1) Thomsen, *ibid.*, 114.

(2) Thomsen, *Ancient Turkish Inscriptions of Mongolia* (Turkish translation), T M III, 111, 116.

(3) Stanislas Julien, *Documents sur les Toukioue*, Paris, 1877, 48.

(4) *Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie Centrale*, Toung Pao, XXVI (1929), 205, 206.

(5) O. Lattimore, *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*, New York, 1951, 450.

God, God-like, Melemir (appointed by God) », which appears on a monument in Greek of the Danubian Bulgars, prior to their slavification (1), is identical with the statement found in the Orkhon monuments. This shows that they, too, believed in the divine origin of authority, which could be a remnant of the Hun period. From the statement of Priskos that Attila declared that he had been appointed by God as the ruler of the whole world, we gather that the Western Huns, as well as the Asiatic Huns, shared this conception (2).

This belief and the formula reflecting it were bound to appear in the manuscripts of the Uighurs, whose kingdom was in every way a continuation of that of the Gök-Türks (3). This belief in the divine origin of authority appears more clearly among the Mongols, who remained within the framework of Turkish culture and adopted the style of the Uighur chancellery. The two famous historians of the Mongol Period, Juweynī and Rashīduddīn, narrate, on the basis of what they heard from distinguished Mongols, that a shaman named Gökçe or Tab-Tangrï was in communion with God, and that the holy man once announced that God had bestowed the domination of the world on Jenghiz Khan (4). A statement by Ascelin, the Pope's ambassador to the Mongols in 1247, that he was the representative of the greatest head of the Christians, angered Bayjū, the Mogul commander, in so much as it implied a partnership in the Khan's domination of the world, which ran counter to the aforesaid belief, and the papal letter omitted to mention the Khan's name. In the letter he addressed to the Pope, the commander specified that the domination of the world was entrusted to the Mongols by God (5).

(1) Géza Fèher, *Les titres des Khans Bulgares,* in *Uspensky Memorial Volume,* Paris, 1930, 38.

(2) S. Eckhard, *Attila and his Huns* (in Hungarian), Budapest, 1940, 151 ; G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia,* Yale University Press, 1953, 97.

(3) E. Chavannes et P. Pelliot, *Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine,* Paris, 1913, 189 ; A. Caferoğlu, *Titles of Khans among Tu-kiu and Uighurs* (in Turkish), T H I T M, I, 105-119.

(4) Osman Turan, *On the name of Çingiz* (in Turkish), *Belleten* XIX (1941), 268.

(5) *Voyage du Frère Ascelin,* trad. Bergeron, Paris, 1830, 233 ; P. Pelliot, *Les Mongols et la papauté,* 119, 120.

The Turkish formula *Mengü Tangrï kücindä kür uluġ ülüs nïng ïalüy nïng khän yarlïġïmïz*, which was sometimes replaced by its Mongolian equivalant, was used by Mongol khans at the top of their letters. This is a continuation of the Turkish concept of authority, and of a Turkish literary tradition. It is clear that this formula, of which the French version of P. Pelliot reads « Dans la force du ciel éternel, (nous) le Khan Océanique du grand peuple tout entier, notre ordre » (1) agrees with that used by the ancient Turkish Khans, that the text of the Orkhon monument *Tanrï-ïeg ïanrï yaratmïş Türk Bilge Kagan sabïm (sözüm)* (2) is its original form, and that the Mongols acquired it from the Uighurs with slight modifications. The same formula, with certain Islamic terms added, was used by the Khans of the Golden Horde, too (3). Georgian sources mention that the Mongols, when referring to their God, put the phrase *Mengü Tanrï güjindä* (« By the Power of the Eternal God ») at the beginning of their books (4), i.e. their official documents. The Mongols, the Armenian historian Kiragos writes, believed that the Heavens belonged to God, and the Earth to Jenghiz Khan, and in proof therof maintained that Jenghis was born not of human parentage but of a heavenly light (5). In fact, such miraculous births were attributed to all the ancient Turkish heroes. Kings, because of their divine origin, were strangled with a bow string, without shedding their blood. The Turks, after they had become Moslems, continued this shamanist practice, and Seljuk rulers and great emirs met their death in this manner (6).

(1) P. Pelliot, *ibid.*, 15-23 ; for the same formula on coins, see Mubarek Galib, *Ancient Moslem Coins* (in Turkish), Istanbul, 1321, 62.

(2) Thomsen, *Inscript.*, 122.

(3) A. N. Kurat, *Yarlïk ve Bitikler*, Istanbul, 1940, 64 *(Mengü Tangrï küçindä Muhammad rasul Allah Haji Giray sözüm).*

(4) M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I, 487.

(5) Kiragos, trad. E. Dulaurier, in T M, II, 173.

(6) F. Köprülü, *La Proibizione di versare il sangue nell'esecuzione d'un membro della dinastia presso i Turchi ed i Mongoli*, in *Annali del R. Istituto Superiore Orientale di Napoli*, Nuova serie, I, 15-23 ; also in *Bull. Hist. Turk. Law* (in Turkish), Ankara, 1944, I, 1-19.

II

At the time that they adopted Islamic civilization the Turks held these conceptions and ideals. We are not going to explain here the reasons that led to their conversion to Islam. This was outlined in an article entitled « The Turks and Islam » (1). It will, however, be to the point to remark that certain affinities between the basic principles of shamanism and Islam played no small part in this change of religion, that the attributes of the God of Islam and those of the Turkish God, as noted by the 12th century Syriac historian Michael (2), were not much different, that the Islamic concept of Holy War was consistent with the Turkish spirit, and that certain traditions of the Prophet tending to favour the Turks, which were extensively known even before the conversion of the Turks to Islam, seem to have attracted them to that religion. A tradition of the Prophet mentioned in the *Ṭabaḳāt* of Ibn Sa'd and purporting to imply that the Turks would drive the Arabs into the desert, another widely reported tradition « Do not hurt the Turk till he hurts you » (3), works written by certain Mohammedan authors in praise of the Turks like that of Jaḥiẓ, the belief brought about by the crisis through which Islam was passing in the 10th century that Turkish conquerers from the East would save the world of Islam — all these convinced the Turks that Islam confirmed their ideal of world domination. The Seljuk invasion, which established the Turkish sway over the world of Islam, served to preserve and strengthen that ideal. The « holy tradition » *(ḥadīth-i ḳudsî)* : « I have an army in the East which I call Turk, I set them on any people that kindle my wrath » (4), allegedly a word of Allah and equally applicable to the Mongols, first appeared at the time that the Seljuk Empire had just

(1) Osman Turan, in *Bull. Fac. of Arts of Ankara* (in Turkish), IV 4, 465-471.

(2) Michel le Syrien, III, 156.

(3) Apart from the great collections of traditions by Bukhārī, Muslim, Nasā'ī, Suyūṭī and others, this kind of tradition can be found in the geographical dictionary of Yāḳūt and several medieval chronicles.

(4) Maḥmūd of Kāshġar, *Dīvān luġāt al-Turk*, I, 293.

been founded, and was later repeated in many works dealing with the Turks. This tradition is nothing but an Islamized form of the pre-Islamic belief of the Turks that they were a chosen people of God, and that the domination of the world was bestowed on them by Him. The Moguls urged the neighbouring rulers to surrender by sending them letters containing this « Word of Allah », which had gained extensive circulation. In the letter addressed by Hulagu to Malik al-Nāṣir, the opening words « We are the soldiers of Allah » allude to that tradition (1). Maḥmūd of Kāshġar saw the greatness of the Seljuk period, and was proud of it. After observing that God had bestowed world domination and the control of nations upon the Turks, that he had made them superior to other peoples, that he blessed and aided with his providence all those who followed them and that he protected mankind from evil through them, this learned citizen of Kāshġar narrates under oath that he had heard the following authenticated tradition from two Imans of Bukhārā and Nīshāpūr : referring to the rise of the Ghuz (Oghuz) Turks and the signs which will announce the last days of the world, the Prophet said : « Learn the language of the Turks, for their rule will last long ». « If this tradition is authentic », says Maḥmūd after recording it, « it is necessary to learn Turkish. If not, then reason makes it necessary for people to learn it ». He thus expressed the Turkish ideal of world domination (2). Obviously what is important in this matter is not the authenticity of the tradition attributed to the Prophet, but rather the psychology reflected by it and its results.

Mohammedan thinkers, realizing that the internal and external dangers to which the world of Islam had been exposed were averted by the Turks, expressed their gratitude and cherished the Turkish ideal of world domination. The following story of Rawandī, who dedicated his work to Ġiyāthuddīn Keykhusrev, is significant. « Grant me Thy grace, oh Allah, if my inter-

(1) Aḳsarāyī, *Musāmarāt al-akhbār*, Ankara, 1944, 51 ; 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī, *Jahān-Gushā*, I, 17 ; Jūzajānī, *Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī*, transl. Raverty, 353 ; Niẓāmuddīn Sāmī, *Ẓafarnāme*, ed. F. Tauer, 218; Aflākī, *Manaqib al-'ārīfīn*, Ankara Public Library, 227 a.

(2) Maḥmūd of Kāshġar, I, 2-3.

pretations of the divine law are right », prayed Imam Abū Ḥanīfa according to the story, during his last pilgrimage to Mecca, « for I have consolidated the religion of Mohammed for Thy sake ». To this an invisible speaker answered : « Thou speakest the truth, so long as the sword remains in the hand of the Turks, thy faith shall not perish ». Adding his opinion of this story, the same author says : « Praise be to God that the defenders of Islam are mighty and followers of the Ḥanafī school, happy because the Turk carries the sword in his hand to the lands of the Arabs, Persians, Byzantines, and Russians » (1), thereby expressing the feelings of all Mohammedan writers. In addition to the works of such well-known authors as Fakhruddīn Mubārakshāh, Naṣīruddīn b. 'Abduljalīl and Ibn Ḥassūl, a large number of other sources express feelings of gratitude for the service rendered to Islam by the Turks (2). We shall content ourselves with quoting a passage attributed to Afrasiab, and apparently known among the Turks, which Fakhruddīn Mubārakshāh mentions in connection with his praise of the Turkish slaves who founded kingkoms far from their native land : « Like a pearl torn away from the mother-of-pearl in the sea, the Turk when separated from his home becomes precious, a crown for kings and an adornment for brides alike ».

The poem of Ġazzī (1049-1130), wherein the Turks are described as demons in war but angels in peace, is quoted in a large number of sources. Thus, many thinkers believed in the Turkish ideal of world domination and elaborated it. From the time of the Seljuks onwards, non-Turks had no longer any political part to play in the world of Islam ,and the belief that domination was an exclusive right of the Turks became firmly established. The Caliphate at Bagdad, which lost its political authority with the emergence of the Seljuks, attempted under Nāṣir lidīnillāh (1180-1225) to re-establish its political sovereignity after the dismemberment of the Seljuk Empire. The Turks

(1) *Rāḥatu's-ṣudūr*, Gibb Mem. Series, 17-18.

(2) *Tārīkh-i Fakhruddīn Mubārakshāh*, ed. D. Ross, 36; Naṣīr uddīn b. 'Abduljalīl, *Kitāb al-naḥd*, Teheran 1331 ; Najmuddīn Rāzī, *Mirṣād al-'ibād*, ed. Teheran, 11-12 ; Yāḳūt, *Mu'jam al-Buldān*, ed. Wüstenfeld, IV, 403 ; Vaṣṣāf, ed. Hammer, 105.

considered this an illegitimate action, and warned the Caliph not to step beyond the sphere of religious affairs (1). Having originally admitted the superiority of the Arabs and Persians in civilization the Turks, once they had gained world domination and power, regarded them as an effiminate body of men whose morals and character had become lax under the drowsy influence of civilization. Even certain Turks exposed to the same influence were considered no better than Arabs and Persians, and called *Tajik* in derision (2). Although the heaviest blows of the Mongol invasion fell on the Turks, political control after the decline of the Moguls passed again into Turkish hands. In dealing with the battle of 'Ayn-Jālūt, where the Mongols sustained their first defeat, Mohammedan authors who regard the Mongols as Turks say : « What an irony of fate that the Tartars could only be defeated by the Turks, their kinsmen » (3).

The Turks felt their ideal of world domination and superiority still more strongly in front of the Armenians, Syrian Christians, and especially the Greeks, with whom they established contact in Anatolia (4). This is also recorded and admitted by Byzantine authors. Kutalmïş regarded the Byzantines as effeminate men, and this view was one of the factors that led to the conquest of Anatolia. « What brings you here, a desire to embrace Christianity or to do evil acts ? » demanded the envoys of the first Crusade from Gür-buğa ; « we suggest that you withdraw from the country of the Christians ». « We are not interested in your God and your Christianity », proudly answered the Turkish commander, « it surprises us that you should put forward a claim on these lands, for we have taken them from effeminate people. Are your lords willing to become Turks, to renounce their God and religion ? If so, they may stay here.

(1) *Rāḥatu'ṣ-sudūr*, 334.

(2) This reflects the thought of the nomadic period. On the contrary, when the Turks had later been influenced by Persian culture and had' forgotten their own Turkish traditions, they called their congenerous nomads and peasants, who were not under the same influence, « Türk » in derision.

(3) 'Aynī, *'Iḳd al-Jumān*, Veli ud-din Library, Nr. 2391 (vol. XIX), 436.

(4) Briennos, trad. Cousin *(Histoire de Constantinople)*, Paris, 1672, III, 674 ; Zonaras, *Chronique*, trad. M. St. Amour, Paris, 1560, I, 97 a.

We will give you cities and horses, you will become horsemen like us, and we will always extend our friendship to you. Otherwise, we will put you in chains, take you to Khorasan or kill you » (1).

The Turks changed neither their belief nor their attitude, even after the first Crusade when they were retreating and the Byzantines advancing in Anatolia. Although the Emperor Alexis Komnenos had recaptured the Anatolian coast, the Turks regarded his alleged illness as a design to cover his cowardice. And at their military camps they amused themselves with comic plays representing the Emperor as a bed-ridden invalid with physicians rushing to his bed-side in a mirth-provoking manner (2). After the battle of Myriokephalon (1176), the Byzantine were fully convinced that supreme power had passed from them to the Turks. So they did not even refrain from clearly admitting this fact among themselves or in their talks with the Turks. A discussion between the Byzantine emperor and a Turkish scholar, which is mentioned in a Greek source, reflects the same attitude (3). On the other hand, a Turkish source narrates that in a discussion among the Greeks, an assurance by a priest that the Turks will not go to Heaven was countered with the question : « Will the Turks, who drove us from our homes in this world, leave us alone in Heaven ? » (4). « The Turks who fled like women before the Moguls », writes a Byzantine chronicle, « acquitted themselves manfully against the Greeks » (5), thereby contrasting the reactions of the two sides to the Mogul invasion. According to a tradition attributed by the Syriac Christian Michael to Ezekiel, « God incited the Turks to this invasion as a retribution for the wickedness of the Greeks » (6). This shows the prevalence among Christians,

(1) *Histoire anonyme de la Première Croisade,* ed. Brehier, Paris, 1924, 150, 151.

(2) Anne Comnène, *Alexiade,* Paris, 1945, III, 188.

(3) M. C. B. Hase, *Notice d'un ouvrage de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue intitulé Entretien avec un professeur Mohametan,* in *Notices et Extraits,* t. VII, Paris, 1810, 309-382.

(4) *Ṣaljūk-nâme,* Top-Kapu Saray Library, 4b.

(5) N. Gregoras, I, 137 ; P. Wittek, *Menteşe Beyliği,* Ankara, 1944, 16.

(6) Michel le Syrien, III, 154.

too, of a belief similar to the tradition of the Prophet Mohammed prevalent among Moslems. A similar belief concerning Attila had also existed in the Europe of his time. Thus, the Turkish ideal of world domination, which developed along with Turkish political power, was accepted by other peoples who admitted the superiority of the Turks.

The Turks also retained their feeling of superiority towards the peoples of Western Europe with whom they established contact during the Crusades, and the world of Islam, in spite of its political dismemberment, believed that the superiority would remain in the hands of the Turks. Sheikh Sharafuddīn Būsīrī, inspired by a vision he saw during the battle of Acre, foretold to Malik al-Ashraf Khalīl that « The Turks once on their forward march, would not yield an inch of ground to the Crusaders » (1). The Turks, however, noticing the valour and chivalry on the Franks on the battlefield, had a higher regard for them than for other peoples, and the Franks, too, felt the same admiration for the Turks. « The Turks are a heroic people », writes a chronicle of the First Crusade. « They thought they could frighten us as they frightened the Arabs, Moslems, Armenians, Syrian Christians and Greeks. The Turks believe they belong to the same race as the Franks (an allusion to the myth that the Turks and the Franks had their origin in Troy). They maintain, therefore, that only the Turk and the Frank have a right to become a knight. If they embraced Christianity no one could equal their power. But our men will not, I hope, be terrified by the Turks, and we shall beat them by the Grace of God » (2). This reflects the mutual admiration which both sides had for one another. In fact the Franks, who had come to fight the Turks and give assistance to the Byzantines, went back home convinced that the latter had betrayed them and the cause of Christianity. On the other hand, the Franks, as mentioned by noteworthy sources, changed their feeling of antagonism towards the Turks who showed themselves to be chivalrous and valiant in war and kind and human in peace.

(1) Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks*, II, 127.

(2) *Hist. anon. 1re croisade*, 51 ; *Histoire du voyage à Jérusalem par Tudebode* (Michaud, *Bibl. des Croisades*), I, 255 ; G. Finlay, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, London, 1851, 235.

Following the Mongol domination, the Turks, rallying round the Ottoman Dynasty, sought to revive their ideal of world domination, strengthening it with such sacred elements as Mohammed's alleged statement on the conquest of Istanbul and the existence near that city's walls of the tomb of Abū Ayyūb, a disciple of the Prophet (1). To this they added a more intelligent conception of national culture, language and history. Furthermore, a concept of history which, through the Seljuks and Ḳarakhanids, reached back to the mythical ancestor Oghuz-khan, assumed at this period a clearer form. What is even more important is that at that time the ideal of world domination penetrated the consciousness of the masses. In fact, the myth of *Kïzïl-Elma* « The Red Apple », which symbolized the ideal of world domination, appeared for the first time at this period in Anatolia. A brilliant metal ball on Justinian's monument standing before the Church of St. Sophia was the lucky charm of the Byzantine Empire. In the 14th century, when the Byzantines thought that the falling down of that metal ball would spell the doom of their Empire, the Turks believed that by taking possession of that lucky charm they would realize their dream of world dominion. Such was the Turkish myth of the « Red Apple », and as the Turkish Empire grew wider, the Red Apple moved farther and farther away. Thus, following the conquest of Istanbul it moved to the dome of St. Peter's in Rome. The fact that Evliya Çelebi saw a connection between this and a myth relative to the birth of Mohammed is rather significant (2). In spite of the Ottomans' attachment to the theory of Ibn Khaldūn, they believed in the permanence of the Empire even when it was on the decline. This is important, insofar as it demonstrates the strength of the ideal.

How did the Turks, with their ideal of world domination, and with their feelings of superiority, behave throughout the

(1) On the traditions on the conquest of Constantinople, see M. Canard, *Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople dans l'histoire et dans la légende*, JA, 1926, and Osman Turan, *The Conquest of Constantinople and History* (in Turkish), in *Türk Yurdu*, Ankara, 1954, I, 30, 35.

(2) F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, Oxford, 1929, II, 736.

middle ages towards the many foreign races and religions under their rule ? That this rule which lasted so long and united so many lands and races, could not have endured without justice and religious tolerance is self-evident.

In fact, we have in our hand a sufficient number of documents which show that the ideal of world domination ran parallel to an ideal of humanity, and that the Turkish people and Turkish thinkers along with the Turkish rulers nurtured this ideal of humanity. This point was dealt with in my articles entitled « Coordination of Nationalist and Humane Feelings in the Teaching of History » (1) and « Les Souverains Seljoukides et leurs sujets non-musulmans » (2), and other aspects of this subject will be studied in the future. The Turks made extensive use of this spiritual factor in realizing their ideal of world domination. Another important factor which undoubtedly contributed to the growth of Turkish political power was the fact that the Turkish people and the Turkish rulers in their concept of state thought above everything else of public good and social solidarity. This is not the place for handling this subject. We shall therefore, content ourselves with giving two quotations. The Gök-Türk kings, according to the Orkhon Monuments, sought « to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to make the Turkish people happy and powerful », and in a corresponding spirit the Gök-Türks, under the Chinese yoke, wondered : « I was a people with a Khan. But, where are, now, my government, my Khan ? Whom shall I serve now and why ? (3). Likewise, Mohammedan authors write thta, whilst the rich in other countries squandered their wealth for their own pleasures, wealthy Turks, first in Turkestan and then in Anatolia, devoted their wealth to charity, and to religious, social and cultural institutions (4). But orf this moral element supporting material power, and ideal of world domination could not have existed.

Osman TURAN
(Ankara).

(1) *Bull. Fac. of Arts of Ankara* (in Turkish and French), X, 3-4 (1952), 209-225.
(2) *Studia Islamica*, I, 65-101.
(3) Thomsen, *Inscript.*, 106, 107.
(4) Osman Turan, *Seljuk Caravanserais* (in Turkish), in *Belleten* XXXIX (1946), 489-491.