RETHINKING HISTORY WRITING IN TURKEY: GERMAN PROFESSORS, THE TURKISH HISTORY THESIS AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE 1930S AND 40S

by
SARP KALAY

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
July 2024

RETHINKING HISTORY WRITING IN TURKEY: GERMAN PROFESSORS, THE TURKISH HISTORY THESIS AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE 1930S AND 40S

Approved by:

Assoc. Prof. AYŞE OZİL ....
(Thesis Supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. SELÇUK AKŞİN SOMEL ....

Assoc. Prof. İLKER AYTÜRK ....

Date of Approval: July 16, 2024

ABSTRACT

RETHINKING HISTORY WRITING IN TURKEY: GERMAN PROFESSORS, THE TURKISH HISTORY THESIS AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE 1930S AND 40S

SARP KALAY

HISTORY PROGRAM M.A. THESIS, JULY 2024

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Ayşe OZİL

Keywords: The Turkish History Thesis, University Reform, German Professors, Clemens Bosch

This study delves into the scholarly works of Clemens Bosch, a German professor of ancient history specializing in numismatics who sought refuge in Turkey during the persecution of German-Jewish academics by the National Socialist Party. It will examine Bosch's contributions to Istanbul University history department and the Turkish historiography of 1930s and 40s, including his textbooks on Roman and Hellenistic histories alongside his article on ancient Anatolia's cultural impact on world civilization, within the context of the University Reform of 1933, the Turkish History Thesis and the shift towards the Humanist history writing of İsmet İnönü's presidency. The study investigates, using Bosch's works as a focal point, whether German émigrés' works were solely influenced by the narrative promoted by the nascent Turkish Republic or if their own perspectives played a significant role. Additionally, it aims to recontextualize the relationship between émigré professors like Bosch and the Republic of Turkey, challenging the prevailing notion of a one-sided influence on the part of the Turkish state, wherein the whole discourse and content of the scholarly works were dictated to the German academics by the state itself. Instead, this study aims to highlight that some German émigrés' views on history and their arguments found in their works produced before their arrival in Turkey resembled, in several respects, the narrative being constructed by the Turkish state in the 1930s. Thus, the study also reimagines the alignment of interests between the Republic of Turkey and German émigrés not only as an imperative for finding a place to live and work on the part of persecuted German scholars and the need to find scholars and experts for the higher education system on the part of the Republic of Turkey but, at the same time, as a coalescence of intellectual interests on the part of both sides. From this perspective study suggests that the convergence of existing historiographical trends, the state's historical narratives, and the methodologies of German professors contributed to the making of these scholarly works. Ultimately, the study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the dynamic interaction between émigré scholars and the Republic of Turkey during this pivotal period in Turkish history.

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE'DE TARİH YAZIMINI YENİDEN DÜŞÜNMEK: 1930'LU VE 40'LI YILLARDA ALMAN PROFESÖRLER, TÜRK TARİH TEZİ VE YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM SİSTEMİ

SARP KALAY

TARİH PROGRAMI YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, TEMMUZ 2024

Bu çalışma, Nasyonal Sosyalist Parti'nin Alman-Yahudi akademisyenlere uyguladığı zulüm sırasında Türkiye'ye sığınan, nümizmatik alanında uzmanlaşmış Alman antik tarih profesörü Clemens Bosch'un akademik çalışmalarını incelemektedir. Bosch'un İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarih Bölümü'ne ve 1930'lu ve 40'lı yılların Türk tarih yazımına yaptığı katkılar, Roma ve Helenistik tarih üzerine yazdığı ders kitaplarının yanı sıra Antik Anadolu'nun dünya uygarlığı üzerindeki kültürel etkisi üzerine yazdığı makale de dahil olmak üzere, 1933 Üniversite Reformu, Türk Tarih Tezi ve İsmet İnönü'nün cumhurbaşkanlığı döneminde Hümanist tarih yazımına geçiş bağlamında incelenecektir. Çalışma, Bosch'un eserlerini odak noktası olarak kullanarak, Alman göçmenlerin eserlerinin yalnızca yeni kurulan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından teşvik edilen anlatıdan mı etkilendiğini yoksa kendi bakış açılarının önemli bir rol oynayıp oynamadığını araştırmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, Bosch gibi göçmen profesörler ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti arasındaki ilişkiyi yeniden bağlamsallaştırmayı amaçlayan bu çalışma, Türk devletinin tek taraflı bir etkiye sahip olduğu ve akademik çalışmaların tüm söylem ve içeriğinin Alman akademisyenlere bizzat devlet tarafından dikte edildiği şeklindeki yaygın düşünceye karşı çıkmaktadır. Bunun yerine bu çalışma, bazı Alman göçmenlerin Türkiye'ye gelmeden önce ürettikleri eserlerindeki tarih görüşlerinin ve argümanlarının, 1930'larda Türk devleti tarafından inşa edilen anlatıya birçok açıdan benzediğini vurgulamayı amaçlamaktadır. Dolayısıyla çalışma, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ile Alman göçmenler arasındaki çıkar uyumunu, sadece zulüm gören Alman akademisyenlerin yaşayacak ve çalışacak bir yer bulma zorunluluğu ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin yükseköğretim sistemi için akademisyen ve uzman bulma ihtiyacı olarak değil, aynı zamanda her iki tarafın entelektüel çıkarlarının birleşmesi olarak da yeniden tasavvur etmektedir. Bu perspektiften bakıldığında çalışma, mevcut tarih yazımı eğilimlerinin, devletin tarih anlatılarının ve Alman profesörlerin metodolojilerinin bir araya gelmesinin bu akademik çalışmaların ortaya çıkmasına katkıda bulunduğunu öne sürmektedir. Nihayetinde çalışma, Türkiye tarihinin bu önemli döneminde göçmen akademisyenler ile Türkiye Cumhuriyeti arasındaki dinamik etkileşimin incelikli bir şekilde anlaşılmasını sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my family and friends

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.   INTRODUCTION

At the end of the 19th century German influence on the Ottoman Empire was an important factor in many areas of the Ottoman state and society; be it military, economic, cultural, or social. Especially after the waning interest of French and British interest in the Ottoman Empire, Germans found the Ottoman state as an ally and the empire as a space for political, economic, and cultural expansion.[1] Germans were slowly penetrating into every sphere of the empire, including education. There was a sizeable number of German lecturers in *Darülfünun*; the number of lecturers reached its peak during First World War at the height of the Ottoman-German alliance.[2] Relations between the Ottomans and Germans were not very active during the interwar period. With the establishment of the Republic of Turkey there was a rapprochement in Turkish-German relations. Interwar period, both during the Weimar Republic and under the National Socialist rule, saw the growth of a German community, constituted by German citizens working, such as academics and experts in Turkish universities, and residing in Turkey in an official or unofficial capacity. This was spurred on by the intertwining of political, economic and cultural interests of Germany and Republic of Turkey.[3] When the National Socialist Party rose to power in Germany, party's anti -Semitic laws began to drive German-

---

[1] For a in depth examination of German influence on Ottoman Empire at the end of the 19th and the beginning of 20th Centuries see: İlber Ortaylı, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu*, (İstanbul: Kronik Kitap, 2020).

[2] For one of the most important works on this subject see Emre Dölen's work on the German professors in Darülfünun. It is a comprehensive look at the contributions of German scholars to the higher education system of the Ottoman Empire in the middle of WWI. Emre, Dölen, *İstanbul Darülfünunu'nda Alman Müderrisler (1915-1918)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013).

[3] Cemil Koçak's book on the subject goes into detail about the many facets of Turkish-German relations in the inter war period and how the tightening of relations led to the growth of German community in Turkey. Cemil Koçak, *Türk - Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939); İki Dünya Savaşı Arasındaki Dönemde Siyasal, Kültürel, Askeri ve Ekonomik İlişkileri*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013); Kader Konuk presents the relationship between German émigré scholars and existing German community to be a tumultuous one, stemming from the German community's National Socialist affiliations. Kader Konuk, *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*, (California: Stanford University Press, 2010), 102-103.

Jewish[4] scholars out of the country.[5] Losing their livelihoods and fearing for their safety, they sought opportunities to live and work in other countries. They sought asylum in many places in Europe and the Americas. One of these destinations was Turkey, which was seen as a viable place of refuge for German scholars because of its old economic and cultural ties with Germany, its diplomatic neutrality, and also because of the newly flourishing republican vision. Moreover, one of the ways in which the vision of the Turkish Republic manifested itself was in the restructuring of the higher education system, known as the University Reform of 1933, and the construction of a new national historical narrative, known as the Turkish History Thesis. Thus, the interests and needs of German scholars and the nascent Republic of Turkey coincided. German intellectuals needed a safe place to live and work, and the Turkish Republic needed scholars and experts to help it realise its vision.[6]

Seeing an opportunity to bring these intellectuals to the country, the Turkish government extended an invitation to many German émigré scholars and experts[7]. Initially about 100 to 150[8] German émigrés; doctors, engineers, biologists, historians, jurists etc., along with their families and assistants chosen by the scholars themselves, accepted the invitation. As a result of the University Reform of 1933, the *Darülfünun* was dissolved, a large part of the teaching staff was dismissed and liquidated, and Istanbul University was established. Through their work German émigré scholars were obligated to contribute to this restructuring of the higher education system. Although most émigré scholars worked in Istanbul University in various faculties ranging from the Faculty of Medicine to the Faculty of Arts, a contingency of them

---

[4]Ethnic and religious identity of the persecuted academics is a debate in itself. Not all of those who had to flee were of Jewish origin, some were persecuted for their political views. İzzet Bahar states that only few of the German-Jewish émigrés openly practiced their religion or partook in other aspects of Jewish culture while in Turkey. On the other, all of the German émigré scholars were bound by their adherence to the idea of Bildung instead of shared religious/ethnic Jewish identity. Concept of Bildung is important here. Bahar quotes George L. Mosse: [Bildung is] a combination of "education with notions of character formation and moral education." Bildung as a German tradition signifies a style of self-development, where philosophy and education intertwine to depict a process of personal and cultural growth. This growth involves harmonizing one's mind and heart, and integrating one's individual identity into the broader societal fabric. İzzet I, Bahar, "German or Jewish, Humanity or Raison d'Etat: The German Scholars in Turkey, 1933–1952". *Shofar*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Fall 2010), pp. 48-72. 2010. Arnold Reismann similarly points out that Jewish, part Jewish or married to Jewish were labels used by the National Socialist Party. Most of the German émigrés in Turkey non-believers or agnostics. Arnold Reisman, *Turkey's Modernization; Refugees from Nazism and Atatürk's Vision*, (Washington, DC, New Academia Publishing, 2006), 33.

[5]The law in question is *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service of April 7*, 1933. It stipulated that Civil servants of non-Aryan descent are to be retired and honorary officials are to be removed from official status. German History in Documents and Images. Volume 7. Nazi Germany, 1933-1945. Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (April 7, 1933). https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub$_document.cfm?document_id = 1520. Accessed : 15.02.2024.$

[6]In his memoirs Phillip Schwartz talks about this coalescence of interests of both parties. Philipp Schwartz, *Kader Birliği: 1933 Sonrası Türkiye'ye Göç Eden Alman Bilim Adamları*, Translated by Nagehan Alçı, (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 2003), 42-43.

[7]In his memoirs Phillip Schwartz talks about this coalescence of interests of both parties. Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 44-45.

[8]Ibid, 66

played an instrumental role in the foundation of *DTCF* (Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, Faculty of Language, History and Geography) in Ankara.[9] As part of their work in these institutions, German émigré scholars were contractually obliged by the Turkish government to learn Turkish, so that they could give lectures, educate and mentor Turkish students alongside prepare reports on their activities in their institutions. They were also required to publish a certain number of articles and books, including textbooks on their respective fields.[10]

In addition to their role in the universities, German émigré scholars were obliged to contribute to their host nation's scholarly-political cause by writing papers congruent with the Turkish history thesis on their area of expertise. Turkish history congresses were already planned to be held every five years and the first one was held in 1932. The Turkish Historical Society, bolstered by the arrival of Western expertise and encouraged by the political establishment, organized a second congress in 1937. Several German émigré scholars and other foreign academics presented papers and gave talks on different subjects ranging from archeology to linguistics, from history to anthropology in this event.[11]

The efforts of the German émigré scholars had mixed results. Sometimes professors were unable or unwilling to learn Turkish, so their lectures had to be simultaneously translated by an interpreter for the students. There were sometimes conflicts between German professors and their Turkish colleagues and students on various subjects.[12] However, the obstacles in teaching and writing in Turkish did not completely prevent German scholars from fulfilling contracts with the Turkish government. They were able to publish many textbooks in German and Turkish on a myriad of subjects including; economics, music, law, architecture, physics, history etc. In time, the textbooks in the German language were also translated into Turkish by German professors' own Turkish students.[13] Conversely, many of the German

---

[9]Horst Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*, Translated by Aykut,Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt, (İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları, 2000), 213.

[10]Ersoy Taşdemirci provides several of the contracts signed between the Turkish government and foreign academics. Ersoy Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, (Ankara, 1992).

[11]Zafer Toprak goes into detail about the arguments and scholarly-political discourse that was in display in this congress. Zafer Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji.* 3rd Edition, August 2023, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. Bilim Tarihi Dizisi, 2023), 308.

[12]Emre Dölen details many of the problems faced or created by the German émigré scholars. Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3: Tasfiye ve Yeni Kadrolar.* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010), 523-30.

[13]Dölen emphasizes this point about the German scholars requiring assistants to do their academic and scholarly works. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3.* 523. All the works which constitute the case studies of thesis similarly required translators. Clemens Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender İmparatorluğu.* Translated by Afif Erzen, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi

scholars who stayed for more than 10 years made a positive contribution to the institutions they worked for and helped build their respective fields in these institutions through their scholarly works and students they cultivated.[14]

This study focuses on the German émigré scholar Clemens Bosch, who was a professor of ancient history at Istanbul University in the 1940s, and examines his work on the history of ancient Anatolia and his textbooks on ancient Greece and Rome. It also compares Bosch's contributions with those of other foreign scholars, such as the German émigré scholar Georg Rohde, and Wilhelm Brandenstein and Giulio Jacopi, two scholars who presented articles on ancient history at the Second Congress of History in 1937. In addition, their works are compared and contrasted with those of scholars who published books on similar topics at the end of the 20th century, using similar methods and sources with different goals, Martin Bernal and Manfred Korfmann. Furthermore, it aims to historicize and contextualize the historical narratives of the Republic of Turkey and German emigrant scholars. Thus, the thesis aims to highlight the collective impact of German scholars on Turkish historiography during a critical period of academic and political transformation. Moreover, by analyzing Bosch's work and juxtaposing it with the work of his contemporaries, the study reexamines the relationship between the Turkish state and German émigré scholars and the broader issue of modernization in the Turkish Republic.

1.1 Literature Review

This study aims to contribute to a growing scholarship which approaches the Early Republic of Turkey critically. There are several works that reexamine and reimagine the Early Republican period with a more multi-layered perspective.

The compilation *Post-Post-Kemalizm:Türkiye Çalışmalarında Yeni Arayışlar* [Post-Post-Kemalism: New Outlooks in Turkey Studies][15] edited by İlker Aytürk and Berk Esen is one of the significant examples of reevaluation of the Early Republican era Turkey. Within this work, İlker Aytürk, in his article "Post-Post-Kemalizm: Yeni

Yayınları, 1942); Clemens Bosch, *Helenizm Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri*, Translated by Sabahat Atlan, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1943).

[14]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 521, 530-33.

[15]İlker Aytürk and Berk Esen, eds., *Post-Post-Kemalizm:Türkiye Çalışmalarında Yeni Arayışlar*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 3rd. Edition 2023).

Bir Paradigmayı Beklerken"[16] describes the concept of post-Kemalism as a critical perspective on modern Turkey viewing the one-party era as the root of the country's core issues. He says that this paradigm represents a tendency to challenge and move beyond the dominant ideology of "Kemalism" in pursuit of democratization. However, Aytürk challenges this paradigm and suggests reexamination of both this paradigm by asking new questions. He says that this reevaluation, post-post-Kemalism, acknowledges that while this critical stance helped to challenge the dominance of the one-party era, it also led to the replacement of one dominant historiographical paradigm with another during the 2000s. Therefore, overall goal of this compilation of works is to advocate for a further step by critiquing the very criticisms themselves. This approach aims to enable an analysis that acknowledges the transformative political and social developments of subsequent periods, extending beyond the confines of the 1908-1945 era, and explores other factors contributing to democratization and authoritarianism beyond Kemalism.

There is a significant point made by Aytürk that is relevant to the goals of this study. He states that on the one hand Kemalists exaggerated Early Republican era's achievements of modernization while post-Kemalist authors exaggerated the abilities of the Early Republican Turkish state to authoritatively and decisively dictate and shape the society around its political desires. Aytürk states that both perspectives led to the reproduction of the same arguments without a critical look at either the Early Republican era or the previous and later time periods.[17] Following on from this perspective, this thesis seeks recontextualize the ability and the desire of Turkish state in this period to dictate its political will on scholarly matters, particularly on the works of German émigrés.

Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek [Rethinking the One-Party Period][18] is a compilation of articles, edited by Sevgi Adak and Alexandros Lamprou, which likewise offer a perspective on Turkey's one-party era that challenges traditional perspectives and focuses on more complex dynamics. This work emphasizes that the state and society during the one-party era were not one monolithic entity, but full of contradictions and ambiguities. By presenting these contradictions this work challenges the historiography that emerged after the 1980's - post-Kemalism- which envisioned a dichotomy of state and society, where the all-powerful state enforced its political

---

[16]İlker Aytürk, "Post-Post-Kemalizm: Yeni Bir Paradigmayı Beklerken". In *Post-Post-Kemalizm: Türkiye Çalışmalarında Yeni Arayışlar*, Edited by İlker Aytürk and Berk Esen, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 3rd. Edition 2023), 23-48.

[17]Aytürk, "Post-Post-Kemalizm", 39-40.

[18]Sevgi Adak and Alexandros Lamprou, eds., *Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2022).

will unchallenged on a society which had not any say in the matter. Alongside that, it also challenges the discourse of Early Republican Turkey itself that perpetuated an image of a secular, modernizing, benevolent and strong state. *Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek* examines this relationship and claims that historiographical paradigm of 1990s and 2000s, often overlooked the desires and agencies of different interest groups that existed in both the state mechanism itself and in society, which clashed or coalesced in various different socio-political issues. Thus, it demonstrates that the one-party era had a more complex structure beyond the binary analysis of authoritarian regime and oppressed people. This is achieved by the demonstrating that even authoritarian regimes cannot be understood without taking into account the need to produce consent and the limitations of the state's capacity to control and regulate. Moreover, this work claims that both the proponents and critiques of the one-party era Turkey's socio-political and cultural policies often mythologized this period, making it so that similar arguments were reproduced without critical examination of this time period. It proposes that this period should be re-evaluated with new perspectives and new questions. The work suggests instead of the older historiography, which traditionally emphasized the top-down modernization by the state, a unique social science perspective should be provided by focusing on social groups from below. By doing that, state-society dichotomies should not be reproduced and the importance of the local perspective should be emphasized. Hereby, *Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek* provides new perspectives and a variety of approaches for a deeper understanding and interrogation of the one-party period.

One of the valuable perspective this book offers for the purposes of this thesis is the transnational view of the Early Republican period. Placing the developments in Turkey in a transnational context by looking not only at Turkey but also at the international situation. At the same time, drawing attention to Turkey's relations with abroad during this period. One of this thesis' aims is to demonstrate the contributions of foreign scholars on the historiography of Turkey in 1930s and 40s by presenting the roots of their influences to be originating beyond just those ideas, arguments and discourse that were constructed in Turkey during this period. For that reason, *Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek* transnational approach is pertinent for this thesis as well.

Following on from these above-mentioned works, this thesis seeks to rethink and recontextualize the early Republican period by examining the capacity and willingness -or unwillingness- of the Turkish government to exert its will on the German émigré scholars in the construction and the continuation of the scholarly-political program of the Turkish History Thesis. By doing so, it seeks to recontextualize the relationship between the Republic of Turkey and German scholars.

I am also aware of Seçkin Çelik's work, *İnönü Döneminde Kemalizm*[Kemalism During İnönü Period],[19] which examines the continuities and changes in the Kemalist ideology during İsmet İnönü's presidency. However, due to time constraints, I was unable to penetrate sufficiently into the arguments in this work to include ideas from this work in my thesis.

The subjects of University Reform of 1933 and the subsequent arrival of German émigré scholars and experts who went onto to be employed in restructuring of the higher education system of the Republic of Turkey constitute the scholarly-political background of this study. There are several works on these subjects.

Sevtap Kadıoğlu-İshakoğlu's article, *1933 Üniversite Reformu Hakkında Bir Bibliyografya Denemesi* [A Bibliography on the 1933 University Reform][20] is a valuable reference point for the studies of University Reform and émigré German scholars' contributions to it. It compiles an extensive bibliography of works that examines the Turkish higher education system, the University Reform and works on many individual academics, experts and officials that contributed to these processes.

One of the first scholars examined in the above work is Horst Widmann and his *Exil und Bildungshilfe*[21] [Exile and Contribution to Education]. Widmann was a lecturer in Ankara University between 1961 and 1965. During this time, he did research on the German émigrés' immigration to Turkey and their contributions to the University Reform in particular and the higher education system in general. His book was a result of that research and was completed in 1969. The work was later translated into Turkish by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt and published for the first time in 1981 on the 100th anniversary of Atatürk's birth and for the second time, in an updated and expanded form, in 2000.[22]

---

[19]Seçkin Çelik, *İnönü Döneminde Kemalizm*, (İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi Yayınevi, 2021).

[20]Sevtap Kadıoğlu-İshakoğlu, "1933 Üniversite Reformu Hakkında Bir Bibliyografya Denemesi", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, Cilt 2, Say 4, (2004), 471-491.

[21]The name of the book has significant connotations as well. As we referenced in a footnote in the introduction, Bildung in a German context meant a combination of education, nurture and the cultivation of a particular life style through a program of self-development. The German émigré scholars' identities were all bound by the experience of having recieved a Bildung rather than an ethnic or religious identity-such as Judaism owing to the fact that most of the émigrés being of Jewish background. The same idea of development of the self through education and cultivation of practices and tastes was prominent in Republican Turkey. Thus, the arrival of German émigrés meant the reinforcement of this newly flourishing cultural practice by the cultivation of students in the hands of German émigrés.

[22]Horst Widmann's work is valuable both for its examination of 1933 University Reform and arrival of German émigrés and for providing official documents on both of these subjects. For that reason, the examinations in this book makes it valuable as a part of the secondary literature on the discussed issues while documents provided are primary sources. Horst Widmann, *Atatürk Üniversite Reformu*, of İstanbul Üniversitesi Cerrahpaşa Tıp Fakültesi, Translated by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt, Atatürk'ün Yüzüncü Doğum Yılını Kutlama Yayınları Özel Seri; 3.(İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1981); Horst, Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*, 2000.

Ersoy Taşdemirci's book, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları* [Foreign Scientists in the 1933 University Reform with Documents][23], is key source of reference on the German scholar's contributions to the University Reform. Taşdemirci briefly examines the implementation of University Reform of 1933 and the foreign academics and experts' involvement in it.

Emre Dölen's seminal work on the development of Istanbul University, from the *Darülfünun* period of the Ottoman Empire through the restructuring of the 1930s in the Early Republican time to the changes in the Turkey's constitution regarding higher education in the 1980s, is one of the most detailed and extensive sources for examining the evolution of the ideas and systems of higher education in the Late Ottoman Empire and in the Republic of Turkey. Dölen's work is separated into six volumes; five volumes constitute a series in which Dölen delves deep into the evolution of the university system from the establishment of *Darülfünun* in 1863 to the founding of YÖK (Turkish: Yükseköğretim Kurulu: Board of Higher Education) in 1981,[24] Dölen has also another volume on the German scholars influences on the *Darülfünun* between 1915 and 1918.[25] Dölen's examination of the arrival of German scholars during WWI provides a good parallel to the arrival of émigré scholars in 1933.

Among these volumes, the most pertinent to this thesis is *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3: Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye Geçiş; Tasfiye ve Yeni Kadrolar* [History of University in Turkey: Transition from Darülfunun to University; Liquidation and New Cadres], as Dölen, in this work, focuses on the restructuring of the higher education system in Turkey and the impact of the arrival of émigré German scholars in this restructuring. Dölen states that a systematical study on the works and contributions of German émigrés to be lacking. He says most works about the German émigrés are authored by those individuals who were interested in history and belonged to the same scholarly or scientific discipline as their chosen émigré subjects.[26] Dölen also challenges the paradigm that lumps in all the émigrés together, either overly

---

[23] Taşdemirci's book is also valuable for providing a cornucopia of documents. Ersoy Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, (Ankara, 1992).

[24] Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1: Osmanlı Döneminde Darülfünun (1863-1922)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010); Emre Dölen, T*ürkiye Üniversite Tarihi-2: Cumhuriyet Döneminde Osmanlı Darülfünunu (1922-1933)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları, 2010); Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3 Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye Geçiş: Tasfiye ve Yeni Kadrolar*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010); Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-4: İstanbul Üniversitesi (1933-1946)*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010. Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-5: Özerk Üniversite Dönemi (1946-1981)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010).

[25] Emre Dölen, *İstanbul Darülfünunu'nda Alman Müderrisler (1915-1918)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013).

[26] Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 532-33

praising the collective achievements of German émigré scholars while neglecting the accomplishments of their Turkish counterparts or downplaying the German scholars influence completely. Dölen states that because the German émigré contingent was a quite large and heterogenous group, understanding their overall impact requires a critical look at each scholars' influence individually, positive or negative or the lack there of.[27]

Arnold Reisman has two books on the contributions of German-Jewish émigré scholars and experts. His work titled, *Turkey's Modernization; Refugees from Nazism and Atatürk's Vision*,[28] similar to Widmann's work focuses on the work and experiences of German émigrés and their influence on the University Reform. On the other hand, *Refugees and Reforms; Turkey's Journey*,[29] has a wider perspective; it is, as Reisman points out, a compilation of writings on the experiences of the German émigrés in their search for a safe place to live and work and Turkey's endeavor to employ them in its various institutions, with a particular focus on the émigré scholars and experts' contributions to the various aspects of modernization efforts of the Republic of Turkey. In Refugees and Reforms Reisman provides an in-depth look at Turkey's historical context during the interwar period, presenting the extensive modernization reforms spearheaded by Atatürk. Reisman analyzes the impact of the influx of immigrants from National Socialist Germany, including intellectuals, scientists, artists, and professionals, on Turkey's modernization efforts. By focusing on the experiences and contributions of these émigrés, Reisman illuminates the diverse facets of Turkey's modernization journey. He investigates how their expertise, talents, and cultural influences shaped various sectors such as education, science, arts, and governance, ultimately steering Turkey towards greater modernity and progress. One particular issue is pertinent to this thesis subject that of the translation of Ancient and Modern classics of the Western world with the leadership of the Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel and through the efforts of émigré scholars such as classical philologist Georg Rohde. Reisman points out this endeavor to be a signal of Turkey's greater integration with the Western Cultural sphere.[30]

Ekmeledding İhsanoğlu's book, *The House of Sciences*,[31] should be noted here as well. In this work, İhsanoğlu thoroughly explores the establishment and evolution of

---

[27] Ibid.,526.

[28] Arnold Reisman, *Turkey's Modernization;Refugees from Nazism and Atatürk's Vision*, (Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2006).

[29] Arnold Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms; Turkey's Journey*, (Charleston, SC: Book Surge Publishing, 2009).

[30] Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms*, 75-76.

[31] Ekmeleddin İhsanoglu, *The House of Sciences: The First Modern University in the Muslim World*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

Darülfünun from various angles. Consequently, his study stands as one of the most exhaustive examinations of the first university in the Ottoman Empire and later in the Republic of Turkey. Particularly noteworthy, for the purposes of this thesis, is İhsanoğlu's detailed account in The House of Sciences of the circumstances leading to 1933 University Reform and *Darülfünun's* eventual dissolution.

There are many articles and theses on the subject of the University Reform and the arrival of German émigrés. A few of them should be noted here. Klaus-detlev Grothusen's work, *1933 Yılından Sonra Alman Bilim Adamlarının Türkiye'ye Göçü*,[32] is a commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's birth, focusing on the celebrations and exhibitions held both domestically in Turkey and internationally. This work is important for being one of the first examinations of Atatürk's modernization efforts through the context the migration of German scholars to Turkey after 1933 in a holistic manner with a particular focus on the German-Turkish relations in from 1924 to 1938. In her article, *German or Jewish, Humanity or Raison d'Etat*,[33] İzzet Bahar explores the ethnic and religious backgrounds of German emigres, challenging the assumption that all were of Jewish descent. Bahar highlights that not all emigres identified as ethnically Jewish or practiced Judaism culturally or religiously. Instead, she emphasizes their common bond through the *Bildung* they acquired in Germany.

There are also some articles that specifically focus on the contributions of particular German émigré scholars in a specific field or discipline. These works should be noted as well. Arın Namal, in her article on medical doctor and notable émigré scholar Phillip Schwartz, *Ord. Prof. Dr. Phillip Schwartz'ın (1894-1977) İstanbul Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi'nde patoloji eğitimine katkıları*,[34] examines Schwartz's innovations in pathologic anatomy teaching and his report on this subject. Ertuğrul Göksoy, in his article on émigré medical doctor Rudolf Nissen, *Rudolf Nissen: Cerrahpaşa Cerrahi Kliniği'ndeki Çalışmaları ve Türk Cerrahisine Katkıları*,[35] evaluates Nissen's contributions to medical discipline of surgery in general and Turkish surgery practice in particular. There are also few Masters and PhD theses on the subjects of German scholars' emigration and their contributions to the institutions of Turkey. The notable examples include Ayşe Altunbaş's MA thesis, *Almanya'dan Nasyonal*

---

[32]Klaus-Detlev Grothusen, "1933 Yılından Sonra Alman Bilim Adamlarının Türkiye'ye Göçü", *Belleten* 45, no. (1981): 537-550.

[33]İzzet I. Bahar, "German or Jewish, Humanity or Raison d'Etat: The German Scholars in Turkey, 1933–1952."

[34]Arın Namal, "Ord. Prof. Dr. Phillip Schwartz'ın (1894-1977) İstanbul Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi'nde patoloji eğitimine katkıları", *Türk Patoloji Dergisi*, 19(1-2), 1-6(2003).

[35]Ertuğrul Göksoy, "Rudolf Nissen: Cerrahpaşa Cerrahi Kliniği'ndeki Çalışmaları ve Türk Cerrahisine Katkıları", *Ulusal Cerrahi Dergisi*, 22 (2), 85-91 (2006).

Sosyalizm Döneminde (1933-1945) Türkiye'ye Gelen Yahudiler,[36] Yunus Kobal's MA thesis, *Üniversitelerimizin Gelişimi ve Alman Bilim Adamlarının Katkıları,*[37] Mehmet Girgin's MA thesis, *1933 Üniversite Reformu Sonrası Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman Bilim İnsanlarının Türk Eğitim Sistemine Katkıları,*[38] and İbrahim Öztürk's PhD thesis, *Atatürk Döneminde Alman Bilim Adamlarının Üniversitelerimizde İstidhamı Türk Bilim ve Kültür Hayatı Üzerindeki Etkileri.*[39] These works are informative but generally descriptive.

This study examines several of Clemens Bosch's scholarly works he produced during his time in İstanbul as case studies. For that reason, it delves into Bosch's biography to analyze how his education, his previous work before arriving in Turkey and his academic and intellectual interests influenced and guided him. In this regard, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi; Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)* authored by Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, is significant for being the only full biography of Bosch.[40] The most notable aspect of this work is that the authors were able to interview several members of Bosch's family and some of his colleagues and students. Thanks to that, this biography paints a clear picture of Clemens Bosch.

Among the literature focusing on German émigré scholars and their works, Kader Konuk's book *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey,*[41] examining Erich Auerbach's seminal opus *Mimesis:The Presentation of Reality in Western Literature* and his experiences working and teaching as an academic in Turkey during its composition, ought to be underlined. Kader Konuk outlines in her book how Erich Auerbach was expatriated to Istanbul in 1936 by National Socialist persecution, thus embarking on a passage from Europe to the Orient. She had been absorbed in the cultural landscape of Istanbul and allows for an account of how Turkey opened up to persecuted scholarship, which became an addendum to plans for modernization. She embeds Auerbach's experiences within those of the German émigrés in Turkey more generally, pointing to an interesting juncture of philology, cultural heritage, and

---

[36] Ayşe Altunbaş, "Almanya'dan Nasyonal Sosyalizm Döneminde (1933-1945) Türkiye'ye Gelen Yahudiler," Master's Thesis, İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi. 2020.

[37] Yunus Kobal, "Üniversitelerimizin Gelişimi ve Alman Bilim Adamlarının Katkıları," Master's Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 1994.

[38] Mehmet Girgin, "1933 Üniversite Reformu Sonrası Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman Bilim İnsanlarının Türk Eğitim Sistemine Katkıları," Master's Thesis, Erzincan Binali Yıldırım Üniversitesi, 2021.

[39] İbrahim Öztürk, "Atatürk Döneminde Alman Bilim Adamlarının Üniversitelerimizde İstidhamı Türk Bilim ve Kültür Hayatı Üzerindeki Etkileri," PhD Thesis, Niğde Üniversitesi, 2002.

[40] This work is also valuable for providing many documents, such as Bosch contracts, reports and correspondence. Oğuz Tekin and Nil Türker Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi; Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)*, (Antalya: Suna – İnan Kıraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü, 2007).

[41] Kader Konuk, *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*, (California: Stanford University Press, 2010).

modernization. She then contextualizes the reformist period under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in Turkey, one in which Western models were taken over but adapted to be very particular. Konuk questions the conventional understanding of exile, whereby she stands opposed to associating it with isolation and instead proposes to reconceptualize it as a condition of multiple attachments. By doing so she also challenges the belief that Auerbach's Mimesis, at face value, did not retain any impact of the land and culture it was penned in. She expounds that bereftness of visible markers of impact did not essentially mean that the effects of Auerbach's status as an émigré scholar and his interactions with the culture around him had not informed his work. She states, in disagreement with some scholars that argue otherwise, that the work of *Mimesis* by Auerbach could not have been the same without its influence from his status as a foreign scholar working in Istanbul. From that perspective, this thesis approaches the subject matter of its topic similar to *East West Mimesis* in presenting layers of influences at work in history text books written by Clemens Bosch.

Rethinking the historiography of the early Republican period, particularly 1930s to 1940s, is one of the main goals of this thesis. Compared to the works pertaining to the early Republican period which focus on various aspects, mainly political issues and the Republican reforms, works that center their examination on the history writing of this era are relatively few. However, there are some relevant and valuable literature that this thesis aims to contribute to.

Zafer Toprak and Şükrü Hanioğlu's works examine how the political goals and discourse of the ruling elite of the Republic of Turkey shaped and guided history writing in 1930s. In his work, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si - La Turquie Kamâliste*[42] [The Kemalist Turkey from Today's Perspective] Toprak dedicates a chapter to late Ottoman and early Republican historiography. He presents the evolution of historiography from 1908 to the end of the 1930s, demonstrating a shift from a more liberal and rationalistic approach to history in the Second Constitutional Period to a more Romantic and nationalistic style in the 1930s. Toprak demonstrates that the official historiography that aimed to create a national identity through the study of pre-historical and ancient past of the Turks using anthropology, linguistics and archeology, thrived with the works of people like Afet İnan and Reşit Galip in the project of the Turkish History Thesis. On the other hand, Toprak also points out that different methods and approaches focusing on the study of various periods of history, such as the Ottoman period, continued to be developed by scholars

---

[42]Zafer Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si - La Turquie Kamâliste*, (İstanbul: Boyut Yayıncılık, 2012).

12

such as Fuat Köprülü and Yusuf Akçura. In *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*[43] [The Republic and Anthropology], Toprak delves deeper into the development and use of anthropology in Turkish history thesis. He shows how anthropology was employed to bolster Turkey's political claims on Anatolia through the demonstration of autochthony of the Turkish race in this region. Furthermore, he examines the Turkish history thesis' claims about the Turks being the progenitors of world civilization.

Şükrü Hanioğlu's *Atatürk; An Intellectual Biography*[44] examines the origins and development of Atatürk's political, social and cultural ideas. Hanioğlu emphasizes the involvement of Atatürk in the shaping of Turkish history thesis in the 1930s. He examines this phenomenon from the perspective of Atatürk and his close circle of government officials, scholars and intellectuals' endeavors in the creation of a historiography that was guided by a desire to shape an overall political and cultural ideology for the state alongside the construction of a Turkish national identity.

Suavi Aydın demonstrates in his work, *The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative*,[45] in the early Republican period the state initially focused on reinforcing the national identity through anthropology and archaeology focusing on the origins of the Turks in pre-history, but this declined after Atatürk's death. During Ismet Inönü's presidency (1938–50), there was a shift towards Humanism ideals, led by initiatives like the Translation Bureau, which translated Western classics into Turkish. Hasan Ali Yücel played a key role in this, emphasizing Greek and Latin education at DTCF. This period also saw the beginning of excavations from Turkey's classical age, focusing on ancient Greece and Rome, directed by Arif Müfit Mansel. While state support remained constant, the focus shifted from the Turkish History Thesis to classical archaeology, reducing emphasis on Hittites, Sumerians, and philology. Instead, new way of constructing a Turkish identity shaped a by fusion of ancient Anatolian and Aegean cultures alongside Central Asian ancestry came to the forefront. According to Aydın, this synthesized identity forms the basis of modern Turkish identity. Consequently, research into ancient Anatolian and Aegean cultures becomes crucial for the strategy of Westernization. The shift in the historiography marked by Suavi Aydın is also traceable in Clemens Bosch's works and it is an important phenomenon the development of which this thesis examines.

---

[43]Zafer Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 3rd Edition, August 2023, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. Bilim Tarihi Dizisi, 2023).

[44]Şükrü M. Hanioğlu, Atatürk; An Intellectual Biography, (Princeton University Press, 2011).

[45]Suavi Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative", In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızılyürek and Umut Özkırımlı, 36-46, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Büşra Ersanlı's book, *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu*[46] [Political Power and History: The Development of Official History in Turkey] is a valuable representative of this critical approach. Ersanlı offers a thorough analysis of the Turkish History Thesis and its impact on Turkish historiography. It discusses its emergence in the 1930s political context, its influence on historical narratives and education, and its implications for academic research. She critically portrays the thesis as prioritizing political goals over disciplined historical study, focusing narrowly on political decisions at the expense of socio-economic and cultural dynamics. Ersanlı's analysis highlights diverse perspectives on the thesis, debating its role in liberating Turkish history from Ottoman influence versus criticism for its methodological shortcomings and haste. She also explores challenges in defining Turkish identity amidst the Empire's multicultural reality and critiques the suppression of dissenting voices within Turkish historiography. Overall, Ersanlı calls for a more nuanced and credible approach to history education, advocating for structured and methodical historical study to shape future historical consciousness.

Etinne Copeaux's book, *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında(1931-1993):Türk Tarih Tezinden-Türk İslam Sentezine*[47] [In Turkish History Books(1931-1993): From Turkish History Thesis to Turkish-Islam Synthesis] holds a particular value to this thesis as Copeaux puts history textbooks at center stage of his study as this thesis aims to do. Copeaux examines how history was employed to construct education systems that aimed to shape younger generations in accordance with the official ideology of the state. Copeaux focuses on the period between 1931 and 1993 and presents how different official history theses were used by governments in different contexts and times. The most pertinent part of his work for this thesis is his examination of the development of Turkish History thesis in the 1930s. Copeaux explores how THT is positioned in a wide range of areas, from geographical knowledge to relations with neighbors, from the ways of perceiving and learning history to the language and emphases constructed when telling history. Copeaux's focal point of history textbooks taught in Turkey since 1930 and his analyzes of these works in terms of discourse, ideological content and symbolism, provides a great example for this thesis as well.

In his two works on historiography of the early Republican period, Erdem Sönmez, challenges the popular misconceptions about the history writing of this era. In *Galat-ı Meşhuru Sorgularken*[48] [Questioning the Popular Misconceptions] Sönmez

---

[46]Büşra Ersanlı, *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu*, 1929-1937, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003).

[47]Etienne Copeaux, *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993); Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine*, Translated by Ali Berktay, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları; 59, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998).

[48]Erdem Sönmez, "Galat-ı Meşhuru Sorgularken." *Modus Operandi*, Sayı 1 (Mart 2015): 49-80. 2015.

highlights Fuad Köprülü's career as a methodologically rigorous and accomplished Ottoman historian who imparted a nationalist perspective to historical writing even prior to the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. Sönmez illustrates Köprülü's academic success by noting his publications on Ottoman history and his presentations at Turkish History Congresses, key forums for shaping the discourse of Turkish History Thesis in the 1930s. In a *Past to be Forgotten*,[49] Sönmez argues that the official historiography of the 1930s Turkey primarily focused on ancient Turkish civilizations in Anatolia and their alleged roots in Central Asia, aiming to refute Greek and Armenian claims on the region. This emphasis on Turkish antiquity was crucial for establishing the historical legitimacy of the Turkish republic. Despite this focus, Ottoman historiography continued to flourish alongside. Sönmez points out that perception that Ottoman history was marginalized emerged later, particularly influenced by a narrative of victimhood crafted by the Democratic Party founders in the post-single-party era. In both works Sönmez challenges the misconceptions present in Turkish historiography which unquestioningly follow an established thesis that Ottoman historiography in the early Republican period was not studied, did not conform to the official view and was therefore victimized. He points out that this discourse reinforces the Ottoman-Republican antagonisms and avoids discussion by the contemporary bearers of the early Republican ideology.

In the literature pertaining the early Republican historiography from 1990s and 2000s the involvement and potency of the Turkish government in constructing the historical narratives by imposing its will on the scholars are overly emphasized. From this perspective the Turkish government of the 1930s and 40s is painted as an omnipotent actor with a singular clearly defined will, which it was able to exercise without any outside intervention or influence. Moreover, both the socio-political and scholarly context of the 1930s and 40s Turkey are presented as completely unique to that time and place, cut-off from both the 1920s local scholarly traditions and the international political, academic and scholarly trends of the 1930s and 40s. Erdem Sönmez challenges several of these arguments and critically reexamines the historiography of the 1930s and 40s. He demonstrates the diversity of historical subjects and approaches that were at display at this time period while showing that the historical narrative constructed by the government was not omnipresent. Following on from Erdem Sönmez's articles, this thesis aims to critically examine the 1990s and 2000s arguments to demonstrate the multilayered influences that went into the creation of scholarly works produced by German scholars that were part of the Turkish History Thesis. By doing so, the study seeks to present the

---

[49] Erdem Sönmez, "A Past to Be Forgotten? Writing Ottoman History in Early Republican Turkey," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 48, no. 4 (August 8, 2021): 753–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2020.1714428

Turkish history writing of the 1930s and 40s to be not completely separate from its international context, and, in fact to be in close interaction with the methods and sources of its times.

1.2 Sources

This study employs Clemens Bosch's history textbooks which he authored during his time as a professor of ancient history in Istanbul University's history department as case studies. Alongside these textbooks, one of his particular articles he presented in The Second Turkish History Congress, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı*[50] [The Particularities of Anatolia in History] is in the central focus of this thesis. Bosch authored three history textbooks for bachelor students of the history department. All three of them focus on ancient Greek and Roman histories. These are: *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet*[51] [The Outlines of Roman History: Part I, The Republic], *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender İmparatorluğu*[52] [The Outlines of History of Hellenism; Chapter I, The Empire of the Alexander the Great], *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri*[53] [The Outlines of History of Hellenism; Chapter II, The Hellenistic States until their Juncture with the Roman Empire]. This thesis seeks to analyze these work content and discourse to follow the roots of the ideas present in them. Ideas present in these works such as Eastern culture's, particularly of Anatolian cultures', diffusion of cultural artefacts, such as the cult of the Anatolian *Mother Goddess*, and these artefacts' impact on the world civilization through their socio-political, cultural and religious impact is examined.

To compare and contrast Bosch's works, works of other German émigré scholars and other foreign academics who presented articles in The Second Turkish History Congress in 1937 on the similar subjects as Bosch did, are examined. There are some works that stand out for this particular purpose. Two articles of Georg Rohde, *Roma*

---

[50] Clemens Bosch, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı*. Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı, (İstanbul: Rıza Koşkun Matbaası, 1937).

[51] Clemens Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet* Translated by Sabahat Atlan, Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı, (İstanbul: Rıza Koşkun Matbaası, 1940).

[52] Clemens Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender İmparatorluğu*, Translated by Afif Erzen, Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1942).

[53] Clemens Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri*, Translated by Sabahat Atlan, Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1943).

ve Anadolu Ana İlâhesi[54] [Rome and Anatolian Goddess] and *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater*[55] [The Great Mother; Magna Mater] -this was an edited and expanded version of the article Rohde presented in The Second Turkish History Congress- present many of the same ideas as Bosch on the subject of Anatolian *Mother Goddess* cult while delving deeper into the religious aspects of this subject. Wilhelm Brandenstein's two articles *Etrüsk Meselesinin Şimdiki Durumu*[56] [The Present Situation of the Etrsucan Issue] and *Limni'de Bulunan Kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan Neşet Ettiklerine Dair Dil Bakımından en Ehemmiyetli Delil*[57] [The Inscription Found on Lemnos: The Greatest Linguistic Proof of Etruscans' Emergence in Anatolia] trace the roots of the Etruscans to Anatolia and Central Asia, using archeological and linguistic evidence while corroborating this evidence with ancient sources such as writings of Herodotus. In his article, *Etrüsk Meselesi ve Bunun Şarktaki Vaziyeti*[58] [The Etruscan Issue and its Position in the East] , Giulio Jacopi makes similar arguments and uses similar methods to Brandenstein's to follow the roots of Etruscans in Anatolia while finding similarities between the Hittite language with the language of Etruscans.

There are few works which provide primary sources pertaining to the 1933 University Reform, arrival and employment of German émigré scholars and the general state of higher education system of Republic of Turkey. Horst Widmann's book, *Atatürk Üniversite Reformu,*[59] is significant not only as one of the earliest comprehensive studies on the contributions of German émigré scholars but also for its extensive coverage of how and where these foreign scholars were employed within Turkey's higher education system. The book offers detailed information and primary sources regarding the number of foreign scholars, their placements in specific institutions and departments, the courses they taught, their living standards, and various other pertinent data.

_____

[54]Georg Rohde, "Roma ve Anadolu İlâhesi". In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20 - 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları - Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 228-237, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010).

[55]Georg Rohde, *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater*, (Ankara: Ankara Halkevi Neşriyatı Büyük Boy No. 23, Müze ve Sergi Şubesi. İstanbul, Kenan Basımevi ve Klişe Fabrikası, 1940).

[56]Wilhelm Brandenstein, "Etrüsk Meselesinin Şimdiki Durumu", In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20- 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları- Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 211-219. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010).

[57]Wilhelm Brandenstein, "Limni'de bulunan kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan neşet ettiklerine dair dil bakımından en ehemmiyetli delil," In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20- 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları- Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 1044-1051, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010).

[58]Giulio Jacopi, "Etrüsk meselesi ve bunun şarktaki Vaziyeti," In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20- 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları- Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 1051-1061. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010).

[59]Horst Widmann, *Atatürk Üniversite Reformu* (1981); Horst, Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000).

Similarly, Ersoy Taşdemirci's book, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*,[60] on top of the examination of the reform issue and the phenomenon of German scholars' immigration, is a significant source for offering a compilation of primary source materials from the Archives of the Ministry of Education, which were lost in a fire in 1947. These materials encompass official records such as contracts of the foreign scholars and experts, Turkish officials' correspondence with these foreign academics, university directives and reports, and appointment documents for university leaders and faculty deans. These documents do not only pertain to the German émigrés but also other foreign academics who worked and resided in Republic of Turkey between 1933-1947. Among these, the contracts with émigré professors are of particular importance for this thesis as they shed light on the specific rights and obligations that were granted to them.

As this study focuses on the scholarly work of German émigrés in Turkey it is important to examine their personal experiences and views for historical contextualization. Several of the German émigré scholars wrote about their experiences of Turkey in their memoirs.[61]These memoirs give an insight into the émigrés' emotions and thoughts about several topics, such as their reception in Turkey, their observations about the country and its people, and their thoughts about their own economic and social situations alongside their observations about both their émigré and Turkish friends and colleagues. Many of these memoirs also possess assessments of the Istanbul and Ankara Universities, the university reform, the higher education system of Turkey, and the scholarly and educational work émigrés were employed to do. Among these some of them stand out for the depth of analyses and breadth of information they provide about the socio-political background of the emigration and employment process, the institutions in which the émigrés worked and the scholarly output of the émigré scholars. Phillipp Schwartz's and Fritz Neumark's memoirs are of particular importance here.

Phillipp Schwartz was a German-Jewish professor of pathological anatomy and medical doctor of Hungarian descent. He wrote about his experiences in Turkey in 1945, at the end of WWII.[62] From his work we observe that, in 1933, Schwartz became one of the founders and the leader, for a certain period, of Die *Notgemeinschaft*

---

[60]Ersoy Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*.

[61]There are several memoirs by German émigrés translated from German to Turkish and published in Turkey. Some of the most notable are Ernst E. Hirsch, *Hatıralarım – Kayzer Dönemi, Weimar Cumhuriyeti, Atatürk Ülkesi*, Translated by Fatma Suphi, (Ankara: TÜBİTAK Popüler Bilim Kitapları, 1997); Reiner Möckelmann, *İkinci Vatan Türkiye: Ernst Reuter'in Ankara Yılları*, Translated by Ahmet Arpad, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2020); Rudolf Nissen, *Aydınlık Sayfalar Karanlık Sayfalar; Bir Cerrahın Anıları* (İstanbul: Epsilon Yayıncılık, 2023).

[62]Philipp Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*.

deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland [The Solidarity Community of German Scientists Abroad]. An association that was founded after the start of liquidation of German-Jewish scholars in German universities brought on by the anti-Jewish policies of National Socialist government of Germany. This community was founded to help the persecuted academics to find a safe place to work outside of Germany. As the leader of this association, Schwartz himself negotiated with the Turkish government for the employment of many German émigré scholars and experts. Then he migrated to Turkey in search of a place to continue his professional career and help his émigré colleagues. Schwartz's first-hand experiences shed light to the political and social machinations that were at hand in the process of migration and employment of German émigrés in Turkey. His memoires also differ from many of the memoirs of German émigrés, as Schwartz compiled them right at the end of WWII with the defeat of Germany. Because of that events in his memoirs are nearly as vivid as those that can be found in diaries.

Fritz Neumark, was German-Jewish economist who made significant contributions to the development of economics education in Turkey and the drafting of income tax laws. He worked at the Istanbul University's Faculty of Economics between 1933-1953. In 1980 Neumark wrote his memoirs under the title, *Zuflucht am Bosporus, Deutsche Gelehrte, Politiker und Künstler in der Emigration 1933-1953* [Refuge on the Bosphorus, German Scholars, Politicians and Artists in Emigration], it was later translated to Turkish and published under the title, *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar: Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları, 1933-1953*.[63] His memoires delve into issues such as the reasons for the departure of foreign scholars from Germany, how they took office at Istanbul University, and their adaptation to social life in Turkey. Neumark also dedicates a significant portion of his memoirs to discuss nearly all of his German speaking colleagues' personalities, their personal experiences and their works. For that reason, Neumark's memoires stand out not just as an evaluation of the experience of emigration and the process of University Reform but as a nearly complete catalogue of German émigrés who resided and worked in Turkey between the 1930s and 1950s.

Arif Müfid Mansel's brief *in memoriam* should be noted as a significant primary source on Bosch's biography.[64] Arif Mansel himself was an archeologist and historian who worked with Bosch in the Istanbul Archeology Museum, Istanbul University and on various archeological expeditions for years, and by his own account was a

---

[63]Fritz Neumark, *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar: Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları: 1933-1953*, Translated by Şefik Alp Bahadır, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Maliye Enstitüsü, 1982).

[64]Arif Müfid Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)". *Belleten* XX, 1956, 295-303.

close friend of Bosch. This work, written shortly after Bosch's passing, provides valuable first-hand insight into Bosch's character, scholarly output and academic interests. Mansel provides the most crucial information for this thesis regarding Bosch's academic output by providing details of Bosch's scholarly works and interests prior to his arrival in Turkey.

Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi; Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)[65] should be noted here as well, as it examines and presents many documents pertaining to Bosch's life and academic work, both before his arrival in Turkey and after, such as his contract with Istanbul Archeology Museum, his reports to Istanbul University and some of his personal correspondence with his family members.

1.3 The Research Questions and the Aims of the Thesis

This thesis aims to examine the influence of German émigré scholars on Turkish historiography in the 1930s and 40s in the context of the Turkish History Thesis and the turn to humanist historiography in the 1940s. It focuses on the scholarly works of the German émigré Clemens Bosch. The study examines the content and discourse of Bosch's textbooks and articles written during his work at the Istanbul Archaeology Museum and later at Istanbul University, with special attention to tracing the influences of the works. In order to achieve this, the study contextualizes and historicizes Clemens Bosch's works with his publications in Germany and within the scholarly works of other foreign scholars, such as the German émigré scholar Georg Rohde, the Italian archaeologist Giulio Jacopi, and the Austrian Indo-Iranian and Indo-European scholar Wilhelm Brandenstein, who were active in Turkey in the 1930s and 40s. By examining the works of these foreign scholars, the thesis aims to understand whether the discourse and the content of the historical narrative constructed in these academic publications belonged exclusively to the Turkish History Thesis or whether they were influenced by different scholarly trends and sources. Moreover, this study seeks to recontextualize the relationship between professors like Bosch and the Turkish Republic, arguing that the view of history in the works of German scholars before they came to Turkey is similar to the narrative of the Turkish state in many ways, but for different reasons and in different ways.

In addition, the thesis also means to further historicize Bosch's works by looking at scholarly publications made in 1980s on similar topics, by historian and political sci-

---

[65]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Türker Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi.*

entist Martin Bernal and archeologist Manfred Korfmann. Both of whom employed similar methods and sources as the above-mentioned scholars towards different ends.

Through this analysis, this thesis seeks to critically examine these scholarly works to ascertain the quality and extent of their impact on Turkish academia and historiography. It also aims to reimagine the German scholars' relationship with the Republic of Turkey, especially in the construction of the history narratives, as an alignment of scholarly and intellectual interest. While also problematizing the ideas of modernization and integration with the Western cultural sphere of Turkey in the early Republican period.

1.4 Overview of the Chapters

The chapters of this thesis do not follow a chronological order in each part but instead offer a combination of chronology and thematic narrative. The introduction lays the basis of the thesis, provides an overview of the literature and the sources on the subject, while presenting the main arguments and questions of this work.

The second chapter provides the background information of Republic of Turkey's efforts to reform *Darülfünun* and transform it into Istanbul University with the contributions of German émigré scholars, alongside the evolution of Early Republican historiography from 1920s to 1940s. These parts aim to show how the construction of a new historical narrative, Turkish History Thesis and later the shift towards a more humanist approach, and the restructuring of the higher education, University Reform of 1933, went hand in hand.

The third chapter provides a biography of émigré German professor of ancient history, Clemens Bosch. As Bosch's works provide the focal point of this study, presenting his personal experiences and examining his professional and scholarly interests and efforts are instrumental to parse out the influences which impacted his scholarly output in Turkey. Second part of this chapter examines Bosch's earlier works which he authored in Germany before arriving in Turkey, from secondary sources, to find throughlines between his early scholarly output and the works he produced during his time in Turkey.

The fourth chapter focuses on Bosch's article he presented in the Second Turkish History Congress in 1937. The article examines Anatolian cultures' impact on several other cultures of Mediterranean basin from the stone ages to rise of Christianity through several perspectives, mainly from the perspective of cultural diffusion. Here

Bosch's ideas on Anatolian religions' origins are compared and contrasted with Georg Rohde's arguments on the same subject found in his articles from 1937, presented in the Turkish History Congress, and one from 1940, the extended and edited version of his paper from this congress.

The fifth chapter analyzes content and discourse of Bosch's textbook on Roman history, which narrates the Roman history from the foundation to the end of the Roman Republic, he authored for the bachelor students of Istanbul University History Department in 1940. Bosch's approach to Roman state, society and culture is examined. In this chapter particular attention is paid to how Bosch presents ideas of cultural diffusion and adaptation with an eye towards the linkages and throughlines constructed by Bosch between the socio-political and cultural traditions and practices of ancient Anatolia and Etruscans and Romans. Bosch's ideas about Etruscan and Roman origins in Anatolia are compared and contrasted with Georg Rohde, Wilhelm Brandenstein, and Giulio Jacopi ideas on this subject of ancestry. Furthermore, these works are also juxtaposed with historian Martin Bernal's arguments about resituating the Western civilization's origins to Africa and Asia, and archeologist Manfred Korfmann's reevaluation of Troy as an Anatolian, specifically a Hittite culture, city to demonstrate that the Turkish historical narratives' arguments from 1930s and 40s were not entirely unique to their time and place.

The sixth chapter focuses on Bosch's textbooks on ancient Greek history, the first book focuses on the conquests and the empire of Alexander the Great while the second one examines the Successors Kingdoms until their incorporation into the Roman state. This chapter examines Bosch's ideas on the formation and spread of Hellenic culture in the Mediterranean. It also discusses how these textbooks, including the one on Rome, now move away from the racial categorizations of the Turkish Historical Thesis, in line with the shift in historiography of the 1940s, to a narrative of high culture and low culture, and how this affects the narrative of history in the textbooks. This analysis emphasizes the coming together of different cultures to form a common culture and the comparison of common images and practices across many different cultures. It also examines the story of how the socio-cultural influence of Eastern cultures became embedded in the base of Western civilization.

2. UNIVERSITY REFORM OF 1933, ARRIVAL OF GERMAN SCHOLARS AND TURKISH HISTORIOGRAPHY IN 1930S AND 1940S

2.1 *Darülfünun* to Istanbul University

2.1.1 *Darülfünun* until the Republic

1863[66] marked a significant moment in Ottoman Empire's history. The first university of the empire, *Darülfünun*, opened its doors and an eclectic group of scholars, government officials, and civil servants started giving lectures on a cornucopia of topics, form chemistry to history. The lectures were open to public and garnered great attention.[67] Establishment of *Darülfünun* was a significant step in the modernization efforts of the Ottoman Empire and the culmination of nearly 20 years of hard work by state's various officials.[68] The second half of the 19th century was difficult time for the institution as it was reorganized and opened several times under different names, curricula, different administrative structures and in various different locales. These closures, restructurings and relocation stemmed from various different reasons. The Ottoman Empire's financial and educational infrastructure was relatively inadequate to sustain the level of continued education in *Darülfünun*. Moderniza-

---

[66]The beginnings of *Darülfünun* dates back to 1846. One of the aims of the establishment of the Encümen-i Daniş in 1851 was to prepare textbooks for the Darülfünun to be established. Osman Küçükler delves deeper into the Encümen-i Daniş, the institution which paved the way for the foundation of Darülfünun. Osman Zahit Küçükler, "Osmanlı Devletinde Eğitimde Modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş" PhD, Ankara University, 2016.

[67]The first classes in *Darülfünun* started in 1863 with a physics course given by Chemist Derviş Pasha on January 13, 1863, the first classes in the institution were open to public. During this period, Hekimbaşı Salih Efendi taught biology and Ahmet Vefik Pasha taught history. Most of the lecturers were high civil servants with upper-class backgrounds. İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 24-25.

[68]Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu and Emre Dölen, in their works, examine the foundation and development of *Darülfunun* from the earliest inception of the idea of a modern higher education system in 19th century Ottoman Empire to its transformation to Istanbul University in the Republican Period. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019); Emre Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1: Osmanlı Döneminde Darülfünun (1863-1922)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010).

tion of education was actively pursued by the state especially the second half of 19th century, however there was still lack of adequate secondary schools and high schools leading to a lack of qualified students in the empire that could continue their education in the newly minted higher education establishment. Moreover, *Darülfü-nun* the lacked necessary university facilities. There was an absence of qualified scholars and experts to employ because of the previously mentioned reasons. All of that was exasperated by the socio-political turmoil that was faced by the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 19th century.[69] However by the end of the century, aforementioned circumstances were relatively improved by the onset of reforms. The institution was reopened at the turn of the century in 1900 as *Darülfünun-i Şahane* under the under the auspices of Abdülhamid II,[70] the name invoked the connection and the fealty of the university to the sultan. During the Second constitutional Period, *Darulfünun* was reorganized and, renamed to *Darülfünun-i Osmani* in 1909 to detach the institution from the former connotations of its name.[71]The Committee of Union and Progress government, promptly after raising to power, made efforts to expand the institution and improve the quality of education.[72][73]

During WWI, *Darülfünun* continued its education. Through an agreement between the Ottoman Empire in 1915, German scholars were brought to *Darülfünun* and employed there until the end of the war.[74]The Ottoman government desired to extend the educational and scholarly capacity of the institution by opening new faculties and employing the necessary number and quality of experts and scholars. On the political side of things, this decision was intended by Germany and Ottoman Empire to lessen the French influence on the Ottoman education system and gradually replace it with German influence.[75]As a result of the agreement, eighteen German scholars were assigned to *Darülfünun's* faculties of Medicine, Law, Literature and

---

[69]The first attempt in 1863 stopped after a fire broke out in 1865, destroying the mansion where the *Darülfü-nun* operated and leading to the discontinuation of the public lectures that were originally conceived as the institution's inaugural educational programs. Later, *Darülfünun* was opened in 1869 with a dedicated building but shortage of administrative academic staff and lack of students led to its closure in 1872. In 1874 *Darülfünun* was inaugurated again as part of the Galatasaray Lycee, this formation lasted until 1881 and constituted the ground work for subsequent successful creation of the *Darülfünun* in 1900. İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 30, 42, 55-56; Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1*, 18-21.

[70]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 59-60.

[71]Ibid., 66-67.

[72]Ibid., 67-68, 70-71.

[73]Extending university education to women was one part of that expansion, a sentiment strongly spurred on by the atmosphere of optimism, freedom and fraternity. At first education was segregated but in time education of men and women was integrated together. İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 80-81, 83-84;Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1*, 468, 471-72.

[74]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1*, 468, 471-72.

[75]Ibid., 468-69.

Science between 1915 and 1918. The German professors, who started working with very high financial standards compared to their Turkish colleagues,[76]were expected to learn Turkish within two years and continue their lectures without an interpreter. However, this was never possible, except for a few philology professors who knew Turkish by profession.[77]The fact that the translators and the professors they assist are not experts in their professions lead to a disconnection between the students and the professors.[78]The entrance of German scholars did not have the intended effect. Dölen identifies numerous causes for this: The wartime shortage of funding, the lack of communication between German teachers and students, and the professors' incompetence and dishonesty prevented them from reforming the *Darülfünun* on their own.[79] The scholars left Istanbul in 1918 when Germany and the Ottoman Empire signed the treaties accepting defeat in the war.

2.1.2 *Darülfünun* during the Republican Period

After the establishment of the Republic, the *Darülfünun* maintained friendly relations with the Ankara government. This was facilitated by the celebratory mood following victory in the Turkish War of Independence and the proclamation of the Republic. The academic staff and students of *Darülfünun* actively supported government's efforts, contributing to the positive atmosphere between the institution and the government in Ankara.[80]These cordial relations helped in the university's efforts to acquire acceptance for its academic autonomy from the government, which the institution was striving for since the late Ottoman period. Subsequently, *Darülfünun* gained its legal identity status under a subsidiary budget in 1924.[81]Despite the changes in administration and academic autonomy, the core educational principles remained largely unchanged. However *Darülfünun* began to align itself, somewhat, with the new Republican ideology.[82]

In the latter part of the 1920s *Darülfünun* was criticized by both media and govern-

---

[76]Ibid., 472

[77]Ibid., 472-75.

[78]Ibid., 474.

[79]Ibid., 475-478

[80]In November 1922, the Darülfünun awarded Mustafa Kemal the title of honorary doctrora, one of the clearest examples of this support. İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 102-103.

[81]Ibid., 104.

[82]Ibid., 105-106.

ment officials continuously for a myriad of reason. The main tensions between the Turkish government and *Darülfünun* stemmed from the institution's reluctance to fully embrace Kemalist reforms. One of these reforms was the substitution of the Latin alphabet with the Ottoman Arabic script in 1928, which some faculty members felt erased cultural ties to the past. The *Darülfünun*contended that attempts to exclude Arabic and Persian influences from Turkish would detach the younger generation from their literary legacy from the Ottoman Empire.[83] This opposition extended to Kemalist historical narratives - the Turkish History Thesis- portraying ancient Anatolian and various Near Eastern peoples as proto-Turks, which many professors resisted as a state imposition on history.[84][85]

2.1.3 Transformation from *Darülfünun* to Istanbul University

As a result of the tensions between *Darülfünun* and the government that lasted for nearly a decade, the government initiated a new reorganization plan, culminating in the closure of *Darülfünun* and its replacement with Istanbul University, compliant with Kemalist ideals. This change was heralded by the visit of Minister of Education Cemal Hüsnü Bey in 1929, who emphasized quality above quantity and pushed *Darülfünu*n to spearhead Turkey's intellectual and educational revolution in line with Mustafa Kemal's goals. Cemal Bey urged *Darülfünun*, in spite of the institutions reluctance to accept a national role in promoting scientific advancement comparable to European norms.[86]

When debates over *Darülfünun's* reorganization heated up in 1930, the Turkish government's stance on the issue solidified. According to İhsanoğlu, priority of bringing the educational institutions into line with Kemalist ideals, prevailed as the dominant sentiment, paving the for officials to move forward with a reform plan. In response to these disputes and in accordance with the prevailing sentiment in the political atmosphere, the Republican People's Party Assembly decided in 1931 to seek support for *Darülfünun's* reform abroad.[87] Albert Malche arrived in Turkey in January 1932 from the consultation of the Swiss government to Turkey

---

[83]Ibid.,112

[84]Ibid.,113

[85]Zafer Toprak explores the resistance to the formation of a new historical narrative by analyzing Fuat Köprülü's careful approach to the anthropological sources and use of methodology associated with this new thesis. Toprak also examines how this thesis created a rift in historiography ecoles of *Darülfünun* and Ankara. Toprak, Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji, 181-83, 183-86, 186-87.

[86]Dölen,*Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 50-52. İhsanoğlu, T*he House of Sciences*, 113-114.

[87]İhsanoğlu, T*he House of Sciences*, 114-15.

or with the attestation of his former Turkish students,[88] under a contract mediated by the Turkish ambassador. Tasked with reforming Istanbul's *Darülfünun*, he did extensive research and talks with professors, government officials, and educational stakeholders. Malche conducted a complete examination of all faculties of İstanbul *Darülfünun*, including specialty departments such as the Institute of Turkology and the Electromechanics Institute. He attended lectures, seminars, and lab sessions to obtain a personal opinion on how the school worked. To that end, Malche interacted with faculty members, deans, and students. He also sought the opinions of various intellectuals, government leaders, and former professors of *Darülfünun* in order to obtain a variety of viewpoints. During the course of this extensive two-month tour, he also visited hospitals and other educational facilities and spoke with students. When he returned to Switzerland in March, he submitted a complete report to the Turkish Ministry of Education. Before his return to Switzerland, he also left a questionnaire for the administration of *Darülfünun*.[89][90] Albert Malche submitted his final detailed report, suggesting comprehensive reforms *Darülfünun's* curriculum, staff and academic structure, to the Ministry of Education on May 1932.[91][92]

Albert Malche returned to Turkey in May 1933 and took up the role of reform advisor, with the request of Turkish government, at the Ministry of Education. A reform committee was formed led by Malche, which included prominent figures such as Salih Zeki Bey, Avni (Başman) Bey, Rüştü (Uzel) Bey, Kerim (Erim) Bey, and Osman (Pazarlı) Bey. Pointedly, no representatives from Istanbul's *Darülfünun* were included.[93] This committee would play an instrumental role in dismantling the *Darülfünun* and restructuring its academic staff. The decision to dissolve the Darülfünun was presented to the Grand National Assembly in May 1933, supported by the Ministry of Education's claim that reforms were necessary.[94]Albert Malche emphasized underlined few crucial points for the continuation of the well-being of

---

[88]Emre Dölen states that it isn't conclusively known whether Malche was recommended by the Swiss government or decided upon after deliberation and attestation of Malche's former students. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 81-83; On the other hand, İhsanoğlu cites an Official report sent by the Minister of Education to the Prime Ministry dated December, stating that Malche was recommended by the Swiss government. İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 115.

[89]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 115-16.

[90]The questionnaire was handed to teaching staff through the rectorate. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 97

[91]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 116-17. Dölen summarizes this report. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 95-109.

[92]This report was later published., Albert Malche, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hakkında Rapor*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939).

[93]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 117.

[94]Ibid.,117-18

the new institution. He underscored the preservation of scientific and moral freedom, he also advocated for a new university model with scientific autonomy but administrative ties to the Ministry of Education.[95]The subsequent law, enacted on May 31, 1933 (No. 2252), officially dissolved the *Darülfünun* and established Istanbul University in its place effective August 1, 1933[96]. The new university's establishment, outlined in the law, centralized authority under the Ministry of Education. Minister of Education Reşit Galip Bey quickly appointed the necessary university leadership and other academics and implemented new laws. The reform resulted in a large purging of teaching staff, with many being replaced by émigré scholars.[97] İhsanoğlu underlines that this restructuring aimed not only to reform the institution but also to align the university closely with government policies and ideology.[98]

2.1.4 The Arrival of German Émigré Scholars in Turkey and their Employment in Turkish Universities

On April 7, 1933, the National Socialists, who had come to power in Germany earlier in 1933, enacted the *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service* in order to force university scholars, experts and other officials whom they disliked on racial and ideological ground. According to this law, those who did not fit into the racial and ideological framework of the German government were to be purged from public office.[99] With the enactment of the law, these individuals were retired or were removed from their positions. Those who did not comply with it were prosecuted through warnings and threats. The individuals who were still determined

---

[95]There is a pertinent part about the autonomy of Darülfünun in Malche's report, Malche states: *"The better it is for a state Darülfünun to ensure scientific freedom, the more appropriate it is for the government to assume responsibility for the selection of the administrative and educational staff of the Darülfünun. Political appointments are feared in every country. However, in trying to avoid this, one encounters appointments that are made under the influence of interest groups, which are even more worrying because they are even less motivated by the public interest."* Albert Malche, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hakkında Rapor*, 5. The translation is mine.

[96]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 118.

[97]A provisional staff was employed during the transition from *Darülfünun* to Istanbul University. This staff included those recruited from the old *Darülfünun* and those recruited outside the *Darülfünun*, such as young people who have studied abroad, and also foreign professors. Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 9-10.

[98]İhsanoğlu, *The House of Sciences*, 117. 119-20.

[99]The Clause 3 Section 1 of the law states: *"Civil servants of non-Aryan descent are to be retired; honorary officials are to be removed from official status."* The Clause 4 of the law states: *"Civil servants whose former political activity affords no guarantee that they will act in the interest of the national state at all times and without reservation can be dismissed from service. They are to be accorded their former salary for a period of 3 months after their dismissal. Thereafter, they will receive ¾ of their pension and corresponding survivor's benefits."* German History in Documents and Images. Volume 7. Nazi Germany, 1933-1945. *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service* (April 7, 1933). https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub$_d$ocument.cfm?document$_i$d = 1520.Accessed : 15.02.2024.

to fight on for their positions and dignity were arrested.[100] Faced with this situation, many scholars were forced to leave Germany. Most of them sought refuge in Switzerland. In Zurich, they founded an organization called the *Die Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland* [The Solidarity-Community of German Scientists Abroad] in order to find countries and institutions where they could live and work in safety. Phillip Schwartz, a German professor of pathological anatomy and physician, was appointed the head of this organization.[101]

Albert Malche contacted this association with a postcard[102]and informed German scholars that there were opportunities for them to work in Turkey[103]The association sent Schwartz to Turkey to initiate and continue negotiations with the Turkish government. Firstly, Schwartz met with Albert Malche, Salih Zeki Bey and Rüştü Bey, the leaders of the university reform process, and then with Reşit Galip Bey, the Minister of Education.[104] At this meeting, on 6th of July 1933, a list of possible German scientists to work at Istanbul University was prepared and a protocol was signed to be used as a basis for their appointment. According to this protocol, Phillip Schwartz was assigned to assist in communicating with the professors invited to Istanbul University and signing contracts with the scholars whose appointment was finalized.[105] The Turkish government assured the German scholars that their contracts would be for three years, but could be extended if necessary, that their salaries would be determined according to their standard of living in Turkey; their marital status, whether they had children or not, and their scholarly reputation, furthermore, that their travel expenses would be covered, and that they would be able to conduct their academic endeavors in safety.[106]

After his meetings with the Turkish government, Schwartz returned to Switzerland and forwarded the protocol and the list of scholars to all interested refugee scholars.[107] In mid-July, he returned to Istanbul to discuss the Turkish government's invitation and terms. During their meetings in Turkey Phillip Schwartz and Al-

---

[100]Schwartz gives a clear example how false suspicion and accusation were used against him for his persecution.Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 37.

[101]Ibid., 39-40.

[102]There is copy of this postcard on Widmann's work. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 380.

[103]Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 41.

[104]Ibid., 42.

[105]Ibid., 45.

[106]Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 42-46. More details of the protocol can be found here. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*,448-50. The list of those who were invited according to the protocol can be found in Widmann's work. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (1981), 225.

[107]Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 46.

bert Malche had prepared a model contract, which was presented to the Minister of Education, Reşit Galip. According to this sample, the contracts would include the following: on the part of the foreign scholars, classes would be taught in Turkish after three years, Turkish textbooks would be written, scholars' efforts would be entirely devoted to the academic and scholarly endeavors, they would participate in all activities related to education and awareness-raising work in public assignments, and each institute director would have the right to employ foreign colleagues or scientific assistants.[108] The requests and suggestions of the foreign scholars alongside the sample contract were approved by the Minister Reşit Galip.[109] The first agreements were signed in Geneva on October 4, 1933, with the attendance of Albert Malche, Phillip Schwartz and the relevant scholars in the presence of the Turkish Ambassador to Bern, Cemal Hüsnü Bey. The ambassador Cemal Hüsnü Bey signed on behalf of Refik Bey,[110]Deputy Minister of Education.[111]The final forms of the contracts were shaped by Phillip Schwartz, Rudolf Nissen, German émigré scholar and surgeon, and Albert Malche. These agreements were generally based on the same scheme and set out the relationship between the Turkish government and foreign scholars in terms of their professional rights and duties.[112]

The term of the contracts were five years and could be extended again at the request of the parties.[113] The scholars were obligated devote all their time and energy to the academic and scholarly endeavors of teaching and research. In this respect they were tasked with giving lectures, and conduct exams. On top of their lectures at university they were also obliged to give lessons to high school and teacher training

---

[108]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 12.

[109]Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 49.

[110]Ministry of Education Reşit Galip had suffered an accident at this point and had to be replaced by his deputy Refik (Saydam) Bey. This incident created doubts and hesitation in émigré camp about the finalization of the contracts and invitations. However, Refik Bey stepped in to reassure that invitations were still valid and promises on the part of the Turkish government were going to be fulfilled. Schwartz, *Kader Birliği*, 56.

[111]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 12-13.

[112]Ersoy Taşdemirci provides several of the first contracts, such as, the contracts of Fritz Neumark, Finlay Freundlich and Richard Honig. Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 140-55; Because these examples are in French, I am also referring to the Turkish translation, made by Emre Dölen, of Finlay Freundlich's contract, dated 15.10.1933. Dölen, T*ürkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*; 605-606(Text of the Agreement); Taşdemirci includes one of the contracts belonging to Clemens Bosch too. Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 156-57. Furthermore, Widmann, Taşdemirci and Dölen have evaluations of the contracts between the foreign scholars and the Turkish government. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 114-16; Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 15-17; Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 465-76.

[113]Widmann states that contracts could also be signed for 2 years, 3 years and 5 years. In general, an extension was only granted if the dean of the department to which the person was attached confirmed that his or her work was of "demonstrable benefit" for the country. Widmann gives the following example from Professor Breusch's account: *"In the early years, in order to organize these approvals, it was necessary to fill out and submit slips detailing the work of foreign professors, such as the number of lectures, publications, and conferences."* Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 115.

school teachers. Until the end of the third year, teaching can be in a foreign language (French, German or English). After the third year, scholars were obliged to teach the classes in Turkish. In three years from the beginning of the contract scholars were tasked with publishing textbooks on their respective fields in Turkish. They were obliged to carry out education and training activities for the public and specialists, and to advise state institutions as experts when necessary.

Alongside the obligations there were several rights afforded to foreign scholars as well. Professors' salaries were 500 TL net.[114][115] In case of the scholar's illness, the payment would continue for one year. In the event of the scholar's death, the payment would be made to his/her spouse and children. The Turkish government was to pay for their and their families' travel expenses and the transportation of their belongings during their arrival and departure. They had the right to invite "scholarly assistants" (ilmi yardımcılar in Turkish) they need in the fields of education and research.[116]

The German émigré scholars were employed in several institutions, mostly converging around Istanbul University and later, after its foundation in 1935, the Faculty of Language, History and Geography in Ankara.[117]In these institutions, German

---

[114]Fritz Neumark remarks that Turkish scholars of equal academic title were paid less than half of this amount. In turn, he states, this led to some anti-reform sentiment amongst some of the Turkish scholars. Neumark, *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar*, 16; Widmann makes a comparison between the wages earned by German émigré professors and their Turkish professor colleagues. According to his numbers foreign professors were being paid 500 to 700 Turkish Liras. A Turkish professor was paid only 150 Turkish Liras, including benefits. For comparison in 1933 1 Turkish Lira was equal to 2 Reich Marks. During the subsequent fall in the value of money, especially after the war, salaries increased. This was also the case for Turkish professors, whose salary coefficients were multiplied by a number corresponding to the depreciation of the Turkish currency. It should also be noted that foreign professors, unlike some local professors, were strictly forbidden to have a side occupation, that foreign professors generally could never live as cheaply as local ones, and that the salaries for giving lectures customary in German universities were not available in the same extent as in Germany in Turkey. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 343-44, 370-71.

[115]Dölen goes into the details about how much émigré scholars were paid. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 493.

[116]Widmann states this right was used frequently, especially in the beginning, and in addition to the refugee professors who were invited first, many new émigré assistants, lecturers, and various other assisting staff worked in İstanbul. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 115.

[117]German émigré scholars were employed in several different faculties in Istanbul University and the Faculty of Language, History and Geography The most of the German émigré scholars and experts were employed in Faculty of Medicine, 21 professors and 48 assistants. In Dentist school 1 professor and 3 assistants, in School of Pharmacy 3 professors and 2 assistants, in Faculty of Economics 6 professors and in Law Faculty employed the least number of foreign scholars employing only 4 professors. Faculty of Science and Faculty of Arts employed, respectively, 15 professors and 16 assistants and 16 professors and 13 assistants. Dölen, T*ürkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 497; According to Horst Widmann the total number of German and Austrian scholars who were employed in Turkey between 1933 and 1945 was 144. He counts 98 people working in İstanbul University, this number includes professors, lecturers and assistants. He further counts 5 more people who were working in other institutions of higher education (yüksekokul in Turkish) in İstanbul. Total of number of German and Austrians employed in Ankara in various higher education institutions in the same time period is given as 41. Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 211-212, 269; Arnold Reisman does not make a distinction between professors and the technical staff who emigrated with them. He also adds several people who migrated from countries other than Germany and Austria, such as France and Britian. He calculates the total number of émigré professors to be 188. This number includes several people, such as Vasily Vladimirovich Barthold, who were invited to Darülfünun before 1933 to give conferences or to work for a short period of time. Reisman, *Turkey's Modernization*, 474-78.

émigré scholars specializing in social sciences, languages and philosophy would go onto contribute to Turkey's academic and scholarly reforms in the shape of the scholarly-historical program of the Turkish History Thesis.

2.1.5 Hiring Criteria for Foreign Scholars and Issue of the Turkish History Thesis

Dölen and Taşdemirci discuss what kind of criteria was set for the hiring of foreign scholars for the Istanbul University.Both of them point out that there were no criteria -excluding one important caveat- process of selecting foreign professors for employment at Istanbul University and other institutions. Prospective scholars' curriculum vitae, scientific expertise, teaching qualifications were not evaluated. Moreover, interviews were not conducted by either Istanbul University or the Ministry of Education.[118] Taşdemirci references a quote on the only requirement on the part of the Turkish government regarding the foreign scholars, *"...that they should have been employed as professors in the universities of their own homeland and that their names should be recognized beyond the borders of their homeland."*[119] Taşdemirci also refers[120] to the German émigré scholar Ernst Hirsch reaching a similar conclusion from the postcard[121] sent to *Die Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland* by Albert Malche in 1933 regarding the requirements of the Turkish government for the choice of scholars.[122]

The lack of solid criteria on the part of the Turkish Republic was also evident in Phillip Schwartz holding sole authority in the matter of hiring scholars, who was conducting the interviews with the professors in Switzerland himself. These interviews primarily focused on the working conditions sought by the professors. Moreover, as mentioned before, Albert Malche and Schwartz defined the contract terms, leading to the selection of individuals for employment with their approval. The assistants were chosen directly by the professors who accepted the positions.[123]However, the Turkish government has identified a particular concern regarding the selection of

---

[118]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 448.

[119]*Milli Eğitimle İlgili Söylev ve Demeçler-II*, 147, Quoted in Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 18. The translation is mine.

[120]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 18.

[121]Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 380(Copy of the postcard).

[122]E. Ernst Hirsch, *Hatıralarım*, 189-90.

[123]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 448.

scholars. Specifically, in fields such as the history of Hittites, which constituted a crucial aspect of the Turkish history thesis, extensive and meticulous scrutiny was observed.[124] Dölen asserts that this scrutiny even extended to evaluating whether the individual in question adhered to the Turkish historical thesis or not.[125]

On January 1, 1937, Emil Orgetorix Gustav Forrer, a professor of Hittitology at the University of Berlin, wrote a letter to Cevat Dursunoğlu.[126] In this letter, a copy of which he sent to Fuad Köprülü and the Presidency of the Turkish Historical Society (Türk Tarih Kurumu in Turkish, TTK for short), Forrer mentions his background and studies. Forrer explains that being a professor of Hittite History and Language at Istanbul University isn't enough to carry out his plans. He aims to create a Hittite History Research Center complete with seminars, a library, and publications. He notes that current conditions in Germany restrict studies on Hittite history and expresses his hope to find a conducive working environment in Turkey. TTK wrote to the Ministry of Culture on February 3, 1937,[127]they stated that their aim was also to establish such a research center in Ankara. They suggested that if the ministry finds it suitable, they should be approached and convinced that their proposal has been received positively. They indicated their willingness to work and implement their plans in Ankara, contingent upon Forrer's acceptance of the Turkish national historical perspective.Through the Minister of Culture Saffet Arıkan, the TTK's requests were conveyed to Berlin. At the same time, Forrer also received a translation of Afet Inan's thesis read at the Turkish History Conference from Turkish Student Inspector in Berlin Reşat Şemsettin Sirer, as per the instructions of Saffet Arıkan.[128]

Taşdemirci, highlights a different issue regarding the sensitivity surrounding the Turkish history thesis. The lectures on General Turkish History and the Turkish Revolution Institute (Türk İnkılap Enstitüsü) at Istanbul University's Faculty of Arts were delivered in the form of conferences by members of the Turkish Historical Society from Ankara. Taşdemirci, points out that, upon investigation, it was discovered that these members of the Turkish Historical Society were not included in the 1933 Istanbul University Provisional Roster or the 1934 Istanbul University

---

[124]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 448; Taşdemirci, Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları, 18.

[125]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 448.

[126]Cevat Dursunoğlu was a Turkish student inspector in Germany-Austrian-Hungarian between 1930-1934. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 448.; Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 189-191.(The letter's text).

[127]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 184-185. (The text of the letter to TTK).

[128]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 449. Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 186-87 (The text of the Ministery's directives), 188 (Saffet Arıkan's letter to Reşat Şemsettin Sirer).

Main Roster.[129] Furthermore, no professors were assigned to the Chair of General Turkish History or the Turkish Revolution Institute in these rosters. Instead, a separate directive was prepared and sent to the University outlining the authority and responsibilities of the members of the Turkish Historical Society for the courses to be taught at these chairs and institutes. Ultimately, only one associate professor was appointed to the Chair of General Turkish History and the Turkish Revolution Institute.[130]

Dölen points out that since Forrer did not come to Ankara, it is understood that he did not accept the Turkish history thesis. According to Dölen, while there were no criteria in the selection of foreign scholars in various subjects, when a foreign professor was brought in for a sensitive subject such as the history of Hittite, they were required to accept the Turkish History Thesis. Dölen has a critical tone on the subject of only strict criterion for hiring foreign scholars being their adherence to the historical narrative.[131] Conversely, Taşdemirci, displays a rather positive attitude to the care and sensitivity shown towards the implementation process of Turkish history thesis and how this sensitivity manifested itself in the hiring choices.[132]

2.2 The Turkish Historiography During the Early Republican Era

2.2.1 The Turkish Historiography from 1920s to 1930s

The end of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the Republic of Turkey had a significant transformational impact on Turkish historiography. This was due, in part, to history's integration into the nation-state structure during the wanning years of the empire and birth of the Republic. During this time history writing served to strengthen national identity and unite citizens.[133]The change had already begun in the Ottoman era, when Ottoman historiography acquired a nationalized

---

[129]The temporary (1933) and permanent (1934) rosters of Istanbul University are given here. Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 75-97, 100-126.

[130]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 19.

[131]Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarih-3*, 450.

[132]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 18-19.

[133]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 176.

content, vocabulary and agenda.[134][135] During the early Republic, history played a pioneering role in the construction of national identity in the interwar period but the liberal sensibilities of the history writing approach that were acquired during the Second Constitutional period started to shift in 1930s.[136]

2.2.2 Late Ottoman Influence

Modern social sciences and professional academic research in these fields emerged during the Tanzimat reforms in the late Ottoman Empire. They combined Western ideas, methods, and approaches with the Ottoman intellectual legacy. The Ottoman intellectuals of this period were particularly influenced by the Enlightenment ideals and positivist theories that originated in France in 19th century. These theories and ideals were especially influential during Second Constitutional period through the translations of French texts to Ottoman Turkish.[137] For these reasons, the socio-political approaches and policies were heavily influenced by French ideas during the late Ottoman and early Republican periods.[138] Thus, Ottoman and later Turkish historians also framed their methods and intellectual approaches largely through the lens of French historiography and scholarship, rather than following the broader influence of the German Rankean school, which had a more global influence on historiography. Wearing the French influence on their sleeves Ottoman historians of the early 1910s and Turkish historians of 1920s placed considerable emphasis on issues such as geographic context, social structures, and religious practices.[139] The influence of Enlightenment ideals and positivism in the late Ottoman period, led to the emergence of a liberal approach to history education during the Second Constitutional period lasting until the early 1930s. Thus, during the interwar years, the West

---

[134]Sönmez, "A past to be forgotten?" 768.

[135]Sönmez goes into greater detail about how Late Ottoman historiography professionalized and acquired its nationalized traits. Erdem Sönmez, "Clio Between Revolution and Collapse: The Making of the Historical Discipline in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Modern Intellectual History* (2022), 1–22. 2022. doi:10.1017/S1479244322000439

[136]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 176.

[137]Ibid., 176.

[138]The term 'cooperation (tesanüt),' which emerged during that period, evolved into 'solidarity(dayanışma)' in the subsequent Republican years. The solidarist approach, which envisioned a classless society and rooted in French Republican thought, solidified and profoundly impacted Turkish society becoming the preeminent political ideal in Turkey during 1930s and 40s. Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 176; Taha Parla's book on the Ziya Gökalp's socio-political and cultural thought is a good examination of this classless ideal of Corporatism. Its roots and adaptation to the Turkish society is discussed at length. Taha Parla, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2020).

[139]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 177.

remained a beacon of aspiration.[140]However, influenced by Turkism, a primordialist view of history extended to Central Asia during the same period.[141] Consequently, while a strong European-centric historiography emphasizing citizenship was evolving, a primordialist approach, which included racial considerations, was also gaining prominence.[142] Although the conception of history to be constructed against the racist arguments of Europe towards the Turks caused Turkish mainstream historiography to move away from liberalism, the use of Western methodology and interdisciplinary studies in historiography to create a new identity that would help establish contemporary historiography in Turkey in the 1930s.[143]

2.2.3 A New Narrative: The Turkish History Thesis

In the 1930s, Turkish historiography began to move away from the liberal approach it had inherited from the Second Constitutional period. Thus, the scholarly establishment in Turkey began to criticize the Western-centric, Enlightenment-oriented and Social-Darwinist ideas of Western social sciences that had dominated Turkish scholarship until then.[144]This scholarly stance in Turkey was also a reflection of socio-political developments in the world. The loss of confidence in the West between the two wars and Turkey's distrust of the West combined to pave the way for the questioning of Western ideas and ideals.[145]This historical perspective has endured in certain circles up to the present day.

The 1930s were a difficult period for Turkish historiography, affected by the search for a new national identity and the 1929 Economic Depression.[146]The work of the Turkish History Research Society was essential during this period,[147]promoting a

---

[140]Ibid., 177.

[141]Etienne Copeaux shows that this search for the roots of the Turks in the steppes of Eurasia had its beginnings in Western Orientalism. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 16-17; Erdem Sönmez presents the Turkism that was emerging in the end of 19th century Ottoman history writing. Sönmez, Clio Between Revolution and Collapse, 11-12.; Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 161.

[142]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 177.

[143]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 140.

[144]Ibid., 129-30.

[145]Toprak underlines, citing Yusuf Akçura's speech from 1932, that Turkish historiography started to orbit around the Turkish race and human endeavors were viewed from this perspective. Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 132; Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 179.

[146]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 145.

[147]Copeaux underlines what the people who undertook this task represented. People like Yusuf Akçura, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, in 1930 were 50 and 61 years old respectively, they represented an intellectual continuation and transition of institutions they were in, such as Turkish Hearths, from the Ottoman Empire to the Republican period as they were scholarly and politically active in both eras. There were also other members

36

historical narrative that, although anchored in contemporary historiography, also adopted a romanticized approach, which Atatürk championed in his efforts to reform language and history.[148]One of the crucial fruits of the society was the construction of a new historical narrative called the Turkish History Thesis.

The Turkish History Thesis was a scholarly-political program that aimed to construct new a historical narrative which sought to create a national identity through the study of Turks' ancient past. It asserted that Turks originated from Central Asia and migrated in waves to regions including China, India, the Balkans, Middle East, Northern Africa and Anatolia, bringing civilization to these areas.[149]It rejected Western claims of Turks being of "yellow or Mongol" race, claims which categorized the aforementioned races and Turks racially and culturally "inferior" to Europeans,[150]instead classifying them as an "Alpine subgroup", specifically those who possessed a brachycephalic phrenology,[151] of the Caucasian race.[152] Atatürk took a personal interest in opposing such racial categorizations by presenting his Turkish History Thesis during the interwar period.[153]In 1930 intellectuals, under the umbrella of THT program, sought to position Turks as equals with Western nations, rejecting the notion that Greece or Mesopotamia were the exclusive cradles of Western culture. THT claimed Turkic peoples shared a Hittite ancestry of Central Asian Aryan origin, asserting they maintained racial and linguistic continuity since prehistoric times.[154]In addition, with this program, historiography turned its attention to Anatolia and endeavored to reveal the importance of this geography and the cultures on it in the history of civilization.[155] A variety of sciences and dis-

---

of Turkish Hearths who were young at the inception of Turkish Hearths but managed pursue careers during the Republican period, such as Reşit Galip, Haşan Cemil Çambel, Sadri Maksudi (Arsal), and anthropologist Reşit Tankut. These older generations would pass on the intellectual heritage of the Young Turks to young Kemalists such as anthropologist Şevket Aziz Kansu (born in 1903) or historian Afet İnan (born in 1908). Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 38.

[148]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 179.

[149]Toprak, *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si*, 181; Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 164; *Copeaux, Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 40.

[150]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 134, 139.

[151]Brachycephalic is an anthropology term which is used for phrenologically categorizing people. In anthropology, some neolithic human groups were identified thusly. In 19th and 20th centuries European race of was claimed to be belonging to this group.

[152]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 164; Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 170.

[153]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 137, 141-45; Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 161.

[154]Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 36; Suavi Aydın states that many people of Asia Minor were grouped together under the name "Proto-Turks". This categorization was justified through anthropology and linguistics. Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative",38.

[155]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 319.

ciplines were employed in this program, such as history, linguistics, geography while archeology and anthropology became the foremost[156] disciplines which provided the thesis with its key sources and evidence.[157]

2.2.4 Institutional and Scholarly Background of the Turkish History Thesis

On 26th April of 1930 during the 6th convention of Turkish Hearths (*Türk Ocakları*),[158]Afet İnan, Atatürk's adoptive daughter and history teacher gave a speech.[159] In this speech, she claimed the authentic history of the Turks was crucial for bolstering national identity and Turkish pride. She proceeded to revisit the key themes of Turkist historiography and outlined the core principles of the historical theses: the ancient origins and extensive geographic reach of Turkish history; the exaltation of the Hittites, considered the earliest Turks in Anatolia and Central Asia; and the remarkable contributions of Turkish civilization, which influenced the development of Greek and even Roman cultures during Classical Antiquity via the Etruscans.[160]She stated that this speech was given with the permission of Atatürk and help of other intellectuals in the Turkish Hearts with the express purpose of creating a committee within Turkish Hearths which aimed to examine and study history of Turks. Afet İnan submitted a motion with 40 signatures, requesting the establishment of this society.[161][162] Thus, *Türk Tarihi Cemiyeti*(Turkish History Society) -which was the continuation of *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni* (Ottoman Historical Comittee)[163] which

---

[156]Aydın demonstrates the keen interest displayed by the Republican elite in anthropology, as evidenced by their prompt establishment of the Institute of Anthropology soon after the Republic was founded. The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative",38.

[157]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*,137, 145; Suavi Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative", 38.

[158]The Turkish Hearths is a non-governmental organization that emerged during the Second Constitutional period with the aim of developing and organizing the idea of Turkism-Turkish nationalism. See Füsun Üstel's comprehensive work on the Turkish Hearths. Füsun Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020).

[159]Ibid., 336

[160]Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 36-37

[161]Üstel, *Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)*, 336-37.

[162]Copeaux adds the following about the meeting on April 26th. Afet İnan's speech was followed by statements by Sadri Maksudi (Arsal) and Reşit Galip. Arsal used Afet İnan's formula "Turkish is civilization, Turkish is history", this idea was not up for discussion and thus this presupposition would serve to identify every brilliant civilization as Turkish, at the same time ancient Turkish cultures would be glorified and, most importantly, these arguments would always emphasize the antiquity of the Turkish past. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 37.

[163]During the Second Constitutional period, the Ottoman Historical Society was established. Led by the state chronicler and comprising esteemed historians and intellectuals, many of whom were educators at

was renamed in 1918- was transformed into the *Türk Tarihi Tetkik Heyeti* (Turkish History Research Committee) under the umbrella of Turkish Hearths. On the 4th of June 1930 the first convention of Turkish History Research Society was held and the board of directors and its members were elected on the same date.[164]This new historical committee was tasked by Atatürk to study Turkish history and to uncover the contributions made to the history of civilization by the Turks alongside the construction of national historical narratives that helped create and support a Turkish national identity.

The committee's initial historical research effort[165]resulted in a substantial book published in late 1930 titled *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları* (The Outlines of Turkish History). This large volume, limited to just to 100 copies and aimed at intellectual and elite audiences, marked the first comprehensive exposition of ideas of the new historical narrative. The books was primarily focused on prehistory and ancient history.[166]Its second chapter introduced the main underlying arguments of the Turkish Historical Thesis. Here Central Asia was situated as the Turkish homeland and contribution to the civilization of various regions worldwide of Turkish migrations were underlined.[167] Subsequent chapters explored antiquity in China, India, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Anatolia, the Aegean, Italy, and Persia, emphasizing the positive effects of Turkish migration into these regions. This book reframed the history of Turks as the story of their homeland in Central Asia and their migrations to many regions around the world. In this narrative Turks were identified as a brachycephalic -which was a phrenological group European anthropology claimed that Europeans were part of and thus superior to others- through anthropological findings. Thus, Turks were viewed as drivers of advancement during the Neolithic and ancient periods.[168] In 1931, the Turkish Historical Research Committee printed 30,000 copies of *The Outlines of Turkish History* to rapidly disseminate these new

---

prestigious institutions, the OHS aimed to cultivate national consciousness and patriotism among the populace. Sönmez, "Clio Between Revolution and Collapse", 8-9.

[164]Copeaux underlines the duties of the elected members and what they represent: Mehmet Tevfik (Bıyıklıoğlu), secretary general of the Presidency, was elected president of the committee. Yusuf Akçura became vice-president and Reşit Galip, the secretary general, represented the populist tendency of the Turkic Hearths. Among the members were Vasıf Çınar, the Deputy Minister of Education, and Sadri Maksudi (Arsal). Copeaux also notes that: The presence of the Deputy Minister of Education in the delegation showed the importance attached to the transmission of knowledge, as Afet İnan underlined in her speech on March 26. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 38.

[165]According to Afet İnan, the work had already started long before the foundation of Turkish History Research Society with the directives to the society's future members by Atatürk in 1923. Work was conducted in Yalova, in Atatürk's residence, Ankara and İstanbul with Atatürk's attendance. Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 136, 509.

[166]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 136-37; Copeaux, T*ürk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 39-40.

[167]Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 40.

[168]Ibid., 39-40

perspectives to a broader audience, particularly to history teachers.[169]

2.2.5 Textbook of the New Narrative: *Tarih* (History, 1931)

As discussed before, in 1931 the *Türk Tarih Tetkik Cemiyeti*(Turkish History Research Society)[170] took over from the *Türk Tarihi Tetkik Heyeti*. This change was more than just a renaming; it involved replacing the Turkish Hearths with an institution directly overseen by the government. Thus, the government possessed near full control on how the historical narratives would be shaped moving forwards. The Society's first task was to write new school history textbooks. The emphasis placed on this task and the speed with which it was completed highlight the significance assigned to school textbooks in implementing the history reform. These textbooks drew direct inspiration from the Outlines of Turkish History and were authored by the same group of people.[171] These publications were printed on high-quality paper and were meticulously bound, and featured a cornucopia of images and illustrations including numerous detailed maps. This attention to detail alongside the layout and appearance of the textbooks demonstrated the significance Mustafa Kemal Atatürk placed on the Turkish History Thesis and its public dissemination. In contrast to the poor quality of previous textbooks from the 1920s, reflecting a shift towards producing elegant library books. At the time, access to education, especially at higher levels, was limited primarily to an elite few, although efforts were made to broaden access over time. To accelerate the dissemination of historical theses, a series was initially published for secondary schools, followed by editions for primary schools. All of these textbooks assigned great importance to the histories of ancient civilizations.[172]

The prefaces to each edition of the four-volume history books succinctly conveyed a move away from the Eurocentric Enlightenment view of history and the quest for a different kind of enlightenment while also emphasizing lack of interest Turkish history received over the years.[173] According to the preface: Until recently, Turkish history was among the least studied subjects in Turkey. Over more than a millennium of Islamic-Christian conflicts, historians portrayed Turkish history as a saga of

---

[169]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 137; Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 39-40.

[170]In the following years, the name of the organization would change to the Türk Tarih Kurumu (Turkish Historical Society). The organization continues to exist under this name today.

[171]Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 40.

[172]Ibid., 41.

[173]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 135-36.

conflict and valor, often blending Turkish identity with Islamic civilization. The Ottomanism aimed to unify the diverse elements of the Ottoman Empire, thus further marginalizing Turkish national history. All of these different socio-political trends influenced school curricula. In education, Turkish identity became associated with nomadic life, tribalism, and warfare. The Turkish History Research Society sought to rectify these interpretations by commissioning a book. In the preface of the textbook, Turkish History Research Society acknowledged the work's shortcomings and limitations, pointing out the vastness of the content and the time constraints. In the future editions, they planned to address the issues. Turkish History Research Society gifted this textbook to Ministry of Education for inclusion in school teaching.[174]

This work highlighted the influences of Turks on the histories of various peoples and cultures such as the Hittites, Egyptians, Sumerians, Romans, Chinese, Ancient Greeks, and others. According to the authors, the narrative of each ancient civilization typically began with a very primitive state that emerged from obscurity upon the arrival of Turks, subsequently making significant advancements that cannot be comprehended without acknowledging the Turks' role.[175][176]

2.2.6 The First Turkish History Congress (1932)

The Turkish History Congress held in July of 1932 in Ankara was the Turkish History Research Society's first congress. It was an important turning point both

---

[174] *Tarih-I: Tarihtenevelki Zamanlar ve Eski Zamanlar*, (İstanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1931), 31-32.

[175] Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 44.

[176] A few arguments that attest to these ideas found in the passages of this textbook is pertinent to this thesis's goals: *"The brachycephalic tribes that have been confirmed to have occupied the Mediterranean islands in ancient times (3000 - 1200 A.D.) were the Turks who had been forced to leave the world's source of brachycephalic peoples, Central Asia, the Mother Turkic Homeland. The similarity between the most ancient artifacts found in Crete and Turova and the artifacts found in the Turkic lands in the Caspian East is one of the pieces of evidence that not only shows the origin of the Mediterranean civilization but also the origin of the people who built it. It is not possible to consider the civilizations that rose on the western shores of Anatolia and the Greek Peninsula as separate from the ancient civilizations in Anatolia, Mesopotamia and Central Asia. Until recently, people were too ill-informed to imagine and accept a singular Greek civilization spanning the entire Mediterranean basin. To confine this civilization to the Greeks and to see it only in contact with the Egyptian civilization was considered to be a fact and a theory of history surrounded by a circle of certainty. In the years since the events of the birth and spread of civilizations have been analyzed in a broader perspective, this primitive notion has disappeared; it has been replaced by the fact that the origins of the Greek civilization, with all its gods, its traditions, its works of science and industry, must be sought in the civilizations that preceded it, especially in the Hittite civilization. Like the Lydian and Phrygian civilizations, which until the last century had their origins tied to a hypothetical Greek civilization, it is now an opinion that cannot be easily denied that the civilizations of Western Anatolia were essentially the continuation of the Hittite civilization." "As all the springs of Greek science, art and philosophy are in Western Anatolia, so is the root of Roman civilization. It is certain that the Etruscans, who established the foundation of this civilization, went to Italy from Anatolia. A close relationship between Etruscan art and Hittite and Lydian art has been established. Each new research, such as the American research in Sart, further illuminates the depths of this relationship. It is well known how much Europe has benefited from the civilization that the Etruscans instilled in Italy." Tarih-I: Tarihtenevelki Zamanlar ve Eski Zamanlar*, (İstanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1931), 31-32. Translation is mine. Copeaux also examines the same passages, however he uses a 1934 publication for middle schools, Ortamektep I, 1934. For that reason, there are slight differences but nothing that alters the argumentation. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 44.

culturally and in terms of historiography. In this congress, it was suggested that this Western-centric understanding of historiography, borrowed from the West itself in the 19th century, was denigrating Turkish identity in its historical narratives and therefore a national understanding of history should be constructed instead of the direct employment of Western methods and sources. For that reason, in this congress the Turkish History Thesis was further developed and effectively became the official ideology of Turkish social sciences. Despite its name, the conference was mainly concerned with prehistory and physical anthropology. Speakers emphasized the importance of these subjects in shaping the Western perception of the new Turkey. The aim was to redefine history by linking it to prehistory and archaeology, and sociology to anthropology.[177]

Before 1932, the Turkish historiography had largely followed a transmissive, pro-Western narrative since the late 19th century, even as efforts were made to ground it in scientific methods during the Second Constitutional period.[178]The attendants at the congress argued that this approach had undermined Turkish national identity. Instead, they advocated for a new, nationalistic history to rectify this. This approach was to bring Turkish historiography closer to romantic ideals. In spite of that, it also aimed to align history writing in Turkey with modern historical standards[179] This was to be achieved by placing history on a much broader base of sciences.[180]

One of the main goals of the First Turkish History Congress was to create a unified national identity based on a historical narrative that highlighted the antiquity and achievements of Turkish culture in Anatolia and Central Asia. This was particularly crucial after the defeat in in the First World War and the subsequent collapse of the Ottoman Empire. At this time substantiating and validating the significance of Turkish culture with an eye towards securing a historical claim on Anatolian lands became a matter of life and death for the Republic of Turkey. Moving forwards with that perspective, Turkey sought to establish itself as a modern nation-state with a clear and distinct cultural identity while corroborating its historical stake on the lands which the country was founded on.[181] In light of this, the narrative that was presented at the convention emphasized the legacy of the Anatolian and Central Asian Turks as well as their subsequent contributions to global civilizations.

---

[177]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 145-47, 148-49.

[178]Ibid., 146.

[179]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 133-34, 146.Ersanlı, *İktidar ve Tarih*, 178-79.

[180]Copeaux, T*ürk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 45-46; Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*,149, 158.

[181]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 137, 147, 148-49; Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 39-40; Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 161, 164-66.

Unlike Western narratives that often portrayed the Turks as outsiders or invaders, this narrative declared the Turkish presence in Anatolia as natural and continuous. Furthermore, this nascent historical narrative on Turkish culture promoted cultural and racial superiority and positioned the Turks as equal or even superior to other nations in their contributions to human civilization.[182]This claim was based on archaeological and anthropological evidence suggesting that the Turks were pioneers in agriculture, technology and state-craft long before similar developments in Europe.[183]

The role of the Ottoman history in the First Turkish History Congress was also highlighted. Erdem Sönmez emphasizes that while the main goal of the congress was to promote the Turkish History Thesis, with a focus on ancient Turkish civilizations in Anatolia and Central Asia, discussions also regularly emphasized the Ottoman Turks and their significance in overall Turkish history.[184]Sönmez gives two examples from the congress to corroborate the importance given to study of Ottoman history. In his presentation, notable historian Fuad Köprülü, was referring to the Ottoman Empire as a remarkable political achievement of Anatolian Turks. While Yusuf Hikmet (Bayur), who served as the Secretary-General of the Presidency of the Republic at that time, similarly praised the grandeur of Ottoman-Turkish civilization and celebrated their accomplishments in arts and sciences.[185]

In the congress Turkish intellectuals were strongly emphasizing Turkish achievements and autochthony. Despite this emphasis they were deeply integrated with Western school of thoughts and methods. Their practices, approaches and sources were heavily influenced by Western ideas. Thus, Turkish scholars and intellectuals were reliant upon Western ideas and argumentations to corroborate and bolster their own arguments. Through this integration Turkish scholars were enabled to interact with Western scholarly works while also opposing Western-centric historical narratives that neglected or distorted Turkish contributions.[186] This also stemmed from

---

[182]Toprak, Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji,149, 157-58, 178-81; Hanioğlu points out that Turkish claims could be positioned as the political and diplomatic situation required. During the negotiations for Alexandretta Sanjak (Hatay province), quoting Atatürk, that *"The Turkish homeland of four thousand years [Alexandretta]cannot remain a prisoner in the hands of the enemy."* On the other hand, when Turkish government sought reconciliation with the Greek government, the Turks decided to emphasize the Anatolian origins of Greek culture through the linkages with Trojans, who, in the Turkish historiography of the time, were considered proto-Turks. Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 166.

[183]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*,148-49, 157-58; Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 32-35. Hanioğlu, *Atatürk*, 164-65.

[184]Sönmez, "A Past to be Forgotten?", 757-58.

[185]Ibid., 758.

[186]While opposing Western science, the Turkish History Thesis in the construction and corroboration of arguments used sources and ideas taken from the West. This trend persisted with Turkish governments' support of thinkers and scientists brought from the West to Turkey. This phenomenon became a key

the fact that Turkish historiography emerged as an extension of Western orientalism, during a period when orientalist perspectives were automatically accepted as authoritative and scientific. Turkish academics purposefully included data appropriated from Western sources to support their claims, despite persistent beliefs that Turks are less intelligent than Europeans. This deliberate application of orientalist techniques laid the groundwork for a new ideological vocabulary in which facts, interpretations, and terminology were carefully selected to preemptively construct arguments against detractors by rendering refutation all but impossible.[187]THT systematically relied on lesser studied areas of historical research, such as Hittite, Sumerian, Etruscan, which were at time not thoroughly researched as ancient Greece or Rome, and employed the logic of "the impossibility of a third option,"[188] which was frequently repeated in school textbooks and commonly found in academic discourse of the Turkish History Thesis. In simple terms, Copeaux explains that, generally, if a people group or culture could not be identified as Indo-European than they were identified to be of Turkish origin in the historical narrative.[189]

The main purpose of the First Turkish History Congress, beyond its scholarly concerns, was to train and equip teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively teach the newly created history curriculum of the Turkish Ministry of Education. This new curriculum, based on the arguments and historical narratives of the Turkish History Thesis, was to be used by young teachers to instill in new generations the ideas of unity, solidarity and Turkish national identity. Thus, with this education system, future generations would assure the survival and advancement of Turkish values, thanks to the ideals they were instilled with.[190]

---

part of Turkish historiography in this period. The fact that Afet İnan's thesis on anthropology was built on the arguments of Eugene Pittard's book and the fact that Pittard later played an important role in the advancement of the Turkish Historical Thesis are some indicators of this. Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 157-58, 309-12; Another indication came in the form of the construction of the discourse. Regarding the three speeches delivered at the Turkish Hearths in April 1930, Copeaux states: *"...what is important, however, is not the correctness of the reasoning, but the use of the opinion of an authority as evidence: the statement of the greatness of the Turks gains weight when it comes from the pen of a Westerner rather than from the pen of a Turk."* Copeaux repeats this sentiment about the Turkish History Thesis's usage of Western sources while refuting Western arguments about Turks. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 37, 52.

[187]Copeaux cites Edward Said on the subject of artificial authority created by orientalist approach. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 51-52.

[188]The impossibility of the third option was a method of corroborating one's argumentation by providing two possibilities to a problem while disregarding the possibility of other solutions to it. Copeaux states this method was used extensively in Turkish History Thesis. The Turkish historical narrative often drew upon lesser-known fields of historical research, such as Hittite, Sumerian, Etruscan, and Hun history. It frequently employed a "the impossibility of a third option," in school textbooks. Thus, that if a people or their language did not belong to the Indo-European family, then it could be classified as Turkic. Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 53.

[189]Ibid., 37, 52-53.

[190]Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 46; Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 148.

Moreover, the establishment of Faculty of Languages, History and Geography in Ankara in 1936 became one of the lasting outcomes of the reform program which included THT. Here, German émigré scholars were to play an instrumental role in the foundation of the Republic's nascent higher education institution. This faculty was designed to encompass a broad spectrum of disciplines. In later decades, it played a pivotal role in fostering the development of social sciences within Turkey.[191]

2.2.7 The Second Turkish History Congress (1937)

The Second Turkish History Congress was held in September of 1937 in İstanbul. It marked a significant evolution from the its predecessor, the First Turkish History Congress. It attracted a diverse international audience and expanded its scope beyond the first congress by inviting many foreign scholars from abroad and including German émigré scholars from Turkey. It encompassed a wide range of historical topics from history of Ancient Greeks and Romans to Seljuk and Ottoman art and architecture. It was led by honorary president Eugene Pittard, a renowned anthropologist. The congress also featured distinguished Turkish scholars. The vice-chairs included Hasan Cemil Çambel, Halil Ethern Eldem, and Afet Hanım. Çambel, upon Yusuf Akçura's death in 1935, became the President of the Turkish Historical Society and was elected an honorary member of the German Archaeological Institute in Berlin. Halil Ethem Eldem, an archaeologist, had previously led the Istanbul Archaeology Museum, while Afet İnan contributed as an anthropologist and important speaker to the congress.[192] The caliber and the diversity of nationalities of people who were gathered in this congress reflected the care and attention given to this program by the Turkish government.

The opening speeches of the congress, featuring Afet Hanım's paper on the archaeological activities of the Turkish Historical Society, and choice of Eugene Pittard a prominent anthropologist who mentored Afet İnan and guided and worked with her on her anthropological studies on Turkey, as the honorary president highlighted that congress was primarily focused on anthropology and archaeology.[193] Following the

---

[191] Copeaux, *Türk Tarih Tezinden İslam Sentezine*, 48; Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 147.Ersanlı points out how the name of the faculty encapsulated the core tenets of the Turkish History Thesis and outlined its objectives: Language: Conducting comparative studies of languages such as Sumerian, Akkadian, Sanskrit, Chinese, and Hittite, which are considered related to Turkish by the Turkish History Thesis. History: Demonstrating the long-standing presence of Turks originating from Central Asia throughout ancient times and their contributions to other civilizations. Geography: Investigating and documenting Anatolian lands, regarded as cradles of civilizations, and asserting their significant Turkish historical influences. Ersanlı, *İktidar ve Tarih*, 199.

[192] Toprak, Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji, 308.

[193] Ibid., 309.

congress, foreign guests were guided to various Anatolian archaeological sites, including the renowned Alacahöyük, which had garnered international acclaim.[194]The congress showed a notable intersection of archaeology and anthropology, with numerous archaeological findings used to bolster anthropological claims. This underscored the congress's focus on employing archaeological evidence to substantiate discussions, particularly regarding the notion of race in anthropology.[195]

German émigré scholars, like Clemens Bosch and George Rohde, and various other foreign scholars were invited to the congress, such as Wilhelm Brandenstein, an Austrian scholar specializing on Indo-Iran history and culture, and an Italian archaeologist Giulio Jacopi contributed papers emphasizing Anatolian cultures' historical impact on world history, particularly on Etruscan, ancient Greek, and Roman civilizations.[196] These works heavily relied on archeological and linguistic evidence to make their claims. While featuring various anthropological assertions which corroborated the other evidence they employed or bolstered their main arguments by displaying the antiquity of the connections they claimed to have found between Anatolia and various other cultures.

Zafer Toprak summarizes the impact of the Second History Congress and the Turkish History Thesis on Turkish historiography, emphasizing its international recognition through the participation of many German émigré scholars and various scholars that presented their papers in the congress. The integration of German and various other foreign scholars to Turkish universities, especially the Faculty of Arts of Istanbul University and the Faculty of Language, History and Geography in Ankara, meant a significant academic collaboration and the bolstering of inter-disciplinary approach that was fostered since the beginning of 1930s.[197] Archaeology, linguistics, and anthropology became prominent disciplines focusing on prehistory and the emergence of cultures and races, in the creation and dissemination of the new historical narrative.[198]Thus, the Turkish History Thesis was widely acclaimed after the Second Turkish History Congress, challenging racial categorizations and arguing that Turks were essentially no different from Europeans. According to THT early societies in Egypt, Anatolia, and the Aegean were descended from nomadic Turks, who

---

[194]Zafer Toprak, *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, (İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2012), 162.

[195]Toprak, *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*, 309-10.

[196]Bosch, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı*; Rohde,"Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlâhesi";Brandenstein, "Etrüsk Meselesinin Şimdiki Durumu"; Brandenstein, "Limni'de bulunan kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan neşet ettiklerine dair dil bakımından en ehemmiyetli delil"; Jacopi, Giulio. "Etrüsk meselesi ve bunun şarktaki Vaziyeti".

[197]Toprak, Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji, 324.

[198]Ibid., 323.

established their own cultures in these regions and through their examples helped the advancement of the indigenous peoples of various geographies. This new understanding of prehistory and the ancient past challenged existing European beliefs about their racial heritage. This strategy has also boosted archeological research in Turkey. Until then archeological studies were predominantly conducted by the initiative of foreign experts and institutions, but with the attention given to archeological findings, used in the corroborating of the new historical narrative, studies started being predominantly conducted by the Turkish Historical Society and various other Turkish scholars and experts. Furthermore, the influence of anthropology extended to the use of geography as a discipline, as seen by the incorporation of geographical components into historical writing. This multidisciplinary approach represented a larger change in Turkish intellectual discourse toward scientific principles. While also helping oppose the prior Western imperialist view of Ottoman Turks as uncivilized conquerors.[199]

2.2.8 A Shift to Humanist History Writing

As discussed in previous parts, during early Republican period, the THT focused on promoting national identity through the use of archaeology and anthropology. This emphasis declined after Atatürk's death, especially during İsmet İnönü's rule. There was a shift towards humanist historiography which emphasized cultural diffusion and transmission more than concerns over "civilization founding characteristics "of the Turkish race.[200] Thus, anthropology, archeology and linguistics, studying the periods between neolithic age and classical antiquity, which were employed to situate the Turks as the progenitors of various cultures around the world began to fell out of favor. It was slowly being replaced by understanding of history which tried to situate the Turks amongst the various other significant cultures of world history without referring to racial categorizations. Archaeological efforts led by figures like Arif Müfit Mansel increasingly focused on Turkey's classical age, meaning Ancient Greek and Roman periods, moved away from earlier emphases on Hittites and Sumerians. The Translation Bureau, established in 1938, played a crucial role by translating Western and Eastern literary classics and texts from Ancient Greek, Latin and Persian into Turkish.[201]In the translation efforts, endeavors of émigré classical philologist Georg

---

[199]Ibid.,324.

[200]Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," 42.

[201]Reisman demonstrates how extensive this translation effort was. Many classics from Gothe to Shakespeare, Lao Tzu to Ömer Hayyam were translated to Turkish. Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms*, 80.

Rohde, translator Erol Güney working in the Translation Bureau and the substantial contributions of famous writer and translator Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, played a key role. Moreover, Greek and Latin programs were included in elite high schools from 1940 onwards.[202] This shift towards a more humanist approach to social sciences was led by the Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel in 1940s.[203]

In this humanist shift, establishment of the Translation Bureau was one of the most important steps. Reisman and Widmann underline the crucial contributions of Georg Rohde in this undertaking.[204] George Rohde was appointed to the Faculty of Language, History and Geography institute of Classical Philology in 1935. In Ankara, Rohde devoted himself to intensive translation work and other scholarly efforts. He became instrumental in the advancement of the institute of classical philology by constituting a dedicated library for the institute. With the support of Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel, Rohde and his student Samim Sinanoğlu pushed for the introduction of Latin in particular schools while authoring a Latin language textbook for this prospective language learning for middle and high school students. With the directives and support of Yücel, he and his students started working on large scale translation initiative at Ankara University. Rohde published the still very popular literary series translations from world literature, in which most of the Greek philosophers appeared in Turkish for the first time. During their time in Anakara, Rohde became close friends with Ernst Reuter, another prominent German émigré in Turkey, who later became mayor of Berlin. This friendship was sparked in the time they spend together discussing classical works in a group of Turkish and German intellectuals.[205]

Although classical studies, including classical archeology and philology, played an important part in the modernization and "Westernization" efforts of the Kemalist regime, they were not initially central to the national historical narrative that was being built during Atatürk's rule. They were integrated into the nascent Ankara University's Faculty of Language, History and Geography, however these studies were subordinated to THT and they supported the aims of studying Anatolian civilizations, such as Sumerians and Hittites. In 1940s classical studies gradually gained their independence and their value as separate disciplines was recognized. The beginnings of this sentiment could be observed already in the care and attention

---

[202]Reisman gives the example of Erol Güney, as Güney was a refugee escaping the Bolsheviks after WWI from his birth place in Odessa in the Russian Empire. Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms*, 81.

[203]Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," 42.

[204]Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms*, 79-81; Widman, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 237-40.

[205]Widman, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 239-40

given to the establishment of independent Greek and Latin language chairs in Ankara University in the 1930s.[206] There were several reasons for this shift occurring. In 1940s, Turkey politically and culturally was aligning itself with Anglo-Saxon-centred Western camp. This was caused by National Socialism's defeat and growing threat of the Soviet Union. Turkey did not want to be alienated from the Western Allies by continuing its program of historical narrative construction, THT, which so heavily relied upon racial categorizations built on anthropological evidence and had strong ontological groundings on romantic German nationalism.[207]Both of these ideals were falling out of favor because of their associations with Germany and its racist ideology. On the other hand, the main cultural reason was, as Suavi points out, not just the adoption of external signifiers of culture but the internalization of modern and humanist ideas which underpinned the Western world always had been a driving force in Kemalist Turkey.[208] The examination classical thought was crucial as it constituted the main basis of the Renaissance and Rationalism, which laid at the advancement of Western culture.[209] Arnold Reisman underlines the instrumentality of translations of ancient Greek classics in emergence of Renaissance while claiming that to the initiative taken by İsmet İnönü and Hasan Ali Yücel in the creation of the Translation Bureau to be similar in spirit.[210]

The previously mentioned rapprochement with the West made Turkey's classical archaeological sites more attractive to tourists and scholars. In this way, classical archaeology gained both political, economic and scholarly importance in Turkey, while still facilitating pursuit of the ideal of internalizing Western humanism.[211] At the same time THT's emphasis on the autochthony of Turkish people in Anatolia was no longer valid. Mission of nation building that was assigned to archaeology by Turkish History Thesis was challenged by international interest and cooperation, as well as the later slow falling out favor of the 1930s origins paradigm that was built on evidence constructed with the convergence of archeological and anthropological findings. Under these factors, archaeology in Turkey flourished in several

---

[206]Suavi takes this interest in classical studies even further back to Ottoman Empire. Aydın, The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative" 44.

[207]Ibid., 43.

[208]Widmann, citing Paul Moraux's eulogy speech for Rohde, underscores that circumstances in Turkey were ripe for advancement of humanist ideals in Turkey. Atatürk's initiatives and Hasan Ali Yücel's efforts are cited as the main reason for prioritization of study of classics. Widman, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu* (2000), 238

[209]Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," 43.

[210]Reisman, *Refugees and Reforms*, 85.

[211]Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," 43, 45.

regions.[212] The shift in the content of the nationalist paradigm led to the marginalization of anthropology and explanation of origins made through racial categorizations lost their cultural currency alongside archaeology, which focused on prehistory and proto-history to achieve national aims.[213]With the gradual move away from discourse of the Turkish History Thesis, Kemalist scholars began to argue that - instead of resolving questions of origins through racial categories and primordialist connections- the synthesis of the cultural heritage of the Turks from Central Asia and the traditions and cultural practices of the cultures in Anatolia constituted Turkish identity.[214]Mediterranean and Aegean cultures played an important role in this synthesis. The influence of Arab culture on the Turks was also recognized. However, Kemalist scholars argued that this influence generally disappeared after the 16th century and was replaced by Western influence.[215]In short, this synthesis view presented Turkish identity as a mixture of ancient Anatolian influence, Aegean civilizations and Western influence. This synthesis produced an identity that was both unique and particular. Therefore, from this synthesis point of view, the study of the ancient cultures of Anatolia and the Aegean became very important. This is why archaeology, the study of classical antiquity, remained important in Turkey and maintained a relationship of interest with the state. Thus, political, economic and academic support for archaeological excavations by the Turkish state continued.[216]

---

[212]Ibid., 43.

[213]Ibid., 43-44.

[214]Ibid., 44.

[215]Ibid., 44.

[216]Ibid., 45.

3. BIOGRAPHY AND THE EARLIER WORKS OF CLEMENS BOSCH

3.1 Bosch's Biography

Clemens Bosch was born as Wilhelm Heinrich Clemens Kümmel in 1899 in Köln, Germany into a well-to-do Protestant family. He was the youngest of three siblings. Even though he lost his father in an early age, his middle-class upbringing allowed him to receive a proper education. He served in the German army at the waning years of WWI, between 1917 and 1919, he was later awarded a medal for his service.[217] In his twenties, he continued his education in Berlin and Heidelberg, studying ancient history. He met his future wife Johanna in 1922 during his bachelor studies. He lost his mother in 1923, her passing prompted him and his older brother Max to be adopted by their close family friend Martha Bosch. With this adoption they changed their family name of *Kümmel*, which annoyed them for its resemblance to the word *Lümmel* (German for rascal), from that point on he was known as Clemens Bosch.[218]

He continued his studies in Heidelberg, completing a PhD with Professor A. von Domaszewski as his advisor. Bosch finished his thesis *Zwei Hauptquellen des Valerius Maximus* [Two main sources on Valerius Maximus] on Roman history and published it under the title *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Historischen Exampla* [The sources of Valerius Maximus. A contribution to the research of the Historical Examples] in 1929.[219]

After his PhD, Clemens married to Johanna. Johanna was born in 1902 as the daughter of Jewish father and a Protestant mother. Like Clemens's own family,

---

[217] Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi* , 13-14

[218] Ibid.,14-15.

[219] Ibid.,15-16.

they were a middle-class family who provided their daughter with a good education. Her father, Robert Kahn, was a famous composer who was good friends with Albert Einstein. Johanna was studying philology and archeology in Heidelberg when she met Clemens. She was also determined to continue her education, enrolling in a PhD program until she married Clemens and prioritized her family life over her studies.[220]

After finishing his dissertation Clemens was academically very active. He was granted a scholarship between 1925-1926, during which time he focused on the ancient history of Ephesus of Anatolia in universities in Berlin and Halle. Between 1927-1931 he received another travelling scholarship from German Ministry of Education to study "Imperial Roman coins which were produced in Asia Minor and their importance on the region." He travelled to England, France, and Austria to gather sources on the subject and took moulage copies (imprints) of coins related to his work. He was awarded the title of *Privatdozent*[221] from University of Halle for his thesis, "Coinage of Asia Minor during the Imperial Roman Period" in 1932. He was the head assistant of Halle University and was tutored by Professor Wilhelm Weber between 1930-1935. He later published his thesis work under the title *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit. II.Einzeluntersuchungen. I. Bithynien. I. Halfte* [The Asia Minor coins of the Roman imperial period. II. individual studies. I. Bithynia. I. Half] in 1935.[222]

The rise of National Socialist Party in 1933 disturbed him and his family. The law of 1933, *the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service* (April 7, 1933), did not affect Bosch at the time but his father-in-law was dismissed by the Nazis from his position in Prussian Academy of Arts due to his Jewish ancestry. The overall political atmosphere and Johanna's Jewish heritage, which according to Nürnberg Laws identified her to be a Jew to be persecuted, convinced the Bosch family to look for ways to find a way out of Germany. Unlike many other families with Jewish heritage, their main concern was not safety but employment, Clemens and Johanna thought that Johanna's heritage might cause Clemens to struggle finding work in academia in Germany. At the time, Bosch family hoped that this wave of anti-Jewish persecution would subside soon, so they were not as worried for their lives as much as they were for their livelihoods.[223] Clemens inquired to several places such as America, India and South Africa and Turkey, looking for a suitable position to

---

[220] Ibid.,16-18.

[221] University lecturer who is not a salaried staff member.

[222] Ibid.,15-16.

[223] Ibid., 21.

work.[224]

Clemens Bosch's inquiry coincided with the Turkish government's search for academics and experts. With the further assistance from a colleague working in İstanbul Archeology Museum, Professor Martin Schede, the Turkish government responded to his request.[225] Bosch began working as a numismatic expert in the Archeology Museum on 1st of November 1935. He came to İstanbul by himself, without his family, thinking that the political troubles in Germany would soon be over and he would get the chance to find employment in his homeland again. At first, he was contracted for only a year and was tasked with taking stock of, categorizing, and archiving ancient coins and medallions for exhibition purposes. Bosch had brought his prior research and the ancient coin imprints to İstanbul which became touchstones for his time in Turkey. His contract with the museum also included other requirements, such as preparing reports about his work and authoring academic or instructional works if needed. Bosch, sensing the need for more time to finish his work in the museum cataloging the numismatics section, asked for a three-year extension of his contract, which was delivered to the Ministry of Culture by the head of the museum, Aziz Ogan. His request, which included a proposal to Istanbul University for him to give classes on ancient coins to students of Ancient History department and courses on numismatics to museum staff on the museum's premises, was approved. His contract was extended and he began conducting the proposed classes. His work in the museum provided him ample sources to further his research on ancient coins of Anatolia. Nevertheless, he was only able to publish the results of his labor in 1951, under the title, *İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri. Eski Sikkeler Rehberi I.Bölüm: Yunan-Romen-Bizantin ve Avrupa Sikkeleri* [İstanbul Archeology Museum, Guide on Ancient Coins Part 1: Greek-Roman-Byzantine and European Coins]. However, he never managed to finish this catalog.[226] At this time, Bosch, also in accordance with his contract with the museum, contributed to Second Turkish History Congress of 1937 by authoring an article on the importance of Anatolia in ancient history.

It should be noted that during the period where Bosch worked in İstanbul Archeology Museum, his reports and correspondence were being translated from German to Turkish by Foreign Language Scribe (Ecnebi Diller Kâtibi) Münire Çorlu.[227] It is

---

[224]Ibid.,19-20.

[225]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin say that Martin Schede might have helped Clemens Bosch but this can't be decisively proven one way or another., Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 20; Mansel, on the other hand, decisively states that Martin Schede, who was the head of the German Archeology Institute, played an intermediary role between the İstanbul Archeology Museum and Bosch himself. Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)," 298.

[226]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 20-22.

[227]Ibid., 22.

also important to point out that Bosch was never able learn Turkish to a sufficient level, and his works and lectures had to be translated by assistants of the Ancient History Department of Istanbul University, such as Afif Erzen, Sabahat Atlan and Bahadır Alkım.[228]

Bosch family's worries were realized, and the anti-Jewish propaganda and violence had escalated to a point in Germany that their hopes for normalization of the political and social situation was crushed. There was no longer any point for them to stay in Germany. After Clemens' contract with the museum was extended and his future in the country secured, he brought his family from Germany in 1936.[229]In 1938, Clemens Bosch converted to Islam, taking the name Mehmet Emin and giving his children Turkish names. Clemens's long-time friend and colleague, Arif Müfid Mansel, later claimed in his memorial article for Clemens that he was a devout believer and that he observed the rites and rituals of Islam.[230]Oğuz and Nil Tekin, who authored Bosch's only biography, challenge that claim by saying that this conversion was a matter of convenience and security. They also state that Bosch never changed his nationality to Turkish even when he was considered a "Haymatloz" (in German Heimatlos, stateless), probably because foreign experts were paid more in Turkey.[231]Tekins say Bosch family were deprived of their German citizenship by the German government shortly after their arrival in Turkey, as per the practice of the Nazi government after 1937 renunciation of Jewish individuals from German citizenship.[232] A residence permit dated to 12th of January 1950 attests to Bosch's legal situation, it indicates his nationality as German(word for nationality here is uyruk in Turkish meaning family of origin) while also identifying him as a Haymatloz.[233] Several of the earlier documents pertaining to earlier years of his stay, from 1938 to 1944, in Turkey identify his and family's nationalities (tabiiyet in Turkish meaning citizenship or subjecthood) as German.[234]

Clemens Bosch officially applied for a position in the Faculty of Arts at İstanbul University, stating that his goal was to train students who could conduct research on the history of Anatolia, while demanding that his rights and duties be equal to those

---

[228]Ibid., 12.

[229]Ibid., 21.

[230]Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)", 299.

[231]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi* , 23-24

[232]Ibid.,24.

[233]Ibid., 191.

[234]Ibid., 190,192,193.

of a professor. Mansel points out that the relocation of the Istanbul Archaeological Museum's coin collection to Anatolia due to security concerns after the outbreak of World War II had an impact on Bosch's decision to request a reassignment. As with the removal of the coin collection entrusted to him, Bosch found himself less busy than before, which he did not want.[235]His request was accepted by the Ministry of Education and he resigned from his post at the Istanbul Archaeological Museum on October 31, 1939 and began his work at the University on November 1, 1939. His contract with İstanbul University gave him many obligations. According to the first clause, he was appointed to the Faculty of Arts to give lectures on "Hellenism and Roman History" and "Numismatics". The third clause of his contract entrusted him with continuing his work in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, completing the collection of the numismatic cabinet and preparing a catalog of it.[236] The other clauses were the same as the contracts of other foreign experts and academics. The other clauses were the same as those of other foreign experts and academics. These clauses included: learning Turkish at a sufficient level to give lectures and make publications; writing scientific papers, textbooks and reports related to his field; and training Turkish students and personnel in the contractor's respective field.[237] It is noteworthy that even though Bosch was later appointed as a professor of Ancient History and his obligations increased as a result, the duration of his contract remained at 7 months, less than the standard 2, 3 or 5 years offered to other émigré professors.[238]

On 15th of December 1939, he was chosen to the Professorship of Hellenistic and Roman Histories in the faculty. [239] Over the years the subjects of his lectures were broadened as well, they varied from "Roman Military Organization" to "Method and Sources", "History of Pamphylia" and "Cicero."[240] He started working on the textbooks of Hellenistic and Roman histories during his first year in İstanbul University. These works were published in different years by İstanbul University: *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet* [The Outlines of Roman History:Part I, The Republic] (1940), *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender*

---

[235]Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)", 299.

[236]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 156.

[237]Ibid.,156.

[238]Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 156; Emre Dölen similarly points out this discrepancy as well. However, he states there were many variations of contracts, which I believe might have resulted in this difference observed on Bosch's contract. Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 466.

[239]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 28.

[240]Ibid., 33,36.

İmparatorluğu[The Outline of History of Hellenism; Chapter I, The Empire of the Alexander the Great](1942) and *Helenizm Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri* [The Outline of History of Hellenism; Chapter II, The Hellenistic States until their Juncture with the Roman Empire] (1943). Apart from these textbooks, Bosch published multiple academic works on during his time İstanbul University, some examples are: *Bergama Kral Hanedanın Şeceresi* [The Lineage of Pergamon Kings](1940/42), *Antalya Bölgesinde Araştırmalar I. Antalya Kitabeleri* [Research on Antalya Region I. Antalya Epigraphs](1947) and *Türkiyenin Antik Devirdeki Meskûkatına Dair Bibiliyografya* [Bibliography on the Coins of Turkey in Ancient Times](1949).[241] Most of these works were translated by the assistants of the Ancient History Department of İstanbul University, Sabahat Atlan and Afif Erzen as was the case with nearly all of Bosch's works in Turkey. Sabahat Atlan was also the only PhD student Bosch advised in his time in İstanbul. She finished her thesis in 1948, her thesis was titled *Roma İmparatorluğu devrinde Küçük Asya'da basılmış sikkeler üzerinde Afrodit tipleri* [Aphrodite types on Asia Minor coins produces during the Roman Empire].[242] Bosch's contract was extended several times over the period he was working for İstanbul University until 1954. These extensions went alongside salary raises and extensions of his obligations, for example an increase the number of lectures he had to conduct and preparation of reports for different institutions such as museums outside İstanbul.[243]

After WWII, Bosch family sent their children to the USA for their education,[244]Johanna also departed for USA so she can prepare a home for the family.[245] At this time Clemens Bosch became ill and got partially-paralyzed. He tried to keep conducting his work and lectures but his sickness did not allow him to do so.[246]His colleagues supported and defended him, enabling his contract to be extended for three more years in 1951. Between 1952-1954, Bosch became unable to conduct his work at all, neglecting lectures, research and faculty meetings all together. In August of 1954 his contract with the university was annulled, although he tried to

---

[241]Tekins' biography of Clemens Bosch has a complete bibliography of Bosch. Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 45-48.

[242]Ibid., 33.

[243]Oğuz and Nil Tekin provide all of Bosch's contracts with the İstanbul University in his biography in the appendix section of his biography. Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografis*i, 45-66.

[244]Ibid., 34.

[245]Ibid., 36.

[246]Ibid., 37.

continue teaching some classes in his room located in the German Archeological Institute in İstanbul.[247]On 22nd of July 1955 Clemens Bosch passed away at the age of 56.

Clemens Bosch established numismatics as an important part of the study of ancient history at İstanbul University, and his work on the coin and medallion collection of the İstanbul Archaeological Museum to expand, categorize, and catalog the ancient coins of Anatolia contributed to the practice of the discipline in Turkey. His assistance to Hans von Aulock, the head of the İstanbul branch of Deutsche Bank, contributed to Aulock's personal collection of Anatolian coins, which Aulock later published under the title *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* between 1957 and 1968.[248]He participated in several archaeological excavations with people like Arif Müfid Mansel and his students Jale İnan, Muhibbe Darga and Semavi Eyice. These names went on to become respected figures in their respective disciplines, leaving a lasting legacy in the fields of archaeology and the study of ancient Anatolian history.[249]According to Mansel, Bosch's interest in Anatolia began long before he set foot in Turkey, while he was still a bachelor's student in Germany. His interest led him to study many disciplines such as numismatics, epigraphy, archaeology and the study of ancient classics.

In the memoriam of Bosch, Mansel, praises his friend for his kindness, enthusiasm and work ethic. In Mansel's eyes, this enthusiasm and work ethic were the crucial pieces of Bosch's academic life that inspired students and colleagues alike. As a result of his efforts in these areas, Mansel points out, Bosch was able to publish many works on the history of ancient Anatolia and train many students. He emphasizes the importance of Bosch's work from the point of view of Anatolian history and underlines his contributions that showed the greater political and cultural impact of Anatolia on world civilization.[250]He also points out that Bosch envisioned a larger project on the coinage of ancient Asia Minor, but was unable to complete it after emigrating to Turkey.[251] Mansel was a contemporary of Bosch's, so his views on the above subject should be understood in the context of their time. How Mansel presented Bosch's work on Anatolia will be discussed in more detail in another chapter.

---

[247]Ibid., 40.

[248]Ibid., 12.

[249]Ibid., 32-33.

[250]Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)", 303.

[251]Ibid.,298.

The authors of Bosch's biography, Oğuz and Nil Tekin, present Bosch's contributions to the field of history and the discipline of numismatics in Turkey, highlighting in particular his contributions to the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. Similar to Mansel, they praise Bosch for his dedication to his work, while admitting that he could have found a better academic space for his work in Germany.[252] Bosch's inability to produce the depth and breadth of work on Anatolia that he envisioned in Germany, while being able to train only one graduate student during his relatively long stay at Istanbul University, supports their point. Thus, both of Bosch's biographies point to the fact that his most persistent and lasting contribution seems to have been to the Istanbul Archaeology Museum and to the field of numismatics. Although, it must be kept in mind that with more than 4 books published and 15 years of service to Istanbul University during his time in Turkey, Bosch was one of the most prolific and persistent scholars among the German contingency.[253] In addition, his work at the Archaeology Museum, where he restored and categorized the coins and medallions in the numismatic cabinets, was able to continue thanks to his efforts in teaching the necessary skills to the staff and students of Istanbul University through his seminars. Moreover, his catalogues and articles on Anatolian coins were invaluable contributions to the discipline of numismatics in Turkey.

3.2 Bosch's Earlier Studies and Works on Ancient History of Anatolia

Arif Müfid Mansel, Bosch's friend and colleague, and Oğuz and Nil Tekin, authors of Bosch's full biography, provide great insight on how Bosch's professional interests were inclined towards the study of ancient Anatolia long before arriving in İstanbul.[254] Bosch's reports written during his time in İstanbul Archeology Museum further corroborate their claims about Bosch's professional inclinations towards studying and writing about Asia Minor.[255] All of this evidence demonstrates how both Bosch's studies and works in Germany guided and shaped his academic work in Turkey.

We can observe Bosch's interest in researching the history of ancient Anatolia from

---

[252] Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 11.

[253] Taşdemirci, *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformunda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*, 29; Dölen, *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3*, 522.

[254] Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)". 296-297; Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 15-16.

[255] Bosch's several reports in Istanbul Archeology Museum are included in the addendum part of his full biography. Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 180-81, 182-85, 188-89.

very early on his career. Bosch's PhD thesis, *Zwei Hauptquellen Des Valerius Maximus* [Two main sources of Valerius Maximus] dated 1925 centered on the Roman historian Valerius Maximus's sources for his most well know work, *De factis dictisque memorabilibus or Facta et dicta memorabilia* [Nine books of memorable deeds and sayings]. Bosch later published his PhD in book form in 1929, titled: *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus; ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Literatur der historischen Exempla* [The Sources of Valerius Maximus; A Contribution to Research into the Literature of Historical Examples].[256] The subject of Bosch's work, Valerius's book was mainly comprised of anecdotes on the achievements and speeches of great men of history with any eye towards teaching rhetorical methods and good virtues of these people.[257] Thus, Valerius's book referred to many other ancient writers' works as sources, these authors included names such as: Cicero, Livy and many other renowned Roman and Greek men of letters of his day.[258]

Although not an especially successful example of its genre, it found itself lasting legacy in the Medieval Ages as a teaching aid for Latin and for that reason was copied continually over the centuries, leaving a lasting impact.[259] What is of particular interest to us is where Valerius compiled his work. His work doesn't include too much detail about his own life; he only says that he came from a poor family but found patronage under the Sextus Pompeius who held consul ship in 14 CE and became proconsul of Asia in 27 CE. Valerius Maximus accompanied his sponsor to his post in Asia Minor and there are some remarks to Asia Minor in his work.[260] We can presume that Bosch's study of Valerius Maximus's work might have been one of the first steps in Bosch's career to draw him into the study of Asia Minor.

As mentioned before, right after his PhD, Bosch received a scholarship between the years of 1925-1926 to study the ancient history of Anatolia in Berlin and Halle. He later received another scholarship from the German Ministry of Education to travel across Europe to England, France and Austria to visit coinage collections

---

[256] I was unable to source either Bosch's original PhD or its published book versions. However, there are references to published version of Bosch's PhD, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus*, 1929, in several works. One example is Alfred Koltz's dissertation on Valerius Maximus's soruces., Alfred Koltz, *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Abteilung Jahrgang 1942, Heft 5. Vorgelegt von Herrn A. Rehm in der Sitzung vom 14. Februar 1942. München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1942. 8; Another example is Hans Mueller's work on Roman religion. Hans-Friedrich Mueller, *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*, (New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2002), 184.

[257] H. J. Rose, *Handbook of Latin Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine*, First Published in 1936, Reprinted with a new bibliography by E. Courtney in 1966. New York: Routledge, 1996. 356.

[258] Rose, *Handbook of Latin Literature*, 356; Koltz, *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla*, 12-13. Mueller, *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*, 186, 189.

[259] Rose, Handbook of Latin Literature, 357.

[260] Ibid.,357.

of museums. In his trip he collected cast impressions of coins minted during the Roman Empire in Asia Minor.[261]This research effort became the basis for his later work both in Germany and Turkey.

Mansel reveals Bosch's preoccupation with studying the ancient history of Anatolia through his publications prior to his arrival in Turkey in 1935. It is in these works that we can observe the foundations of Bosch's views put forward at the Second Turkish History Congress in 1937. According to Mansel, Bosch's lecture *Über die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit* [On the coins of Asia Minor of the Roman imperial period] which he presented at the Berlin Archaeological Society in 1931 was the starting point for Bosch's Anatolian studies. In this work, Bosch argues that even during the Roman imperial period, the cities of Anatolia retained their independence on the basis of how many cities in this region had the power and the right to mint coins. As evidence, he cites coins minted in this region from the 1st century BC to the 3rd century CE. He also traces the cultural, political and geographical characteristics of Asia Minor through the coins. For example, the depiction of the *Sangarios*(Modern day Sakarya River) river on the coin suggests that this river may have been important for the trading city of *Nicea*(Modern day city of İznik). Bosch also demonstrates that by tracing the religious symbols on the coins, the spread of the religious cults, these cults' buildings and holy sites can be located.[262]Bosch published his conference work in 1932 as his habilitation thesis entitled *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserziet* [The coins of Asia Minor of the Roman imperial period] and became an associate professor. In 1935, he published *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit. II.Einzeluntersuchungen. I. Bithynien. I. Halfte* [The Asia Minor coins of the Roman imperial period. II. individual studies. I. Bithynia. I. Half] this work was compiled from his earlier lectures on the subject which he presented in 1931. Mansel emphasizes that this work was well received by the scholarly community.[263]

According to Mansel, this work represented only a small portion of what Bosch had intended to do with his sources and findings on Anatolia. Bosch wanted to use the coins of Anatolia as a whole, not just the coins of some particular regions, in order to point to Anatolia's originality and its importance for the political and cultural history of the whole of early antiquity. However, the inadequacy of the catalogs of the coins of Asia Minor, as well as the large number and breadth of coins minted between 700 BC and 300 CE, led Bosch to limiting his work and to examine only

---

[261]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin. *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 15.

[262]Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)", 296.

[263]Ibid., 297.

the coins of the Roman imperial period. According to Bosch, the Roman provinces that made up Asia Minor were merely political boundaries. For him, to understand Anatolia as a whole, ancient geographical, ethnic and cultural units such as Bithynia, Pontos, Lykia, etc. needed to be examined. For that purpose, he intended to publish two books on each region; the first a catalog of coinage of the region, the second a detailed analysis of the findings of the first. Then a volume would be constituted from all the findings about the 18 ancient regions of Anatolia. That volume would be used to understand how each region and the interactions between the regions came together to influence Roman political, economic and cultural life. Mansel states Bosch's work could not come to fruition as he was forced to immigrate because of the political situation in Germany.[264]

Bosch wrote several reports he detailing his work for the Istanbul Archeology Museum. In these reports, we can observe his desire to continue with his research about Anatolia which he started in Germany. His wish is clearly visible in two of his reports. In his first report for the Istanbul Archeology Museum, dated November 1935, he details the situation of the collection of coins in the museum, how much time he needs for the restoration of some of the coinage, what he plans to do about categorizing the material and what would be the best way to prepare exhibitions for the material at hand. Furthermore, he adds that a catalog detailing the coinage published in Turkish and another European language would be greatly beneficial as an introduction to numismatics. Furthermore, he requests that the collection be assembled in a fashion that emphasizes their value for the history discipline. In this manner coins would be categorized in such a way to demonstrate political, social and cultural phenomena through the years of their minting and the symbols, faces and words upon them. By doing so, the spread of worship of different deities, economic policies of the Roman Empire, cultural and religious significance of landmarks and symbols, socio-political traditions and practices of the regions can be followed using these coins.[265]

In his second report, dated February 1936, Bosch requested permission to visit other coin collections found in Anatolia so that he can evaluate and study these collections as well. He also requested that the copies of the coins found in these other museums be made and distributed to teachers and other officials who were knowledgeable in numismatics so that they can benefit from them.[266]We can assume from several of his published articles on the coinage of various parts of Anatolia, that he was able

---

[264]Ibid., 298.

[265]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 181.

[266]Ibid.,185.

to survey the coinage.[267]From Bosch's insistence in his reports for the creation of a catalog of ancient Anatolian coinage, we can assume that his desire and willingness to continue his great project of investigating social, political and cultural history through coins never wavered.

Several points can be drawn from these observations. First, Bosch's interest in studying Anatolia and uncovering the region's influence on world culture began long before he ever set foot on Turkish soil. Both the focus of his studies and the work that emerged as a product of those studies attest to this. His insistence on continuing his project of producing several volumes of ancient Anatolian coinage that would serve as a guide for historians, archaeologists, and numismatic experts after his arrival in Turkey further confirms this point. Likewise, Mansel emphasizes Bosch's desire to create what they both believed could have been a monumental project. At the end of his *In Memoriam* for Bosch, Mansel points out that although this project unfortunately never came to fruition, one of Bosch's greatest achievements was to demonstrate through his many works that Anatolia maintained its social, economic, and cultural independence even during the Roman period, while at the same time influencing Roman and even modern Italian culture over the centuries.[268]

Another point that we can glimpse from Bosch's works is that there was a place for the study of ancient Anatolia in Germany at that time, and an academic could pursue this line of investigation while creating and publishing his works. Thus, we can observe that many of the themes and discussions present in Bosch's works produced in Turkey were already established in German academia. Bosch's achievements in academia, such as securing state scholarships, publishing his works, giving lectures, and receiving recognition from fellow scholars, indicate that his works were appreciated in both Germany and Europe. This may indicate that the Turkish government did not need to dictate a complete agenda to pursue to Bosch in his works when he arrived in Turkey. In fact, it is quite possible that Bosch's work and expertise aligned with the needs of the Turkish Republic, which was in the process of building a national historical narrative. Thus, this alignment may have been one of the important reasons for his employment by the Turkish government in its institutions.

In light of this apparent alignment of interests between the Republic of Turkey and Clemens Bosch, it is interesting to note that Bosch's intended work of compiling a

---

[267]There are several articles and papers that are presented in various congresses by Bosch on Anatolian coinage. Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*. For example: E. Bosch, "I. Gordianus'un Küçük Asya'daki Sikkeleri/ Münzen Gordianus I aus Kleinasien", IV. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 10-14 Kasım 1948, Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler, TTK, Ankara (1952) 66-72. E. Bosch, "Colonia Iulia Concordia Apamea sikkeleri III". A. Erzen (çev.), İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi 8, 1953, 55-68.

[268]Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)", 303.

catalogue of ancient coins from all regions of Anatolia and using them to analyze the socio-political, economic and cultural history of the people of this region never came to fruition. The realization of such a work would have been desirable both within the framework of the Turkish History Thesis and the more humanistically oriented historiography of the 1940s. In the THT, as mentioned above, claiming Anatolia as the homeland of the ancient Turks was one of the most important political priorities. On the other hand, Turkish historiography of the 1940s marked a shift toward humanism, where the study of ancient Latin and Greek classics and classical archaeology focused on excavating and studying the remains of Roman and ancient Greek civilizations. Bosch's envisioned work could have fit into either program's agenda and been shaped and guided by their discourses. Moreover, Bosch was well positioned to gain access to the necessary primary sources, coins, medallions, and other pertinent artifacts of ancient Anatolia through the collections of various museums. As mentioned above, he was able to study these sources and write articles about them with the permission of the state.

Then we can ask the question: Why couldn't Bosch finish his monumental work? Arif Mansel offers two answers. First, he notes that Hitler's Germany created an oppressive socio-political and intellectual atmosphere for people like Bosch. In the period between the Nazis' rise to power and Bosch's emigration to Turkey, neither the time nor the academic situation was conducive to undertaking such a monumental project.[269]Second, according to Mansel, this work was beyond the capabilities of a single person, and he points out that Bosch's work was already cut out for him at the Istanbul Museum of Archaeology, where he was entrusted with the restoration, analysis, and cataloging of a relatively large collection. For these reasons, Bosch was not even able to complete a more focused part of his larger work, a detailed catalog of Bithynian coins, in Germany.[270] Similarly, the catalogue for the Istanbul Archeology Museum's coinage and medallion cabinet was only be able to be published in 1951, nearly 12 years after Bosch's departure from the museum.[271]We can observe that even though Bosch had access to the relevant primary sources and his interests and those of the Turkish state seemed to coincide, he was unable to construct his desired monumental work. In this situation, Bosch's obligations to the institutions he worked for, the Istanbul Museum of Archaeology and Istanbul University, over and above his obligation to be academically creative, became a greater priority and preoccupied him to the point that he could not work on his project.

---

[269]Ibid., 298.

[270]Ibid., 298.

[271]Ibid., 299.

One of the causes of this phenomenon could have been the lack of experienced experts and other support staff who could have helped Bosch with his obligations in the aforementioned institutions. However, our sources do not provide any further information on this issue. Therefore, this point requires further investigation.

Another crucial aspect of Bosch's earlier works is that their presence in the academy and their relatively positive reception in Germany and Europe do not imply that Bosch's works were integrated into the dominant historical paradigm of 1930s Europe. In fact, in the European historiography of the early 20th century, the ancient Greeks and Romans were seen as the progenitors of Western civilization. In particular, the achievements of the Greeks were portrayed as unique in the eastern Mediterranean, and many through-lines were constructed between ancient Greece, via Roman culture, and the political and cultural achievements and aspirations of modern Europe. This particular phenomenon is explored in Martin Bernal's 1987 work, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization.*[272] The book is relevant to this study in two ways: First, it explores and evaluates the perspectives and debates within 20th century historiography on ancient history. Second, it provides an opportunity to compare the goals of Bernal, who seeks to redefine the origins of European civilization, and his approach using historical, archaeological, and linguistic sources, with the goals and methodologies found in Turkish historiography, particularly exemplified in Bosch's works of the 1930s and 40s. These comparisons will be further explored in the chapter devoted to Bosch's textbook on Roman history.

In the following chapters, I will examine several of Bosch's works written during his time in Turkey. I will try to analyze the genealogy of the content of his work and at the same time show the roots of the discourse used.

---

[272]Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*, v.1, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003).

4. CLEMENS BOSCH'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE SECOND TURKISH HISTORY CONGRESS

Bosch presented a paper on the cultural history of Anatolia in ancient times at the Second Turkish History Congress in September of 1937. It was called *Das Anatolische in der Geshichte* [Anatolia in History].[273] His article was translated by the Turkish History Association and published in the same year, 1937, as a booklet under the name of *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı* [Particularities of Anatolia in History].[274]The name of the translator for the pamphlet of the article in Turkish is not given. Afif Erzen and Sabahat Atlan, translators of Bosch's later works and assistants at the Ancient History Department of Istanbul University during the 1940s, are unlikely candidates, as both of them were studying in Germany at the time of publication of the Turkish translation. One of the other assistants or junior researchers with a background in the German language must have been involved in the translation. The fact that the article had to be translated suggests that Bosch had not yet fulfilled his contractual obligation to master the Turkish language in order to produce scholarly works in Turkish.

At the time he was preparing his article, Bosch was working at the Istanbul Archaeology Museum as a numismatic expert, categorizing and archiving ancient coins for the purpose of studying ancient medallions and coins while preparing them for exhibition. He was also assigned to teach a numismatic course to undergraduate students at Istanbul University. This activity seems to be intertwined with his research and findings in the article. His familiarity with ancient Anatolian coins and his particular focus on these materials as historical evidence should be understood in this context, along with his previous expertise on the subject. Furthermore, we can understand his choice of topics and methods of investigation, the interactions of different ancient civilizations with Anatolian culture, and the study of these in-

---

[273]Clemens Bosch, *Das Anatolische in der Geshichte*, II. Türkischer Geschichtkongress, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1937).

[274]Bosch, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı.*

teractions through linguistic and textual analysis of ancient sources in the context of Bosch's formal training in ancient history and his specific expertise in ancient sources.

From the beginning of the article, Bosch tries to recontextualize Anatolia's place in world history. He says that it is very tempting to overemphasize Anatolia's role in history as a bridge that facilitated the transmission of cultures and peoples between Europe and Asia. This interpretation is also a valid way of looking at the region from a geopolitical perspective. However, this perspective should not be overly generalized and used as the only representation of this land.[275] Bosch tersely dismisses this narrow representation of Anatolia in historiography by stating: *"It was not the role of Anatolia to be a passageway for every man."*[276] Bosch declares that Anatolia's role as a land bridge for migrations did not diminish its value as a cradle of cultures and civilizations, in fact he wants to demonstrate foreign influences, such as Crusades, were not at all the determining factor in the character of Anatolia. On the contrary, it is better characterized as a place where ancient traditions, language and religion were created and exported to other lands.[277] Nevertheless, Bosch acknowledges the need to categorize and distinguish the cultural layers of Anatolia by periodization. However, he advises that each period and cultural layer should be thoroughly examined so that the different groups that inhabited Anatolia are not mistaken for complete strangers to the land and that. He wants to draw the reader's attention to the argument that political and cultural interaction was not a one-way affair, coming from the West to the East, but a reciprocal relationship.[278]In fact, he wants to demonstrate that the balance of exchange between Anatolia and other civilizations which are considered foreign in historiography, was in favor of cultures which originated in Anatolia. This is a point he emphasizes several times in the text. He alludes to the underlying thesis of the article which is demonstrating both the potency and the validity of the Anatolian culture, traits which made this place unique, while, on the other hand, contextualizing and historicizing Anatolia similar to any other geographical location so that it could not be essentialized to just one concept or symbol. This is most apparent when Bosch situates Anatolia as a part of Eurasia, both a part of Europe and Asia, existing in the East and the West at the same time, by detailing the Rome's inhabitation and the interactions with the

---

[275]Ibid., 3.

[276]Ibid., 3. Translations are mine.

[277]Ibid., 3.

[278]Ibid., 4.

region.[279]

To bolster his argumentation and to highlight his point about the persistence of the Anatolian culture over the ages, Bosch makes a few distinctions between the different civilizations he is examining that ruled over Anatolia. Here, he claims that although the "Ottoman-Islamic" period can be categorized as a time when Anatolia's own cultural characteristics were suppressed, he admits that the same level of cultural domination cannot be observed for the Seljuk period, and even less so for the Roman and Byzantine periods. He suggests that a study of the local culture of Anatolia under Ottoman oppression would be fruitful research. In the Seljuk and Ottoman times, these groups were formed by tribes/peoples (*kavimler* in Turkish translation, *Völkern* in German original) who lived in the country as a whole and ruled the land by themselves. While he categorizes Romans and Byzantines not as tribes/peoples (*kavim*) but as "ways of life" (*birer hayat şekli*) which could be adopted by anyone.[280] He emphasizes that Byzantines were a culture that was adopted and practiced by a substantial part of humanity at the time, "a way of life" which an important part of was adapted from Anatolian characteristics.[281]

Bosch argues that Anatolian history and culture must be taken into account when writing the history of the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Byzantines. Bosch constructs his argument using evidence from archaeology, anthropology, and linguistics. He uses these sciences to demonstrate how Anatolian socio-religious artifacts were adopted and adapted in Greek, Roman, and Byzantine cultures. Among these sciences, Bosch relies heavily on archaeological and linguistic evidence to make his case. Through them, he demonstrates that neither Roman nor Byzantine history could be understood without the influence of Anatolian history on these cultures; he supports his claims by saying that after a certain point in Roman history, many of the ruling elite families of Rome were either of Anatolian origin or deeply influenced by the socio-religious culture of Anatolia. However, Bosch distinguishes between Romans and Byzantines; he doesn't portray them as one people, nor does he portray Byzantium as the logical conclusion of Rome. Nevertheless, he similarly maintains that Anatolian socio-cultural influence on Byzantine civilization was persistent and lasting. In fact, he locates Anatolia as the heartland of the Byzantines. By making this region their homeland, he also tries to do away with the understanding of the Byzantines as foreign rulers of a passive land. In fact, he states that Anatolian culture was very active in shaping this civilization. A point that, according to him,

---

[279]Ibid., 8.

[280]Ibid.,4-5.

[281]Ibid.,5.

is even more obvious in the case of Rome.[282]

After, the addition of Anatolia into the Roman Empire and its constitution as a separate province, many notable families of these lands became willing participants in the Roman "commonwealth of nations" going as far to play crucial roles in the politics of the empire while influencing the society, the arts and the sciences of Rome in a lasting manner. Bosch emphasizes this willing participation in the Roman "commonwealth of nations" of the Anatolian elite, saying that although idea of *nationes* (nation in Latin) did not exist at the time, and Anatolia functioned as a province of Rome, the right and the ability of the Anatolian urban nobility to continue minting coinage underlined their relative political and economic independence.[283] Bosch claims the persistence of Anatolian noble family's political independence was mirrored in socio-cultural field too. The ruling elite of Rome who moved to Anatolia for administration of this province lost much of their Roman culture, adapting to the culture of their new home. To corroborate this adaptation Bosch points to the slow decline in the use of Latin on coinage in the city of *Sinope*(Modern day Sinop) in Anatolia where the local language of the region persisted on coins into well beyond the Roman period. As the socio-political integration of Anatolia to the greater Roman world increases cultural impact of the region transcends its geographical borders. Noble Anatolian families extend their political and economic reach, in time possessing the most crucial political offices, producing individuals who become senators, governors and even emperors. Bosch goes as far as to claim that the after political and socio-economic incorporation of the region was completed the real Romans became this small enlightened few originating from Anatolia and not the "hungry and debauchery addicted" masses of proletariat of the city of Rome.[284] He fortifies his claims by referring to archeological and numismatic evidence. He demonstrates through the variety, abundance and quality of Anatolian coinage in the Roman imperial period, the richness of the cultural life and the wealth of the Anatolian urban elite. He also introduces a Roman council, named Julius Celsus Polemeveanus who hailed from Anatolia and held the highest political and military office of the empire whose statue can be found in the Istanbul Archeology Museum and visage on coins.[285] According to Bosch, the biggest and the most persistent cultural influence of Anatolia on Roman and Byzantine civilizations came in the form of religion. He mentions that many deities, gods, and rituals were either directly

---

[282]Ibid.,5.

[283]Ibid.,6.

[284]Ibid.,7.

[285]Ibid.,7.

adopted by the Romans from older Anatolian traditions, or were slowly transmitted to Rome via the Greeks, and even influenced the rituals of Christianity later down the centuries. A considerable part of the article is devoted to the study of this phenomenon of transmission.[286]

4.1 Image of the *Mother Goddess*

Among the many cultural exchanges and interactions between Anatolia and other civilizations, adaptation of religions is the topic most thoroughly covered in the article. Bosch pays particular attention to the cult of *Magna Mater* Latin name for the life-giver *Mother Goddess* worshiped in Anatolia under many names, most notably *Kybele* by Hittites.[287] Bosch uses linguistics to follow the origin of words pertaining to this cult. Through his investigation he tries to determine how this cult was born in Anatolia in prehistoric times and then went on to be adopted by the Roman ruling elite. Moreover, Bosch finds several connections and similarities between the cult of Virgin Mary and *Magna Mater*. He claims that the former was an adaptation of this ancient tradition. Furthermore, he states that the cult of Jesus Christ was the continuation of the cult of *Attis*. Like *Magna Mater*, *Attis* was also an ancient deity which was transformed through many cultures over millennia, again originating in Anatolia. He was closely associated with *Magna Mater*, sometimes depicted as her son, sometimes as her lover. *Attis* embodied death and rebirth symbolizing the eternality of life. Bosch points out the clear influence of these two cults on the fledgling Christianity of Rome.[288]He refers to a secondary source on Byzantium on this point.[289] Using this source, he states that in the 5th Century some Byzantine intellectuals were clearly aware of the concept of Virgin Mary being the mother of God was a clear adaptation of *Mother Goddess* cult of Anatolia.[290]

Bosch's once again draws our attention to the coinage to examine the symbols present on them.[291]He points out the crucial use of the symbols of the stars, the

---

[286]Ibid.,8.

[287]Ibid., 9-10.

[288]He references in the footnotes to, H. Gelser's history of Byzantine literature. [Geschichte der byzantinischen. Litteratur, 2. Aufl., München, 1897, p.917. In the Turkish translation of Bosch's article, the footnote is given erroneously. The correct version is in the German publication at the end, in the notes section.

[289]Ibid., 9-10.

[290]Ibid.,10.

[291]In both the German and Turkish publications there are references to the pictures but they are not present

sun and the crescent. The crescent and the star were presented together by the Achaemenids as symbols of power, and their use and influence permeated all cultures that wished to invoke similar ideas and confer legitimacy on their users. They were also used by Mithradates, one of the kings of the Pontus state in Anatolia, against the Romans to signify his political aspirations for universal rule. Consequently, they were also found in many representations of goddesses, such as Aphrodite.[292]Bosch claims that these symbols represent the universality of *Magna Mater*, signifying her power not only as a mother, a life-giver-although he points out that *Magna Mater* is also worshipped in ancient Greece as the mother of all the gods-but as a queen whose all-encompassing rule is accepted by all.[293][294] Bosch even claims that many goddesses of the Greek pantheon can be understood as merely representing many aspects of the much older *Magna Mater*.[295] He also claims that it was the all-compassing aspects of the *Mother Goddess* and the idea of her universal rule that gave power to the aforementioned symbols used by many cultures. Although Bosch does not make the direct and immediate connection between the ancient symbols of the power of the sun and the crescent with the flag of the Turkish Republic, which has the same symbols, there is a high probability that this point is also an allusion to the everlasting influence of Anatolian culture, which reproduces itself in modern times.

Bosch emphasizes the transfer of the *Mother Goddess* cult to Rome in 204 BC as a confirmation of the cultural importance of this deity in Roman civilization. From that point on, the *Mother Goddess*, under the name *Kybele*, continued to play a major role in both Greek and Roman cultures. In the Roman Imperial period, she was given the title *Conservatrix* (guardian/protector in Latin), representing the personal patron of the emperors themselves and the perpetuator of Rome's destiny, immortalized on Roman coins under the aforementioned title and role. Thus, as Bosch puts it: "*The Anatolian goddess became the imperial goddess.*" [296]

Bosch traces the development of *Attis* along with the cult of the *Mother Goddess* and shows how the cult of the all-powerful celestial deity, found in Greece, Germany, India, and many other places, was actually adapted from earlier versions of the cult

---

in either the German or Turkish copies of the congress papers.

[292]Ibid., 11.

[293]Bosch talks about the idea of a cosmic and universal rule in some detail and points out their Eastern origins. These ideas are elaborated even further in his works on Hellenic history.

[294]Ibid., 12.

[295]Ibid., 11.

[296]Ibid., 9.

of *Attis.* Bosch traces the origins of this idea back even further, tracing its roots to the Stone Age through literary and linguistic evidence. He compares the names given to the gods *Magna Mater* and *Attis* in different languages. He says that some of the names given to the *Mother Goddess, Ma, Mama, Omma, or Nana*, may be related to the Turkish word for mother: Anne. While the names for the male god, *Papa* and *Attis*, could have Hittite and Turkish connections. He does not elaborate on this issue from a linguistic perspective, except to note that the formation of these words could indicate their antiquity. On the other hand, he refers to the writings of the Roman poet Ovid, which demonstrate that stone tools were instrumental in the worship of this deity. From Ovid's textual evidence, Bosch concludes that the worship of this cult must predate metalwork, making the cult an artifact of the Stone Age.[297]This point can be understood through the substantial premium placed on the age of historical finds in the Turkish history thesis, where the age of artifacts was conflated with the historical validity of the culture that created the said artifact. Through this narrative, Bosch creates an unbroken line of cultural transmission of traditions, rituals, and names that goes as far back as the Stone Age and as recent as Christianity, while also making many other connections between these time periods.

Georg Rohde's works on the *Mother Goddess* provide an appropriate point of comparison with Bosch's article. Rohde was a German émigré philologist working in Ankara University. He wrote two papers on the subject of *Magna Mater*, focusing specifically on the Anatolian origins and the lasting influence of this religion in various Mediterranean cultures. Rohde presented these two articles on separate occasions: First one, *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater* [Great Mother; Magna Mater][298] on April 24, 1937 in a conference held Ankara Halkevi [People's House] and the second one, *Roma ve Anadolu İlâhesi* [(Rome and Anatolian Goddess] in the Second Turkish History Congress in September of 1937.[299] Both works share most of the same points, but each has a few different arguments that warrant an examination of both. In both articles, Rohde makes several observations similar to those of Bosch, using primarily philological and historical evidence; he traces names, traditions, symbols and rituals belonging to the *Mother Goddess* cult. Rohde's work differs from Bosch's article in scope; while Bosch presents several different cultural artifacts of Anatolia for examination, Rohde's investigation is solely concerned with the worship of the *Mother Goddess* of Anatolia and its impact on Roman culture. In this section, I will focus on the arguments concerning Anatolia. I will examine the parts about Rome

---

[297]Ibid.,9-10.

[298]Georg Rohde, *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater.*

[299]Georg Rohde, "Roma ve Anadolu İlâhesi."

under sections where the relevant topics are discussed in more detail in Bosch's other works.

In *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater*, Rohde focuses on the origins and the cultural aspects of the *Mother Goddess* cult, asking who this deity was, why she was transported to Rome, and what did this exchange meant. Although the worship of similar mother-goddess deities was widespread in the Mediterranean basin, he traces the worship of *Magna Mater* and her companion *Attis* to Anatolia, placing their roots firmly in two main regions of western and central Anatolia, in Phrygia in the city of *Pessinus* (Ballıhisar, a village in modern day Eskişehir, Turkey) and in the city of Ephesus.[300] The *Mother Goddess* was a sovereign deity of nature, representing creation, birth, love, bounty but at the same time death and cruelty of nature, ruling with her companion, *Attis*, at her side over all other deities who were allowed to serve her.[301]Rohde follows the evolution of the symbols and words associated with the goddess, pointing out the many names the goddess has taken over the years; *Kubaba* in the *Kültepe* tablets, *Chepat* or *Arinna* in Hittite,[302] *Kybele* in Phrygia,[303] *Meter* in Peloponnese,[304] Aphrodite, Artemis, Demeter and Rhea in different parts of Greece.[305] All of these names coincided with different aspects of the goddess, Aphrodite representing her as the personification of love, Artemis as the hunter and protector of nature, and Rhea as the mother of Zeus. Later, Rohde draws our attention to the tradition of attributing *Attis* as the celestial father Zeus in Phrygia, pointing out that *Attis*' name is derived from the word *at* meaning father. But he says that this attribution was probably erroneous, since *Attis* and Zeus did not share too many aspects.[306]Rohde also points to the use of stone tools in *Attis* rituals, implying that the worship could be traced back to the Stone Age.[307] The ability to trace the origins of the rituals back to the Stone Age indicated that the worship must have been originated locally and not been imported from elsewhere.

Rohde states that the lion was one of the materializations of the goddess's personal power. The *Mother Goddess* was often depicted with lions either accompanying her

---

[300]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 7; Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 230.

[301]Ibid.,5.

[302]Ibid., 5. For these names he refers to German émigré scholars Berno Landsberger and Hans Gustav Güterbock's conferences.

[303]Ibid., 7.

[304]Ibid., 9.

[305]Ibid., 6

[306]Ibid., 7.

[307]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 7; Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 231.

or as lions being controlled or dominated by the goddess, representing her rule over nature.[308]Rohde cautions against understanding the *Mother Goddess* through her name as only a compassionate creator. Her Latin name, *Magna Mater*, should be understood in the context of Roman religion where deities were given the names *pater* and *mater* (father and motherin Latin), so the *Mother Goddess* should not necessarily be portrayed as the loving parental figure of her worshippers. Her aspects and domains hint at her darker side; as the creator and protector of nature she ruled over the forces and creatures that threatened human civilization. Consequently, foreigners, the unjust and the insane were also under her protection too. This idea was reinforced by the fact that the one of the criteria for becoming her chief priest in Ephesus was to be a foreigner.[309] In both Ephesus and Pessinus, the *Mother Goddess* was worshipped through the medium of a rock fallen from the sky. In Pessinus this was black meteorite.[310]

According to Rohde, the *Mother Goddess* in her original form in Anatolia did not accept any equals, only subordinates as in the case of *Attis*, which meant she could not be a part of a pantheon in earlier times.[311] The constitution of her worship in a such a style also led to the creation of a theocratic state around her clergy, a clergy most likely of Phrygian origin, which derived its legitimacy and power from the symbols and rituals of its deity.[312]The clergy of the cult were called *Galloi*, they had two high priests and one of them was called *Attis*. They performed castration on themselves in ecstatic displays of faith, imitating and honoring the sacrifice of their deity, while symbolizing the coming of spring and the cycle of life, which were aspects of *Attis* and the *Mother Goddess*. Rohde points out that castrations were common in ancient times as religious rituals, and although the exact intent behind them cannot be known, Rohde emphasizes that they did not signify the sacralization of the self through the loss of sexuality, as they would in later periods.[313] Furthermore, Rohde states that these sacrifices took place during orgies of violence in which the participants, under the influence of hallucinogens, danced and whipped themselves to honor their patron deities, the *Mother Goddess* and *Attis*.[314]Rohde then draws our attention to the power of the *Mother Goddess* cult over time. Their priests must

---

[308]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 6.

[309]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 230.

[310]Ibid., 231.

[311]Ibid., 231.

[312]Ibid., 231.

[313]Ibid., 231.

[314]Ibid., 231.

have ruled alongside other kings and even foreign conquerors, while the forms and meaning of *Mother Goddess* worship remained unchanged, as Rohde puts it: *"The spirit and power of the goddess were greater than all the conquerors."*[315]

The cultural and political power of the Phrygians must have been sustained by their attachment to their religion, making their city, *Pessinus*, the center of this worship. Rohde emphasizes that the Phrygian culture and state were closely identified with the cult of the *Mother Goddess.* Some Phrygian myths portrayed the goddess as the mother of the famous king of Phrygia, Midas, closely linking religion and politics. The same Midas sent gifts to the Oracle at Delphi, establishing early links with one of the most important centers of Greek religion. This allowed a process of transmission and conflation of certain myths and stories about Troy with the Phrygians to begin, which would not have been possible because of the earlier obscurity of the Phrygians in the Greek consciousness.[316] This was intended to facilitate the integration of the cult of the *Mother Goddess* into the Greek world.

Rohde identifies the adaptation of the *Mother Goddess* cult to Greek cultures as one of the crucial steps in its cultural transmission beyond the geographical and cultural boundaries of Anatolia. After the destruction of Phrygia by the Cimmerians, many worshippers of the *Mother Goddess* cult were either enslaved or found themselves without a home, causing them to migrate in many different directions. Although the worship was claimed by the Lydians after the fall of the Phrygian state, the dispersion of the original worshippers, some of whom became traveling priests, throughout the Mediterranean basin solidified the Phrygian characteristics of the cult, for even though the cult evolved wherever it went, the worship of the *Mother Goddess* became almost unanimously associated with the culture of the refugee Phrygians. These individuals kept the worship of the *Mother Goddess* alive and spread it beyond Anatolia.[317]Some of the Phrygians migrated to Greece. Here they were initially held in low esteem because of their alien status. However, Rohde shows the gradual change in attitudes towards them as the socio-political landscape of Greece changed.

The beginning of the social change occurred when Greek poets portrayed the Phrygians and their culture as being of Trojan origin. Thanks to this conflation of the Phrygians with the Trojans, the Phrygian *Mother Goddess*, thought to be the same goddess worshipped in Troy, was not considered a foreign cult - due to the fact that

---

[315]Ibid., 232. The translation is mine.

[316]Ibid., 232-33.

[317]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi* ,232; Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 8-9.

the Trojans and the myths surrounding the Trojan wars were held in high esteem - and found its way into Greek culture. On the other hand, political circumstances also played a role, and Rohde notes that the worship of the *Mother Goddess* met a real religious need in Greece. He draws our attention to the many testimonies of the importance of the religion of Meter in Athens at the time of the Peloponnesian wars. The ancient Greek Demeter and the *Mother Goddess* of Crete, called the *Idaean Mother* [318] were among the deities that were beginning to be forgotten, but contact with the Anatolian the *Mother Goddess*, with her vivid forms of worship, gave these deities a new life. Demeter began to be seen as equal to the Great Mother. This merging or blending of different deities, especially the *Mother Goddess* and the *Idaean Mother*, will be crucial in understanding the later transmission of the Anatolian goddess to Rome. The *Mother Goddess*es worshipped in many different parts of Phrygia and Troy were united in the Greek consciousness under the banner of Phrygian culture. The resulting set of beliefs became a symbol of the Anatolian influence on Greek religion and culture in general. Rohde emphasizes the change in the character of the *Mother Goddess*, who was initially a disturbance of human order, and through this adoption became the protector and representative of civilization in this land, which she entered in times of war.[319]Rohde draws our attention to the long history between Delphi and Anatolia as the next link between cultures in the spread of the *Mother Goddess* cult to even wider horizons. Specifically, he points to the prophecies of the Roman Sybil books as one of the first stepping stones of Anatolian culture into the Roman consciousness.[320] However, However, I will discuss this connection in the section on the Roman history textbook.

Most important for the issue of the cult's lasting impact on world civilizations, beyond its embrace by the Greeks and Romans, is its direct influence on Christianity. Rohde details the particular persistence of the influence of these cults in early Christianity. He contends that the similarities between the cults of *Kybele* and early Christianity stem mainly from two points that are inextricably linked: The first point is the appeal of certain elements of these cults to early Christians, and the second point was the conversion of some important clergy of the *Mother Goddess* cult to Christianity. For the first point, Rohde describes the process by which the many different cults worshipped in late imperial Rome began to coalesce into different aspects of a single divinity. He points to the blending of symbols

---

[318]Rohde doesn't use the name *Idaean Mother* when he first mentions this deity, only calls her the Mother Goddess of Crete. However, we understand later in the text the goddess he is referring to is the *Idaean Mother* worshipped in Crete and later mainland Greece, and also the deity mentioned in the Oracles of Sybil. Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 233.

[319]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 233; Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 9.

[320]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahes*i, 233-34.

and traditions of Mithra,[321] *Kybele* and *Attis.* The worship of the *Mother Goddess* and *Attis* adopted rituals such as blood baptism, resurrection, and belief in eternal life from Mithraism. Rohde corroborates his findings by pointing to archaeological finds in Rome and Athens that show this fusion of symbols.[322] According to Rohde, these particular rituals and symbols of the *Kybele-Attis* cult were enticing to Christian converts, who adapted parts of this ancient nature worship into their own religion. Rohde goes on to say that what we know about the worship of *Kybele-Attis* was handed down by the Church Fathers.[323]Second, Rohde tells the story of one of these early Christian converts to support his argument. He tells us of Montanus of Phrygia, once a priest of *Kybele* and later the founder of his eponymous Christian movement called *Montanism.* Montanus' own sect of Christianity incorporated several aspects of his earlier belief system, and these aspects lived on as part of this particular Christian group and persisted well into the Middle Ages. Rohde claims that the persistence of unsanctioned practices of the *Kybele* cult adapted to Christianity had to be eradicated by hard work over a long period of time by the Church, demonstrating the deep-seated influence of the Magna Mater cult in the societies in which it was worshipped.[324]

There is a crucial historiographical layer to the question of the name of the *Mother Goddess*, which persists in several works of Rohde and Bosch. Rohde admits that the exact origin of the tradition cannot be attributed to one group of people. Her worship could be observed in many different cultures under different names, while retaining the same aspects and traditions over the millennia.[325]One of the only constants is the basis of its origin in Anatolia. Apart from this, several details about this cult and the goddess evolve and adapt themselves to the cultures in which they are adopted. Because of this, the use of the nickname *Mother Goddess* of Anatolia is necessary to talk about the deity in question.[326]It is also important to note that Rohde and Bosch present the *Mother Goddess* in her original form as a singular deity. However, in some cultures that adapted her worship, the aspects of the Goddess were given to different deities. In these cases, either the goddess herself was subsumed into different personas, or she continued to exist, while herself

---

[321]In pre-Zoroastrian Iran, Mithraism was the worship of Mithra, the Iranian god of the sun, justice, contracts, and war. In the second and third centuries CE, this god—known as Mithras—was revered as the deity representing loyalty to the emperor in Rome.

[322]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 13.

[323]Ibid., 14.

[324]Ibid., 14

[325]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 229.

[326]Ibid., 229.

containing only a few of her original aspects. Bosch, in his various works, refers to many deities under the name of *Mother Goddess* or Anatolian *Mother Goddess* without making the distinction between the deities clear. As long as the deity and/or the rituals of her worship contain or can be traced back to cultural aspects of Anatolia, she is referred to as *Mother Goddess*. Her name is not always given in the particular culture. Many rituals, traditions, and gods that are considered distinct from each other, whether related or not, are lumped together because their origins can be traced back to a single point. Even though their evolution through the millennia in a cornucopia of cultures is mentioned, the differences are ignored in favor of the continuities. This results in a loss of nuance and specificity. I believe that the point of the historiographical choice was to emphasize the persistence of Anatolia's cultural influence. However, the construction of the narrative in this way often hinders or neglects cultural specificities by omitting variations and names.

4.2 Anthropological Evidence of Anatolia's Cultural Persistence

Bosch touches on anthropological issues related to the biological roots of different "race types" in Anatolia in order to bolster his cultural claims about Anatolia's lasting influence on human civilization. As noted above, anthropology was a credible and respected field of science in the 1930s. Moreover, it was instrumental in supporting and defending historical arguments. This was also the case with the works produced under the guise of the Turkish history thesis. A significant number of the articles presented at the Second Congress of Turkish History were either on the subject of anthropology or had anthropology as one of their methods of investigation and argumentation. Bosch's article was no exception. He makes it clear from the beginning that his purpose is to demonstrate the persistence of Anatolian elements to the present day, not only cultural elements, but also "racial" elements. Bosch claims that the depiction of man on Hittite structures resembles "Homo Tauricus," a "racial" category of man coined by Otto Reche in the 1920s, which, according to him, is the "racial type"[327] present in Turkey in 1930's. *"The Permanence of [this] human body type (. . . insan vücudunun. . . istikrarı. . .) over the millennia (. . . binlerce yıl süren. . .)"*, according to him, is evidence of the permanence not only of the biological characteristics of the people of Anatolia, but also of other enduring characteristics of this place. He states that he will try to demonstrate

---

[327]In the German original of the text the words used are *rasse* (Race) and *rassische Typus* (Race type). Clemens Bosch, *Das Anatolische in der Geshichte*, 1; In the Turkish version these are translated as *ırk* (Race) and *ırk tipi* (Race type). Bosch, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı*, 4.

these other characteristics, cultural elements, while encouraging others to continue the aforementioned anthropological investigation.[328] He does not elaborate on this point, probably due to the fact that his field of study and expertise is outside of anthropology, instead he is much more interested in following up the anthropological assumptions with cultural artifacts.

4.3 Centrality of Anatolia

Bosch places Anatolia at the center of his narrative, focusing on it as a place where cultures are born and cultivated. He draws our attention to the antiquity of the cultures that were born there, while demonstrating the longevity of cultural artifacts such as words, rituals, and symbols by showing their continuity across many different societies. According to him, the long duration in which the cultural ideas of Anatolia were transmitted without losing their essence also signifies the potency of the cultures that constructed them in influencing other cultures that settled there. Through the construction of his narrative, he attempts to elevate Anatolia from a place of mere transmission to a place of creation, where high culture was constructed and disseminated through time and space. By invoking the almost unchanging nature of Anatolia's cultural artifacts and their eternal influence on generations of people over the millennia, he reinforces the monumental impact of this land and its place in the history of civilization that the claims of the Turkish historical thesis ascribe to it. Moreover, he does so with an eye to linking all of his findings and arguments to show the history of Anatolia as both a progenitor and an extension of Eurasian culture. In doing so, he aims to lend more credibility to the claims made by the Turkish history thesis in the 1930s.

All in all, even though his areas of study and expertise do not entirely coincide with the work he is doing on this article, Bosch does not refrain from touching on some of the most controversial parts of the Turkish history thesis. His claims about race and some of his linguistic explanations attest to this. It could be argued that his most overt assertions are on these topics; the conflation of Turkish and Hittite languages, this conflation being a prominent part of the THT, especially the Sun Language Theory. Similarly, the point that Anatolian people share the same genetic traits as "Homo Tauricus" seems to reflect the Turkish History Thesis' reliance on anthropology. Apart from these, Bosch reinforces several other conclusions of the Turkish History Thesis, such as Anatolia being the cradle of civilization, while em-

---

[328] Bosch, *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı*, 4.

phasizing its strong connections with both the East and the West, thus reinforcing the THT's claims about Anatolia being both a place of creation and transmission of the high culture of Eurasia. His conclusions about the transmission of Anatolian socio-religious elements to ancient Greece and Rome are particularly pertinent, for in categorizing his work he clearly finds many direct connections between the prehistoric past of Anatolia and the culture of the Greek, Roman, and Byzantine elites. By demonstrating and examining these connections, Bosch not only verifies the impact of Anatolian culture in human history, but also situates the region as the homeland of these people, while also highlighting the impact of Anatolian religions on Christianity. This is crucial because at the time, these elements were considered to be some of the most important building blocks of Western civilization. Through Bosch's assertion, Anatolia, both the present and ancient homeland of the Turks, became the progenitor of the West. This idea was a prominent feature of the Turkish Historical Thesis that the Turks were both the founders and disseminators of world civilization. The connection between the Turks and the West was made through Anatolia. Bosch's expertise allowed him to focus primarily on the Roman period and to construct the connections relevant to that civilization on the part of THT. Many of the ideas in this article about the construction of cultures and their diffusion throughout the Mediterranean world were expanded and explored more thoroughly in Bosch's textbooks on Roman and Hellenistic history.

5.   CLEMENS BOSCH'S TEXTBOOK ON ROMAN HISTORY:
THE OUTLINES OF ROMAN HISTORY

Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet [The Outline of Roman History: Part I, The Republic][329]is the first textbook written for bachelor students in Istanbul University by Clemens Bosch. It depicts the reign of the Roman Republic from its inception to the time until Octavian took full control of the Roman state as a sole ruler in 30 B.C. Bosch wrote it, as per the obligations of his contract with the Turkish government, during his first term working as a professor in İstanbul University's department of Ancient History.[330] It was translated by Sabahat Atlan, then the assistant of the department of Ancient History and was published by the İstanbul University in February of 1940.[331]

The nature of this work as a commissioned textbook is evident in the introduction Bosch wrote for it. Here he presents his work in the book as a necessary aid for any student of history, emphasizing the crucial importance of learning Roman history for every student of history, regardless of his or her major. He also points out the relative simplicity of the work, saying that it does not go into detailed discussions and imparts to its readers what it must. For this reason, he warns that this textbook should not be considered as a substitute for lectures and does not represent the whole of Roman history.[332]

The book is divided into 8 main chapters and 69 subchapters. They are generally arranged according to important events and people, such as wars, creation of laws and institutions, rebellions, important generals or consuls, etc. There are several

---

[329]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet.*

[330]Oğuz Tekin and Nil Tekin, *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi*, 31.

[331]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, Foreword.

[332]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, Foreword. Mansel comments about Bosch's textbooks as well. He says they were not very original, but that they contained many accurate opinions saying that *"...[they] were intended to provide students with concise but solid information."* Mansel, "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)," 300.

chapters that deal with socio-economic issues, such as Land distribution, tax collection, economic or social inequality between classes, decadence of the ruling elite, and mismanagement by the aristocracy. In these, Bosch delves into the details of social and economic circumstances. These examinations are usually interwoven with political and diplomatic events, alongside detailed accounts of wars and the exploits of "great men." It is important to note that by interweaving politics with social and cultural circumstances, Bosch is able to contextualize and historicize the social and cultural issues discussed in the textbook.

The book has some useful additions. The many names and terms have their original Latin versions along with Turkish translations. The book has a chronological list of events beginning with prehistoric occurrences in Italy, it has an index which also functions as a dictionary explaining who, what and where questions of Roman history, it also has three maps; one depicting the Mediterranean basin showing some of the important geographical features, political entities and cities, the other two depicting northern and southern Italy in a similar manner to the first in more detail. None of the maps provide a specific date for us to determine a time period. There is also an appendix section at the end of the book, littered with a cornucopia of photographs, from museums, archaeological sites, and other collections, of temples, statues, paintings, pottery, coins, medallions, and excavation sites; these are referenced in the text itself as visual aids, depicting many personalities, places, events, and other cultural artifacts of Roman history. Bosch does not provide a bibliography or footnotes. However, the source of most of the photographs is given. We can glean from the text itself some of the primary sources that were used, such as Herodotus and Ovid. We can also note that most of the coins and medallions referenced and shown in the appendix are from the Istanbul Archaeology Museum.

In the *Outlines of Roman History*, Bosch continues to develop some of his ideas that are present in his article from 1937, *The Particularities of Anatolia in History.* In that work, Bosch had focused on the socio-cultural influence of earlier ancient Anatolian cultures on ancient Greek, Roman, and Byzantine societies from prehistoric times to the rise of Christianity. However, the relatively narrow scope of this work, i.e., the emergence of Roman civilization, the rise of the Roman Republic, and its transition into an empire, allows him to examine only those points that are directly relevant to Roman history. Thus, he goes into detail about the cultural aspects of Roman civilization, describing its arts, social life, and especially its religious practices and rituals, paying particular attention to the origins of political and social practices with an eye to finding their roots, aiming to find connections between Roman traditions and older traditions of the Mediterranean basin. For this reason, he devotes several pages at the beginning to the founding myths of the Romans, along

with contemporary archaeological evidence of Italic peoples, such as the Umbrians and the Oscans, who lived in Italy before the emergence of Roman culture as a distinct entity.[333]

Special attention is given to the origins of the Etruscans and their influence on the Romans. They are portrayed as the forerunners of cities in Italy and the first great power in the region. Bosch points to the western shores of Anatolia, specifically the island of Lemnos, and speculates that this region was the homeland of the Etruscan people. He supports his argument with archaeological evidence found in Italy and Anatolia. Through these findings, he points to the burial rites of the Etruscans and their use of bronze tools as indicative of their Asian Minor roots. To support his claim that Lemnos was the Etruscan homeland, he points to the similarities between the language on a tablet found on the island and the Etruscan language. Two pieces of literary evidence are given to further support these claims. First, Bosch refers to Herodotus' retelling of a Lydian myth in which Etruscans from Lydia migrate to Umbria in Italy. Second, he points to the Egyptians' use of the name *Turşa* for a group of seafaring people in 1200 BC. Bosch argues that this word must have been used to refer to the Etruscans, who in later periods were known for their mastery of sailing and their domination of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Here Bosch relies on the writings of Herodotus. This evidence is enough for Bosch to declare decisively that the Etruscans were clearly of Eastern origin.[334]

Starting from their origins, Bosch elaborates on the Etruscan influence on the Roman founding myths. Bosch presents a version of the founding myth in which *Rhomos* becomes the founder of the city of Rome. In this version, Aeneas, the mythical ancestor of the Romans, marries an Etruscan woman named *Tyresenia*, and from this union is born *Romylos*, who later fathered *Rhomos*, who became the founder of the city (Rome).[335] Bosch doesn't reference any sources on where he took this version of the foundation myth.[336] According to Bosch, these names might not have been particular names of people but generic nouns, *Tyresenia* meaning Etruscan

---

[333] Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 5.

[334] Ibid., 5.

[335] Ibid.,5

[336] There are few ancient sources that Bosch might have taken this version of the Roman foundation myth from. Ancient writer Livius Andronicus, in his work *Odyssia* alludes to Romos, son of Odysseus and Circe, being the founder of Rome. Sander M. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) 50; Plutarch had different claims to the origin of the name Rome. According to him, *Rhomos*, again son of Odysseus and Circe sent from Troy by Diomedes, could have given his name to the city. Erich S Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1992) 11.

woman, derived from *Tyresenio*,[337]name of the ethnic group.[338]Bosch extends his linguistic explanations to place names demonstrating the Etruscan roots of Roman place names.[339]

Bosch links many of the religious practices and deities back to Etruscans by linking the similarities between religious understandings.[340]Alongside linguistics, he uses archeological evidence of pre-historic settlements in Italy to lend credence to the foundation myths.[341]Bosch's historical narrative demonstrates the extent of the Etruscans' political domination and the cultural influence on the people of Italy, particularly on Romans. This political domination started to subside after 6th century BC with the invasions of Gallic people from the North of Italy and Greek push from the South Italy to Etruscan and Latin lands.[342]Nevertheless, Bosch makes it clear that their cultural impact over the Romans never dissipated completely, remaining in Roman cultural consciousness long after any political Etruscan entity disappeared. For example, Bosch brings up the Etruscan ancestry of Octavian's political ally, C. Maecenas.[343] By setting the stage in such a way, Bosch, depicts the Etruscans to be a high culture of outside conquerors whose political domination over the Latin peoples of Italy, and especially Romans, shaped and guided these peoples' political and social cultures over centuries.

Bosch mentions the cultural influences of another people group called the *Elymians* who lived in Sicily. He cites Thucydides while talking about this group. He also refers to linguistic and numismatic evidence -as he does many times throughout his book- to link the *Elymian people* to Asia Minor alongside their deities which he links it back to the *Mother Goddess* cult of Anatolia. Bosch claims that Iulia family, a Roman aristocratic family which produced several notable people, such as Gaius Iulius Caesar and the first Roman emperor Octavian, traced their origins to *Elymian* people as well.[344]

It would be useful to compare Bosch's data and claims about Etruscan origins with other scholars who contributed to Turkish history thesis at the time. Willhelm

---

[337]Tyrrhen and Tyrsen mean Etruscan in ancient Greek. The name of Tyrrhen sea comes from this origin.

[338]Bosch, Roma Tarihinin Anahatları, 6.

[339]Ibid., 9.

[340]Ibid., 12.

[341]Ibid., 8.

[342]Ibid., 9.

[343]Ibid., 108.

[344]Ibid.,5, 83.

Brandenstein and Giulio Jacopi have presented works on the origins of Etruscans in the Second Turkish History Congress in 1937. They subscribed to the thesis that claimed Etruscans migrated to Northern Italy from Anatolia.

Brandenstein was a classical philologist, his two works reflected his expertise. In his article, *Etrüsk meselesinin şimdiki durumu* [The Present Situation of the Etruscan Issue][345] he employed linguistic evidence and the examination of ancient myths to corroborate the Etruscans' eastern origins, tracing their roots even further east compared to other proponents of the "Eastern" theory, to Central Asia. He claimed that the Etruscans originated in Central Asia and were forced to migrate to Anatolia. They firstly settled in North-Eastern parts of this region. Here, they had to migrate on several occasions to Western Anatolia, because of outside pressures, particularly of invasions from different groups of people. Brandenstein states that the most of the ancient stories pertaining to Etruscans originated in Western Anatolia, particularly from the island of Lemnos and other locations close to the island in the Aegean cost.[346]He finds them referred to as *Tursa* in Egyptian records. He points out that *Tursa* is also the name of the capital city of the Etruscans near İzmir, where Tursen, the first name of the Etruscans, comes from.[347]As mentioned before, Bosch similarly references Herodotus' claims and Egyptian records to corroborate the use of the *Tursa* name for Etruscans in the ancient sources.[348] Furthermore, Brandenstein's delves into linguistic evidence, demonstrating the similarities between Turkish and Etruscan languages through their use of syntax and grammatical components. He puts this similarity as proof that Etruscan language was not of Indo-German origin.[349]To sum up, according to Brandenstien, Etruscans came to Anatolia from Central Asia, then they migrated to Italy through West of Anatolia. He also emphasizes if Etruscans originated in Central Asia, their way of life must have been similar to that of the Turks at that time, similarities in their language structures could attest to that. However, Brandenstein says this was not conclusive proof that the Etruscans were of Turkish origin. Instead, he suggests that cultural similarities between the cultures of Central Asia and Etruscans could not be ignored and should be studied more closely. Another thing that is poignant in this work is the underlining of Etruscan cultural impact on the Romans implicitly and explicitly. He directly states that the Etruscan people and polities in Italy deeply influenced

---

[345]Brandenstein, "Etrüsk meselesinin şimdiki durumu."

[346]Ibid., 213,216.

[347]Ibid., 215.

[348]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 5.

[349]Brandenstein, "Etrüsk meselesinin şimdiki durumu," 218.

the Romans by providing a basis for Roman culture.[350] The more subtle implication comes from, one of his linguistic arguments. He claims that the word *Troia* was of not Greek or Hittite origin but of Etruscan one.[351]By presenting this idea, he constructs another throughline between the Romans and Etruscans who were of Central Asian ancestry. We should point out that this connection between Central Asian people and Turkic peoples with Romans and Etruscans do not come up in Bosch's works. Bosch does not make this connection. As mentioned before, both in his article and his textbooks he only finds connections between Rome and ancient Greeks and Anatolia.

In his second work, *Limni'de bulunan kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan neşet ettiklerine dair dil bakımından en ehemmiyetli delil* [The Inscription Found on Lemnos: The Greatest Linguistic Proof of Etruscans' Emergence in Anatolia],[352] he analyzes the eponymous tablet, finding connections between it and the previously examined tablets that were identified as of Etruscan origin elsewhere to find close similarities between them. This work can be understood as a companion piece to his previous article on the Etruscans. Here, he corroborates and strengths many of the arguments he made about the Etruscan roots, locating them in the Western Aegean cost through the linguistic evidence found on the tablet.

On the other hand, Jacopi approaches the subject from the perspective of archeology in his work, *Etrüsk meselesi ve bunun şarktaki Vaziyeti* [The Etruscan Issue and its Position in the East],[353]particularly through the archeological findings located in Italy. He compares three different theories on the origins of the Etruscans "Northern origin theory", which Jacopi considers to be the part of the old paradigm, the other theory situates the Etruscans in the Villanovan culture, while the last one, the one Jacopi subscribes to, "Eastern origin idea posits that Etruscans were of Anatolian origin. Similar to Brandenstein, Jacopi points out that the main evidence for the Eastern origin theory came from, as mentioned before, the stories of Herodotus and Thukydides.[354] Jacopi corroborates the ancient stories of Etruscan migration to Italy using archeological evidence, strengthening Anatolia's claims of being a homeland to these people.[355]

---

[350]Ibid., 219.

[351]Ibid., 214.

[352]Brandenstein, "Limni'de bulunan kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan neşet ettiklerine dair dil bakımından en ehemmiyetli delil."

[353]Jacopi, "Etrüsk meselesi ve bunun şarktaki Vaziyeti."

[354]Ibid.,1060.

[355]Ibid., 1054.

Jacopi questions the northern theory of origin. According to this origin theory of the Etruscans, developed by German scholars such as Barthold Georg Niebuhr Niehbur and Wolfgang Helbig in the 19th century, the Etruscans migrated from the Alps to Italy and were of Indo-European origin. Theory posits that the Etruscans and Italic peoples were related people groups. Jacopi claims that this theory is outdated. He says that anthropological evidence does not support this view. He also questions the theory of Villanovan origin, citing archaeological evidence against this idea.[356] Jacopi states that the theory of Eastern migration is supported by contemporary archeological evidence, linguistic findings and ancient stories and myths.[357]For archeological evidence he points to the lack of artifacts that could be identified as belonging to the Etruscan culture in the lower levels of the ground, which belonged to even more archaic times, in archeological dig sites. However, he states that materials found in the tombs, which were dated later times, most likely belonged to the Etruscans. According to Jacopi, this demonstrates that the Etruscans were conquerors who descended on the Italic inhabitants in a much later that, making Etruscans foreigners to Italy.[358]Jacopi corroborates archeological findings with ancient stories and names and reigns of Etruscan royalty and clergy to date Etruscan's arrival from Anatolia to Italy in around 1000 BC.[359]Jacopi retells the story of Etruscans' flight from their original homeland of north-Wwstern Anatolia to Italy in two different waves. He demonstrates that in each Etruscan wave of migration was caused outside invaders coming from the east of Anatolia.[360]On the other hand, Jacopi employs linguistic evidence to demonstrate that Indo-European impact on Etruscan language did not mean that Etruscans were Indo-European. In fact, he states that the Etruscan language was in the same branch as Asian languages such as Lydian, Lycian and Hittite. The reason for the impact of Indo-European influence of on the Etruscan language can be explained by the Etruscan's interactions with Indo-European people's groups, such as Achaeans and Phrygians around the Aegean and Latins and other Italic peoples in the north of Italy.[361]This Hittite and Lydian connection is of particular note, as one of the main goals of Turkish history thesis was the demonstration of Hittites to be the ancestors of Turks, thus making Anatolia homeland of the Turks. Jacopi's linkage of Etruscans to Hittites could

---

[356]Ibid., 1054.

[357]Ibid., 1054.

[358]Ibid., 1055.

[359]Ibid., 1055.

[360]Ibid., 1055.

[361]Ibid., 1053.

be read as a continuation of that endeavor. As linking the Etruscans to Hittites would mean, Etruscans also would be considered the descendants of the ancestors of Turks. Thereby, constructing a connection in which the ancient Turkish influence could be transmitted to Italy and influence the ancestors of Romans. Jacopi does not make this connection explicit, he doesn't go beyond demonstrating close similarities between Etruscan language and Hittite language.

According to Jacopi, the rejection of the northern origin and Villanovan theories along with the overwhelming archaeological, linguistic, and anecdotal evidence of the ancients showed that the eastern origin theory was the idea that should be pursued and developed through more rigorous research and study. From this perspective, Jacopi declares that the Anatolian-Eastern origin of the Etruscans is a proven fact.[362]

5.1 Roman State, Society, and Culture

The themes of law and order and the mutual agreements that constitute and maintain them are central to Bosch's examinations of Roman state and society. Bosch shows that Rome was built on alliances, or pacts (*pactum* in Latin). The pacts between the state and the citizen, between the upper and lower classes of society, and between foreign entities and Rome are presented and analyzed in several chapters. The connection of these pacts with divine laws is strongly emphasized. Divinity is presented as both the source and the guarantor of the pacts. On the other hand, he also emphasizes that patriarchal family ties, martial strength, and wealth also dictated, in both domestic and international relations, the nature and form of the contracts that many different agents could enter into. In Bosch's narrative of the Roman Republic, socio-political changes can be observed through the development and observance of these contracts.

Bosch shows that in domestic affairs, two relationships stood out as the defining features of Roman society: The relationship between the state and the citizen, and the relationship between the upper and lower classes. Both relationships were defined by struggle and negotiation. These struggles, in turn, became the driving force behind socio-political change. To illustrate his points, Bosch lays out the basic institutions, practices, and traditions of the Roman state from the end of the Roman kingdom to the early Republic. First, he defines who citizens were and what rights

---

[362]Ibid., 1061.

they had. The community of citizens (*populus*) consisted of family fathers (*patres*) and their closest relatives (*patricii*). Only they had the right to vote (*suffragium*), to hold office (*honores*), to marry (*conubium*) and to trade (*commercium*).*Patricii* would also hold military offices and advise the king in different political bodies, such as the senate (*senatus*). They chose the next king from their own ranks. Legally, the king (*rex)* had ultimate authority, but both the checks and balances provided by various political bodies and the strong aristocratic family ties limited the king's power. According to Bosch, these aristocratic families were instrumental in the Early Republic's successes over other Italic peoples. They provided the Roman state with a framework of command and control based on obedience to a familial patriarchal figure that enabled the Romans to prevail over their less politically structured enemies.[363]

The emergence of the plebeian class is a sticking point for Bosch in his works. He pointed out this problem in his article on ancient Anatolia, here he delves deeper into this phenomenon. Bosch presents that the rest of the population of Rome, those who were neither *populus* nor *patriici*, consisted of immigrants who had no rights. They were integrated into the city of Rome through patron-client relationships, meaning that non-citizens had to find a patron (*patronus*) in order to maintain themselves as clients (*clientes*) of their patrons. If their patron family perished in one way or another, they would join the ranks of the *plebs*, the name given to the disenfranchised mass of people in Rome.[364]

The upper and lower classes of citizens were also organized into groups of 100 men (*centuria*) for military purposes based on their wealth. This new system divided the population into five sections, including patricians and plebeians, to ensure that Roman citizens with property and possessions could serve in the army. There was no coinage in Rome at the time, so wealth was calculated by landed property or exchangeable crops. When the *plebs* were sufficiently numerous, they were allowed to represent themselves in popular assemblies called *comitia centuriata*, which meant that these *centurias* would serve as both political and military units. The *comitia centuriata* was established during the reign of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome, largely as a result of military and financial necessity.[365] Until the end of the Republican period, consuls, *censor*s, praetors, *aediles*, tribunes and other high officials were elected by this assembly. However, the votes of *patricii* assembly (*comita curiata*) were purposefully designed to outnumber them 98 to 95 to continue the

---

[363]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 9-10

[364]Ibid., 10.

[365]Ibid., 10.

political domination of the *patricii* class. Political categorization of units of hundreds also provided the backbone of the Roman military by becoming the framework for legions. People who were conscripted had to equip themselves, thus wealth of the individual was also instrumental regarding in which part of the military system they would serve in. On the other hand, military service meant having a claim on the spoils of war and attainment of martial glory, which were both crucial for social advancement in Rome. Every four years a census would be held to reevaluate wealth and redetermine the size of the *centurias*.[366]

After laying out the early constitution of the Roman state, Bosch analyzes Rome's transition into a republic (*res publica*) which brought with it several changes to the aforementioned relationships and shifted the main source of political authority. At this time *comitia centuriata*, the people's assembly, became the ultimate authority in Rome. The duties of the assembly included hearing treason and criminal cases, making laws, deciding on war and peace; however, they were obliged to obtain the prior approval of the *senatus -patrium auctoritas-* for all decisions made This assembly, whose organizational and numerical structure favored the representation of wealthy citizens over the poor, also dealt with homicide cases until the permanent courts were established. The two consuls, elected from among the members of the Senate, held executive and legislative power; they were politically immune during their year of office. However, they had to account for their decisions after their term of office.[367]

The Senate, formerly composed of 300 *patricii*, was augmented by plebeians who were wealthy enough to serve as cavalry, members of the newly formed equestrian class (*equites*), whose names were added to the end of the senate list. The decisions of the Senate were the basis for the consuls but did not have the force of law.[368]

During times of special danger, all these state organizations are rendered inactive and all authority is transferred to an extraordinary official, the *dictator*, who is appointed for a period of 6 months. The *dictator* is appointed by one of the consuls by order of the senate without the involvement of the popular assembly. The *dictator* has the authority to override all laws and the authority of officials and is a temporary example of absolute sovereignty.[369]

Bosch emphasizes several points. First, Bosch pays special attention to the phe-

---

[366]Ibid., 11.

[367]Ibid., 17.

[368]Ibid., 17.

[369]Ibid., 17.

nomenon of two consuls holding office together (*collegialitas*), and he points out the length of their term, which was only one year (*annuitas*). He demonstrates integration of different classes into the political system through representation, without overlooking the important role played by wealth in the distribution of political responsibility and power. Furthermore, he represents the office of dictator as a necessary evil.[370] According to him, cohesion of all of these practices indicated the robustness of the Roman political system, where different class interests were represented and several checks and balances existed to provide a safety net against monopolies of power. Bosch refers back to these practices several times in his narrative, gauging the health of the political system of Rome in different periods through the continuity of the institutions and the level of adherence to foundational traditions and the practices of the Republic.

Bosch emphasizes how, with the establishment of the Republic and the expansion of political representation, the tug-of-war between different classes came to the fore. Although the *plebs* gained political agency during this period, wealth and nobility still played a significant role in determining who was favored by the system. The *patricii* class, which was the most senior group of the Roman elite and enjoyed a much better political standing, attempted to contain and/or curtail the growing power of both the newly formed elites, such as the *equites*, and the *plebs*. This political struggle boiled over on many occasions, causing socio-political strife in Roman society. Bosch delves into the details of how the class struggle continued through the 5th and 4th centuries. He interweaves the examination of this social issue with the retelling of Rome's wars with its neighbors and the internal political developments of the institutions, such as the creation of new offices or the recording of laws. In doing so, he shows how the aforementioned topics were inextricably linked, and for this reason, how one topic could not be studied without the study of others.

One of the first setbacks for the *plebs* occurred in 494 BC. The *plebs* were financially burdened and impoverished by the economic demands of military conscription. Despite their service to the state, they could not use the public lands (*ager publicus*) acquired through war. In addition, debt laws forced many of them into indentured servitude. Faced with all this, the *plebs* decided to found a city of their own and migrated to the Sacred Mountain (*Seccessio plebis in Montem Sacrum*). The situation was stabilized only when they were promised some concessions through the intervention of one of the consuls. These compromises included the cancellation of the *plebs*' debts and the establishment of a new office called the *tribuni plebis*.

---

[370]Ibid., 16-17.

Tribunes, like consuls, were elected for one year and were charged with representing the interests of the *plebs* while protecting their rights from encroachment by the aristocratic classes. They were later given the right to veto (*ius intercedendi*) legislation that they felt threatened the rights of the lower classes. They were also given the responsibility of keeping the peace and prosecuting crimes in certain special situations. Tribunes could not be prosecuted for their decisions while in office, but they did not have military jurisdiction. Alongside the office of tribune, a new representative body consisting of *plebs*, *comitia tributa*, was established. The decisions taken by this assembly was called *plebiscita*. The creation of such institutions was not enough for many wealthy plebeians; the *patricii* class still enjoyed many rights that the lower classes did not. Plebeians could not marry into the upper classes, and they were barred from holding many political offices. Moreover, the aristocratic classes tried to reverse the progress made by the lower classes or to exploit the *plebs* by circumventing the new institutions.[371]

Bosch again addresses the question of the rule of law and how it was established in Rome. He argues that from the founding of Rome, the traditions and practices of the ancients (*mos maiorum*) were held by the *patricii* class. According to him, this left the door open for abuse and misinterpretation of the laws in favor of the Roman elite, and thus the writing down of the laws was prevented by the aristocracy for a long time. The constitution of the Twelve Tables was born out of this need to define and clarify the laws of the land so that they could not be so openly abused. In 451 B.C., the consuls and tribunes were charged with writing down the laws. As a result of this process, ten tablets were created and later approved by the people. Later, two more tablets were created with the added supervision of three plebs in the group responsible for writing the laws, called the *Decemvirs*, who held various political offices such as consulship and quaestorship. These 12 Tables of Law, which contain provisions on family law, inheritance, debt, the right to sue, and criminal law, have been the unchanging foundation of Roman law.[372]

The *Decemvirs* did not relinquish their posts even after their term limits ended, this led to a second migration of the Plebs to the Sacred Mountain. The group of *Decemvirs* were dissolved and Plebs were given more rights to calm them down. *Comitia tributa*, which was made up of poor Plebs, was elevated to the same authority as *comitia centuriata* thus the results of plebiscites were given same power as laws. The right of Provocation (*ius provocationis*, right to appeal to the assemblies), which was taken from the Plebs shortly after its granting, was instituted

---

[371]Ibid. 18-19.

[372]Ibid. 20.

again. Lastly legal immunity of the Tribunes, which was also taken away, was confirmed again. Alongside these, in 5th century BC, Plebs also acquired the right to marry with *patricii* families and hold several military positions, such as tribune with military authority and even commander of legions. The *patricii* class was quite concerned with the rise of the *plebian* political power. They wanted to wrestle some semblance of their former political domination. In order to do that, they created the office of *censor.censors* would be chosen from former consuls by the *comitia centuriata* and would serve for 18 months. They had to power to oversee and assign duties of tax collection and distribution of public property, choose who would be in the senate and who belonged to what class and, *censor*s also had the power to safeguard public morals. All of this authority was designed keep the growing power of rich and influential Plebs in check by overseeing their actions from several socio-economic avenues. On the other hand, the office of *queastor*, who oversaw economic affairs started admitting *plebians*.[373]

Bosch points out that in the 4th century the class struggle began to subside in favor of a greater integration of the various classes of Roman society. This was mainly a result of the serious external threats the Romans faced. Large groups of plebeians were more and more integrated into the political structure, while the previous political acquisitions of the lower classes were accepted as core parts of the Roman Republic even by the aristocratic elites. Bosch emphasizes the many wars and invasions the Roman state had to face during this period as the main driving force behind this socio-political change.[374]The war with the Gauls, which lasted most of the 4th century, became the main catalyst for change. The Romans were drawn into the war by their alliances with the Gauls, and their armies were decisively defeated in the field. In 390 B.C., the city of Rome was sacked by the Gauls, and the alliance of Italic peoples, whom the Romans thought were under their control and in good standing with the Roman state, turned against the Romans.[375]Bosch points out that both of these events had a lasting effect on Roman consciousness and in turn on Roman politics.

The class struggles flared up again immediately after the sack of Rome; the wealthy plebeians demanded that they be granted the same rights as the patricians, such as holding the same offices and being subject to the same more lenient debt laws. The Roman aristocracy came to the realization that they could no longer push for the consolidation of their political dominance over every part and facet of the Roman

---

[373]Ibid. 20-21.

[374]Ibid., 21.

[375]Ibid., 23-24.

state and society. In this time of war and crisis, the need for compromise and social integration became apparent. The *patricii* class relented and negotiated with the wealthy plebeians. As a result, the Plebeians gained more political representation and rights. Many political offices were opened to them. In just a few decades, they were admitted to the offices of *aedil*, *censor*, *auger*, and *ponficies*, and even to the offices of *consul* and *dictator*.[376]Since high civil servants did not receive a salary, wealth was a necessary condition for a career. This was a point that deepened the conflict between the haves and the have-nots.[377]At the same time the new office of praetor, took the task of the creation of laws and edicts from the consuls and in time their decisions came to constitute the common legal practices of Roman state. This office, was reserved by *patriici* class as a cautionary institution against the lower classes.[378]On the other hand, plebs also attained some economic rights which finally allowed them to benefit from their wealth as *patricii* did.[379]The reconciliation between these classes mainly benefited the wealthy plebeian families. However, poorer plebeian families were also given a share of state land and citizen colonies which were established on land acquired in wars. In addition, the practice of debt bondage was abolished in 326.[380]

Bosch argues that it was becoming apparent that the Patrician class and the rich Plebeians were the primary beneficiaries of the reconciliation between the classes. With the expansion of political rights, the aristocracy of officials (*optimates, nobiles*) expanded with the addition of new members (*homines novi*). Although there was still a wealth gap amongst the different parts of the lower classes, the differences between the classes, between *patricii* and *plebian*, were no longer as deep as before. The greatest contribution of the new civil servant aristocracy to society was the facilitation of this social mobility. Any candidate (*candidatus*) could enter a public office by popular election and, if the *censor* expressed confidence in him, he could be included in the senate.[381]

In this period, the management of foreign policy and finance belonged to the senate. The *comitia centuriata* and the *comitia tributa*, including the *patricii* and the *plebs*, still existed. It was their duty and right to make laws and decide on criminal cases.

---

[376]Ibid., 24-25.

[377]Ibid., 25.

[378]Ibid., 24-25.

[379]Ibid., 24.

[380]Ibid., 25.

[381]Ibid., 25.

Consuls, *praetors* and *censors* were elected by the *comitia centuriata*, and *aediles* and *questors* by the *comitia tributa*. The Tribunes of the people now began to be more lenient and friendly towards the government than they had been when the class struggle was more heated. They participated in the meetings of the Senate and often used their influence in favor of the Senate.[382]

Bosch emphasizes another crucial effect of the aftermath of the Gallic sack of Rome. He states that this event traumatized the Romans and made them wearier of being taken by surprise again, as they had been in that war. Thus, the Romans realized that their military system needed to be reformed. Bosch points out that in the eyes of Roman politicians, military reform was as necessary as social reform, which involved reconciling class differences. In this regard, consul Marcus Furius Camillus led the reorganization of the army. Camillus reformed the army's categorization and conscription systems so that they were no longer tied to the wealth and property of the conscript. Citizens would be categorized into units based on their years of service. Formations, movement, weapons, and other equipment were changed. The equipment and constitution of the army was made more uniform.[383]In addition to reforming the army, the Romans decided to take a more active role in diplomacy and the international arena. The Romans wanted to dictate rules of engagement so that something similar to 390 BC would not happen again.

Bosch emphasizes the crucial role played by mutual agreements in the constitution of the Roman state and in Rome's international diplomacy, especially after the wars of the 4th century BC. Rome itself was built on mutual agreements between many peoples. The Romans adhered to a legal principle that regarded each state as an independent entity with the right to act according to its interests.[384]States were immune from encroachment unless they acted against divine law, that is, unless they lost the moral right necessary for their existence. Therefore, the Romans tried to maintain peace in international relations as long as possible. Whenever a state violated this principle and disturbed the international peace, war against that state was permissible in self-defense. Jupiter oversaw this mode of international affairs. The Romans believed that he was not only the god of heaven and king of the gods, but also the guardian of public oaths and contracts, and the guarantor of good faith in public affairs and politics. This mode had been accepted from time immemorial, both by the Romans and by many other Italic peoples.[385]From this perspective, the

---

[382]Ibid., 25-26.

[383]Ibid.,26.

[384]Ibid., 32.

[385]Ibid., 33.

Romans believed in an international order governed by strict rules of engagement and a network of alliances. Thus, at various times, the Romans formed pacts with their former enemies after invading their lands by restoring some of their legal rights. Even when the destruction of the enemy seemed legally permissible according to Roman laws and beliefs, they chose to incorporate them rather than destroy them. Many of the Italic peoples and city-states around the Mediterranean basin were incorporated into the Roman state through these mutual treaties. Moreover, the pacts between Rome and the city-states it occupied were relatively flexible. They allowed the cities to exercise a certain amount of political agency within Rome's borders. This agency manifested itself in a number of ways; for example, the minting of coins and the prosecution of criminals according to their own laws were some of the rights that Rome extended to these polities.[386] In all of these pacts, the Roman state was the senior partner and held the moral high ground as the enforcer of peace and order.[387] The people of these polities gained full citizenship through centuries of hardship and struggle, but even the opportunity to be integrated into society while gaining political agency was, as Bosch points out, a relatively new phenomenon in ancient times.[388] Thus, Bosch points out that the Roman state was able to bind the interests of many different people to the interests of the state without enslaving them. The Roman state, or *Imperium Romanum*, was based on such a system of alliances. Bosch calls this system of incorporating different peoples under a common law, political will, and a flexible system of cultural exchange the Roman Commonwealth of Nations. Bosch refers to Rome in this way because through this mode of operation, Rome, instead of becoming a dominator and destroyer of cultures and peoples, as many contemporary empires had been, became a melting pot of these peoples and their cultures. This system also allowed the Romans, through their alliances, to intervene in international affairs and conflicts without appearing to be the aggressor. The Romans declared several defensive wars, claiming the right to come to the defense of their allies in times of need. Bosch cites this system as the key to the success of the Roman state.[389]

The importance of laws and covenants in Roman history can be observed by examining situations in which various contracts that constituted the state and society were violated. Bosch gives several concrete examples of where these phenomena occurred. Although he describes the slow process of corruption and abuse of power

---

[386]Ibid., 60-61

[387]*Pax*, peace in Latin, is closely related with the word *pactum*, meaning contract.

[388]Ibid., 33-34.

[389]Ibid., 33-34.

exhibited by Roman officials in the 3rd and 2nd centuries, he points to the last century of the Republic, particularly to the figures of Sulla and Caesar, as those who did not follow the examples set by Roman political practices and traditions, exploiting the weaknesses inherent in the system. On the other hand, he presents Cicero and Pompey as examples of Roman virtues and contrasts them with the former names. Bosch criticizes Sulla and Caesar for using violence against their own people to gain power. He highlights the purge of their opponents and their marches against the city of Rome as their most egregious crimes. Sulla's favoring of the Senate and the aristocracy over the common people is described by Bosch as: *"...a fundamental regression..."* [390]While Caesar's war against the Gauls is also examined as an example of breaking with the tradition of international relations in its brutality.[391]On the contrary, Cicero's brave and diligent defense of the Republican traditions during the Catilina Conspiracy, makes Cicero the embodiment and the savior of the Roman Republic.[392]Furthermore, Bosch praises Pompeius both as a military leader and one of the best examples of a public servant for relinquishing, as per tradition, his military authority and becoming a common civilian at the gates of the city of Rome. Bosch points out that he could have kept his armies, thanks to his successes and popularity, and forced himself to the political establishment as a dictator as Sulla had done before him.[393]In presenting these events, Bosch underscores the prominent role that tradition and pacts played in Rome, both in their observance and in their violation. Bosch shows that the actions of Caesar and Sulla became the norm in the 1st century B.C., and the actions of Cicero and Pompey were considered heroic when they merely followed the basic practices of the state. According to Bosch, by the end of the Republic, the only way to save the system was to create new instruments of legitimacy and to renew the pacts between the state and the people. That's why the transformation of the Republic into an Empire led to the stabilization of the socio-political situation in Rome.[394]Bosch shows that the transition of the Roman state from a republic to a monarchy allowed the establishment of internal peace, which had been disturbed by civil wars for a century, and the improvement of the administration, which had been plagued by corruption. This was done by consolidating executive and legislative power in one hand, which allowed the locus of power to reconstitute laws and rearrange political offices. According to Bosch,

---

[390]Ibid., 79. Translation is mine.

[391]Ibid., 96-97.

[392]Ibid., 93.

[393]Ibid., 95.

[394]Ibid., 83.

Caesar was the first person to come close to achieving these goals.[395]However, only Caesar's adopted son was able to make this transition to one-man rule and stabilize the socio-political situation in Rome.[396]

On the cultural side, one of Bosch's main arguments is the pragmatism of the Romans in adapting to foreign influences. He portrays Rome as something close to a benevolent empire that did not impose its culture and laws on its allies, while allowing them to remain legally within the Roman state. On this point, however, Bosch makes it clear that practical considerations seemed to outweigh moral ones for the Romans.[397]He also points out that the Romans were quick to adopt foreign practices and institutions. Bosch will return to this point later to show how the adoption of the mother goddess of Anatolia could still have been possible, even if it was not considered part of ancient Roman custom.[398]We will delve into Rome's adoption of *Mother Goddess* cult in one of the following sections.

5.1.1 Roman Religion

Bosch devotes a chapter to Roman religion. Here he presents their belief systems, examining the most important rituals, traditions, and deities of their faith. He points out several traditions and gods that the Romans adopted from Etruscan culture. He also emphasizes the centrality of Roman belief in the lives of the Roman people and in the affairs of state. Religious beliefs were crucial in determining Roman political and cultural actions; Romans make war, speak in public (which was a crucial political action in Roman society), make laws, and create art more often than not in accordance with their beliefs.[399]

Bosch points to the intertwined nature of the religious and socio-political elements in the Roman state and society. In doing so, Bosch establishes the necessary foundation and context for his narrative, in which religion, ancestry, and the adoption of foreign cults, along with social practices, play an instrumental role in shaping and dictating the political decisions and cultural life of the Romans. Bosch's claims about the influence of Eastern cultures, especially those originating in Anatolia, the themes of the cult of the *Mother Goddess* along with the myth of Aeneas and the city of Troy,

---

[395]Ibid., 83.

[396]Ibid., 120-21.

[397]Ibid., 35-36.

[398]Ibid., 36.

[399]Ibid., 11.

and the broader concept of Roman interaction with the East can be understood in this context. Similarly, his approach to the cultural practices of the influential Roman elite and their political discourse about their ancestry can be viewed through the same lens.

5.2 Rome's Expansion to the East

Bosch highlights the aftermath of the Punic and Macedonian Wars as a turning point for Roman politics, society, and culture. Rome's victory over the Carthaginians on the west-south axis, its victories over the Macedonians in the east, and its political and military interventions in Asia Minor and Syria made the Roman Republic the dominant political and economic force in the Mediterranean. As they expanded their lands and wealth through conquest, plunder, and reparations, their diplomatic and trade reach to the east and west increased greatly. It also broadened their political ambitions and cultural horizons. As the state grew, so did Rome's ability to exploit land and people. This meant, however, that the laws and regulations created to maintain social order and peace in the city of Rome and among its closest allies began to crack under the stress of running an overseas empire. Bosch explores both the successes and challenges Rome faced during this period from a variety of perspectives.

Bosch emphasizes the corruption and injustice that accompanied the exponential expansion of Rome's land and resources. As a result, the ranks of Roman officials charged with collecting taxes and administering newly acquired territories swelled. The lucrative nature of this duty allowed these officials to invest their profits in *latifundium*, large farms run by slave labor and created from state-owned land. *Latifundiums* used the best agricultural technologies and practices of the time, and the exploitation of slaves made these institutions immensely profitable. The peasants could not compete with them and lost their land, becoming the unemployed masses of the urban proletariat. Bosch harshly criticizes the greed and callousness with which these newly minted officials conducted business at home and abroad; he likens their behavior in the provinces to that of careless thieves. More importantly, he blames their use of government land, which he describes as confiscation, as one of the main causes of social destabilization. In several regions of the country, Rome was slowly deprived of one of the building blocks of the state, the free peasants. This, in turn, brought the Republic closer to the brink of social collapse. While Bosch points out these injustices, he does not detail the exploitation of the slaves. Instead,

he chooses to focus on the societal disintegration brought about by the dissolution of the laws and rights that maintained the Roman system of alliances and ensured law and order in society.[400]However, he notes that the downfall of the system was successfully delayed by several means. One was the extension of the right to sue and complain to the people in the provinces. Another was the incorporation of the upper classes in the overseas provinces into the Roman bureaucratic aristocracy. This, in turn, created a mechanism of oversight over Roman administrators while ensuring the compliance of the local elite.[401]

The Eastern cultures, which, as Bosch puts it, *"...the Romans had so long mystically feared..."* [402]were finally brought to Rome with the conquests in the eastern Mediterranean. The resulting cultural exchange introduced many new cultural elements and arts into Roman society, which increased the Romans' progress in intellectual matters. Poetry and theater, although not unknown in Rome, penetrated deeper into society. In the first stages of this phenomenon, the creators of new types of art were of foreign origin, such as the poet Livius Andronicus from *Tarentum.* In time, the Romans adopted these arts to tell their own decidedly Roman stories about the history of their city and their wars with Carthage.[403]This idea that the Romans feared the East and yet, through various myths, traced their origins to Anatolia seems to be a contradiction in itself. However, this phenomenon becomes clearer when we look at the question of the adoption of the *Mother Goddess* cult from the East.

5.2.1 *Magna Mater* in Rome

Amongst many cultural changes that followed the Punic Wars, Bosch singles out the transportation and acceptance of the *Mother Goddess* cult of Anatolia as the most monumental one. This cult was brought to Rome in 204 BC close to the end of the war.[404] The decision to transport the artifacts, along with the rituals belonging to worship of the *Mother Goddess*, was made earlier during the war when all seemed lost for the Romans and the Roman public was looking for divine salvation of any

---

[400]Ibid., 62-63.

[401]Ibid., 62.

[402]Ibid., 63. Translation is mine.

[403]Ibid., 63.

[404]Here Bosch puts the date in 205 BC but this is the date for the decision to bring the artifacts and not the date for their arrival. Bosch also doesn't cite his sources for this event but we can surmise that the version of the story Bosch retells comes from Livy's *History of Rome.* Ibid., 54..

kind.[405]After the war, the Roman war hero Scipio Africanus[406] and his family started to represent part of the Roman upper class who actively sought Eastern cultural products and brought them to Rome. Cultural shift was not uniformly appreciated by the Roman upper classes. Conservative party, most importantly people who coalesced around the notable orator and statesman Cato the Elder, endeavored to fight against Eastern influences. They spoke out against the corrupting influences of the East and whenever the conservative party had the authority to do so, they banned these practices they deemed un-Roman.[407]In this case, Cato the Elder's political and cultural opposition of the foreign influences should not be understood as just a reactionary backlash. The Cato's and his circle's rejection of Anatolian *Mother Goddess* mainly stemmed from two main points. Firstly, Romans of the 3rd and 2nd Centuries BC were not used to self-sacrificial and orgic rituals, which as mentioned before, took central stage in the worship of the *Mother Goddess*. From the Romans's perspective, arrival of *Mother Goddess* with her cast of castrated priests, with whips and long hair, as Mary Beard puts it, must have been the most un-Roman site to behold. Secondly and her physical representation being a meteorite was also unusual for Romans, who generally were used to the representation of their gods to be in human form.[408]

According to Bosch these events were a turning point for Roman socio-political life. They coincided with greater monopolization of power in the hands of the elite Roman families resulting from a break in the term limits of the high public offices during the Punic Wars. Romans first forays into the east, Greece and Anatolia, also happens during this period. At the same time invasion of the Apennine peninsula by the Carthaginian General Hannibal Barca and his successive victories against several Roman armies created a crisis of faith in the Roman public which sought comfort in the search for new deities that could deliver them to salvation. All of that meant the Roman society experienced a transformation in political culture and a break from traditional political practices while also having an existential a socio-cultural search

---

[405]This point elaborated further in Bosch's textbook on history of Helenism. Bosch, Helenizm Anahatları; II. Kısım, 83.

[406]In this work Bosch does not explain the reasoning behind Scipio and his family becoming the torchbearers of Eastern cultures but the cause is examined in more detail in his textbook on history of Hellenism and in one of Rohde's articles. Rohde, *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater*, 10-11.

[407]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 54.

[408]Bosch and Rohde both point out that some of the Mother Goddess's rituals and practices of worship were alien to Romans. They both also refer to Livius Histories for their retelling of the events surrounding the transportation. But it seems they downplay these aspects in favor of representing the Romans reverence towards her. For that reason, Cato's reaction is not contextualized in the right manner. Beard's contextualization of the event makes it more clear why someone like Cato, who valued Roman historical consciousness as a politician and a historian, would object to the practices of a deity which belonged to the homeland of Aeneas. Mary Beard, *SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome* (London: Profile Books, 2015), 215-16.

for meaning because of the extraordinary circumstances of war and implication of certain doom. While Bosch does not go into further detail about the rituals or the origins of the cult, intricacies of this topic are explored in his textbooks about the Classical Greece and Hellenistic periods. However, Bosch still relays several events that are related to this topic. For example, he retells a small anecdote about Roman General Gaius Marius dedicating one of his victories to *Mother Goddess* personally by visiting her temple in *Pessinus.*[409]

Several things can be gleaned from the initial reception of the *Mother Goddess*, an Eastern goddess, in the city of Rome, whose citizens, according to Bosch, had long feared the East. Although Bosch doesn't point out any contradiction in this phenomenon, it may be useful to examine the gap between the Romans' understanding of their own ancestry and their fear of the East. It seems that the aforementioned conservative faction, led by Cato the Elder, did not reconcile its conception of its origins with the cultural artifacts it received from the Romans' claimed homeland of Asia Minor. The forms and rituals of worship were altogether alien to them. We can sense this alienation in Bosch's retelling of the events, particularly in the rejection of practices of worship of the *Mother Goddess.* From this perspective, we can assume that the decision to transport the cult of the *Mother Goddess*, made in a time of desperation, did not work out the way each faction in Rome intended or imagined. I think this could also point to a divergence between political discourse and cultural reality. Until the arrival of the official Roman delegation in Anatolia in 205 BCE, Roman's understanding of the east beyond Greece, particularly of Anatolia, would be formed by ancient myths, poems and other stories. In these stories, symbols, characters and practices might get distorted from their original versions in time or they might be altered by story tellers themselves for the cultural sensibilities and pallets of the audiences. Moving on from that assumption, Roman's understanding of their mythical homeland and the artifacts of that homeland they receive after several centuries of their migration to Italy could become incompatible. This might be one of the reasons behind the cultural dissonance experienced by the conservative faction during the reception the *Mother Goddess* cult. Conversely, Bosch points out that this fear was not universal among the Roman elite, underscoring the enthusiasm with which the Scipio family spearheaded the adoption of cultural artifacts from the East. Thus, this contradiction may also be inherent in the Roman political establishment, where different factions' approaches to different foreign influences may reflect their stance on domestic issues or their cultural sensibilities. Mary Beard points out that Cato's political discourse against foreign cultural influences could have been either a political tool or a reflection of cultural identity. Often the two

---

[409]Bosch, Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları, 73.

were intertwined. Furthermore, As mentioned before, Beard states that representation of the Mother Goddess, and the practices of her priests were not what the Romans expected from the goddess of the Homeland of Aeneas.[410]Moreover, she points out that transportation of the goddess to Italy was heralded as a return.[411] From this perspective, we might infer that the Romans conceptualized the goddess, the patron deity of the Roman ancestral homeland of Troy, and her cult as having Roman qualities rather than anything the Romans would consider Eastern. Thus, absent evidence to the contrary prior to the arrival of the *Mother Goddess* cult in Rome, the Romans' adoption of the cult and their fear of the East would be two separate issues.

In his article, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, which is discussed in the fourth chapter, Rohde brings the question of the *Mother Goddess's* importance to the Romans to the forefront of his work, going into far more detail than Bosch does on the subject, while drawing several other connections between Anatolia and Roman religion through the theme of the *Mother goddess.* In addition, Rohde suggests that the religious ties between Rome and Anatolia were more profound.

From the first paragraph, Rohde tells the story of the Roman army's intervention against the Galatians to punish them for supporting King Antiochus against the Romans. Here, in their first foray into Central Anatolia in 189 B.C., the Romans witness the full splendor of the *Mother Goddess* cult in its homeland, in the city of *Pessinus*, through the rituals and premonitions of the cult's adherents. The followers of the *Mother Goddess* herald to the Roman soldiers that Rome would one day rule of these lands. Rohde, points to the familiarity of the Roman soldiers with the *Mother Goddess* before their arrival in Anatolia in 189 BC, as the cult was transported to Rome in 204 BC, and according to Rohde, it was fully embraced by the Romans even before the Roman soldiers' encounter with the *Mother Goddess* worshippers in Central Anatolia.[412]

Rohde points out that relations between Delphi and Anatolia have existed since the earliest times. The visible evidence of this is the Midas's gifts mentioned above. This connection is important because of the references to myths and deities associated with Delphi in the Roman Sybil Books. Thus, it is possible that the Delphic deity took the Anatolian deity under her patronage and extended her worship to the west. It is therefore very likely that the Mother Goddess played a role in Sybil beliefs

---

[410]Beard, *SPQR*, 215-16.

[411]Ibid., 213-14.

[412]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 228.

from the beginning.[413]The Sybil books were of great importance in the introduction the *Mother Goddess* worship to Rome and the official integration of the deity into the religion of the Roman state. As already mentioned, the entry of the goddess into Rome coincided with a period of political and spiritual turmoil. Before Scipio Africanus crossed from Sicily to Africa to attack the Carthaginians in their homeland, a rain of stones was observed in Rome. The Sybil books were then consulted on these occurrences.[414]In this case, the Sybil books said that it was necessary to bring the *Idaean Mother* to Rome. Rohde draws our attention back to the religious customs of the day. It was the accepted belief in Rome at the time that Aeneas was the ancestor of Rome and that the *Idaean Mother* was his mother. Thus, according to Rohde and as he states contrary to the claims of modern historians, there was no political purpose here, but a religious and spiritual one. The names used in the Sybil books attested to the divine part of this event. At the same time, the relationship between the *Idaean Mother* and the *Mother Goddess* was known to the Romans through the Phrygians.[415]The envoys sent to the east learned in Delphi that they had to appeal to King Attalos of Pergamon.[416] Here Rohde uses different discourses in his two works. In his first article, he says that the Roman delegation appealed to Attalos and with the king's help they obtained the sacred symbol of the goddess without problematizing the story.[417] In his other work, he emphasizes that it does not matter whether Attalos actually led this delegation to *Pessinus* or not, and argues that the Romans would have already considered the temple of *Pessinus* as the mother of the Roman temple and that the connection between *Pessinus* and Rome would be apparent to the Romans, as he conveys in the first paragraph.[418]

Rohde details the story of the arrival and reception of the *Mother Goddess* in Rome. The Sybil books mention the need to choose the best Roman to welcome the goddess into the city. The Roman Senate deliberated and decided that a member of the Scipio family should join the delegation. When the delegation returned to Rome, the best man in Rome, chosen from the Scipios, sailed out to sea and received the stone idol of the goddess with great reverence. Rohde emphasizes how the cult, which was to be called *Magna Mater*, was received in Rome with great awe and pomp. A level of reverence unprecedented in a city that had previously accepted many deities. All the

---

[413]Ibid., 234.

[414]Ibid., 234.

[415]Ibid., 234.

[416]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 10; Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 234.

[417]Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 10.

[418]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 234.

women of the city traveled to Ostia, the port of Rome, and escorted the goddess to the city limits. The representation of the *Mother Goddess* was placed in the Shrine of Victoria on the Palatine Hill. The goddess had brought with her Phrygian clergy. Following the example of Asia Minor, Rome also organized troupes that celebrated the day of the ceremony with banquets.[419] In 191 BC, the temple of the deity was inaugurated on the Palatine. A festival called *Megalesia* was established in honor of the deity. The orgic and sacrificial rites of the goddess and her friend *Attis* were not accepted by the Romans of the Republican period and were officially banned.[420] The views on these rituals were loosened in the Imperial period and became a part of the worship of *Mother Goddess* in the Roman Empire.[421] Some of the rituals called *Mother Goddess Misteriums* lasted until the end of Antiquity[422] and coalesced, as mentioned before, with Mithridatic traditions, later influencing early Christianity.[423] Rohde, underlines the fact that, *Mother Goddess* worship was the last thing that was exported according to the prophecies of Sybil books.[424]

What is certain, according to Rohde, is that the entry of the Mother Goddess into Rome was an event that manifested a distant symbol of the ancient connection between Italy and Anatolia, which, according to Roman belief, went back to the earliest times of Rome's roots. Rohde compares the belief in the goddess Bellona, who was brought to Rome at the time of Silla, with the belief in the Mother Goddess and argues that Bellona was a goddess who was alien to the Romans, a goddess who had to be tolerated with difficulty and who was never officially worshipped.[425] But not only the deity of the land of Aeneas, which was also his divine mother, found a particular worship in Rome with the sign of the Sybils.

Rohde presents other religious and cultural links between Italy and Anatolia. In 217 B.C., after the battle at Lake Trasimene, the worship of Aphrodite came to Rome from Mount Erix in Sicily. This deity was also close in nature to the Great

---

[419] Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 11.

[420] The Cato the Elder's and his circle's rejection of Anatolian *Mother Goddess* mainly stemmed from these rituals and her physical representation being a meteorite. Romans of the 3rd and 2nd Centuries BC were not used to self-sacrificial and orgic rituals, they also wished to the representation of their gods to be in human form. In this case, Cato's political and cultural opposition of the foreign influences should not be understood as just a reactionary backlash.

[421] Rohde, Büyük Ana, 12.

[422] Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 235.

[423] Rohde, *Büyük Ana*, 13-14.

[424] Ibid., 235.

[425] This is an interesting claim as both ancient and modern sources attest to adoration of Romans towards her. Lloyd-Morgan, Glenys, "Nemesis and Bellona: A Preliminary Study of Two Neglected Goddesses," In *Concept of Goddess*, E-Book Edition, edited by Sandra Billington and Miranda Green, 120-128, (New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2002).

Mother of Anatolia. In this region, she was not a love deity, but the state deity of the *Elymians.* It is important to note that Rohde, like Bosch, links the origins of the *Elymians* to Asia Minor and, more importantly, to Troy through ancient traditional stories. He argues that these traditions are supported by linguistics. He then turns to the legends of the Roman faith, emphasizing that Aeneas founded the temple on Mount Erix. He sees the fact that the slaves in the temple, after being freed, remained subject to their goddess and played a role in the official life of Sicily as evidence that they were a group from Anatolia.[426]It should be remembered that after the destruction of their country, the Phrygians spread throughout the Mediterranean, both as free individuals and as slaves, continuing their culture and, in particular, preaching the religion of the Great Mother. Rohde goes a step further and argues that even before the arrival of Venus and the Great Mother in the 3rd century BC, the Anatolian nature goddess had arrived in Italy. The famous temple of Diana on the Aventine in Rome was founded by the Roman king Servinus Tullius. A shrine dedicated to this deity, the Shrine of Diana, located in a poetic place on Lake Nemi in the Albano Mountains, is related to this shrine. In both sanctuaries, Diana was considered a political deity, not just as the sister of Apollo. Because both sanctuaries belonged to the sacred alliance of the Latins.[427]

Finally, Rohde examines these earlier connections between Rome and Anatolia. According to Rohde, the ancient traditions of antiquity contain much that is important for our discussion. So much so that he claims that the sanctuary of *Arventin* imitated the Artemis of Ephesus and the worship style of Artemis of *Massalia*.[428]Rohde laments that this information has long since been discarded, and a new theory that sought to explain the conflation of the Roman Diana with the Greek Artemis was created. He argues that the recent change in ancient Roman religious history has led to a realization of the true meaning of this tradition and examines how this new understanding came about by looking at ancient stories and evidence.[429]It is commonly known that *Massalia* was founded by the Ionian Greeks of the city of *Phokaia*[Modern day *Foça* in Turkey] in Anatolia and that the people of Phokaia played an important role in the spread of the worship of Aphrodite of Ephesus in the west. When these people decided to leave their homeland in Anatolia and settle in the western Aegean Sea, they received a revelation from the gods that they should ask for a guide from the temple of Artemis. Following this prophecy they landed in

---

[426]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 235.

[427]Ibid., 235-36.

[428]Massalia is the ancient predecessor of the modern city of Marseilles in Southern France.

[429]Ibid., 236.

Ephesus. There the goddess entered into the dream of a well-known woman named Aristark and commanded her to join the Phocaeans and to take with her a picture of the temple of Ephesus. Besides Apollo of Delphi, Artemis became the chief deity of *Massalia.* The name of the temple there was Ephesus, connecting *Massalia* with the deities of Ephesus through the shared names. According to another legend, the Phocaeans even stayed in Rome before arriving in *Massalia.* In many parts of the western Mediterranean there is evidence that temples to Artemis were built by the inhabitants of *Massalia.* Rohde also points out that the inhabitants of *Massalia's* relations with Rome were friendly from the very beginning.[430] In the light of both tradition and evidence, Rohde suggests that Diana in Rome must have been an adoption of Artemis of Ephesus. Moreover, city of *Massalia*, with its close connections to Rome, must have played a role in the transmission of goddess Diana to the city Rome. This is corroborated by the similarities of the aspects of Rome's Diana to the aspects of Artemis of *Massalia.* Here again, Rohde goes a step further and suggests that the Diana of the Latins and Romans was a form of the Anatolian *Mother Goddess.* He offers some more evidence to support this idea. One of them is the similarity of the statues at the site of Diana's worship to the statues of Artemis. Another is the similarity of the traditions of succession of the religious state at the Lake Nemi sanctuary, where the former king had to be challenged to a duel in order to become the head of state. Rohde perceives this ritual as an export from *Mother Goddess* cult in Anatolia which entailed both these kinds of brutal traditions while also required the leadership of foreigners at the head of the religion.[431]

For Rohde, demonstration and examination of these points was sufficient reason to indicate that Rome and Anatolia's religious connections were deeper, asserting that, as he put it: *"Anatolia has played the role of transmitter far more often than we can sense today."*[432] In his first article, although still giving several evidences and making connections, he is much more direct, stating that Diana, Artemis, Venus, *Magna Mater* and Bellona are just different aspects of *Mother Goddess* of Anatolia.[433]

Similar to Rohde's works, there are several other references and allusions to the importance of Anatolia in Roman history in Bosch's textbook. He presents one such example while recounting the events of the Third Mithraic War. He draws our attention to the injustices and theft brought to Anatolia by Roman tax collectors and moneylenders, which alienated many local elites and led a substantial majority to

---

[430] Ibid., 236.

[431] Ibid., 236-37.

[432] Ibid., 237. The translation is mine.

[433] Rohde, Büyük Ana, 16.

become either actively hostile or neutral toward the Roman political establishment in Asia Minor. The combination of negligence and avarice on the part of the Roman administration is pointed to as the cause. The Roman commander Lucullus, sent to deal with Mithradates, takes the side of the local Anatolians and tries to bring order to the situation by protecting their interests. Under Lucullus' patronage, the people of the region managed to pay off their debts to the Roman tax collectors.[434]Although Lucullus is relatively successful in campaigning in Asia Minor, he is relieved of duty both because of the political rearrangement in Rome disfavoring people with political ties to Sulla, who had passed away, and his protection of Anatolian people against the interests of his soldiers and Roman merchants who sought to benefit from the Anatolians' sufferings.[435]He is replaced by Pompeius Magnus. After his arrival, Pompeius stabilized the situation in Asia Minor and took control of King Mithradates's holdings. Proceeding the cessation of hostilities, he reorganized the provinces that constituted Roman Asia Minor taking into consideration the newly conquered lands and the devastation of the war. Bosch draws our attention to the creation of a new calendar by the people of Asia Minor in honor of Pompeius' success in bringing peace and order to the region.[436]Bosch makes several points by framing these events in this way. First, he emphasizes the corruption, political turmoil, and class struggles present in Roman society in the mid-1st century B.C., which are crucial themes in his narrative. Second, he emphasizes the wealth of Anatolia, which, he points out, was immense enough to tempt the appetites of greedy administrators, yet self-sufficient enough that the people of the region were able to recoup their losses and rebuild their pre-Roman social and economic conditions.

5.2.2 Discourse on Ancestry

Bosch's emphasis on the discourse of Roman elites about their ancestry is also part of his narrative about the lasting impact of Anatolia on Roman socio-politics. For this reason, the political discourse surrounding the roots of consequential Roman figures and their claims to divinity should also be examined in this context. Bosch had already mentioned at the beginning of his work how the Iulia family traced their ancestry to Elymian people living in Sicily who migrated to the island from Anatolia. The Iulia family also claimed descent from Aeneas and the *Mother Goddess*. One

---

[434]Bosch, Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları, 90.

[435]There are two interesting points here. Firstly, he calls the corrupt Romans who had business interests in Anatolia capitalists. Secondly, he tells a small anecdote about how Lucullus was the first person to bring some of the indigenous fruits of Anatolia to Europe, such as plums and peaches. Ibid., 91.

[436]Ibid., 92.

of the most notable members of this family, Iulius Caesar, used these claims for political gain on many occasions.[437]

Caesar continued the family tradition and traced his ancestry to the mythical ancestor of Rome Aeneas through Iulus, who, according to ancient tradition was the grandson of the goddess Venus from his father's side.[438]Bosch highlights two events in this regard. After winning a battle against the son of Mithradates VI, Pharnakes, in Anatolia, Caesar arrives in Nicaea to stabilize the provinces of Asia Minor. Here, the story about Caesar being the grandson of Aeneas is spread throughout the region, claiming that his return to the homeland of his ancestor destined Caesar to be a ruler of the world. Later, when Caesar is installed as dictator for life, he makes plans to invade Parthia in revenge for Crassus's defeat against them. Bosch claims that Caesar, as part of his plans also envisioned Troy as the new capital of Rome.

We can glean several points from these stories. Although Bosch does not say so directly, it is most likely that both rumors were deliberately spread by Caesar himself. In this case, Caesar situates himself as a divinity while legitimizing his military actions through myths of ancestral right. In this way, he wants his discourse to be that of a legitimate ruler rather than a conqueror.[439]When looking at these events, it is important to consider not only the political side, but also the religious context. Bosch points out that at the time, the goddess Venus was sometimes depicted as an aspect of the *Mother Goddess*, and both deities were especially revered in Rome because of their connections to Troy and Aeneas. Moreover, worship of both the cult of Venus and the *Mother Goddess* was popular in Caesar's time, and Caesar himself was known to make dedications and sacrifices to his patron deity and ancestor, Venus. Caesar's apparent religious devotion, along with his family roots and the stories surrounding him in this regard, reinforced his image as a divinity among the populace. His adopted son and political heir, Octavian, was no different; Octavian drew more heavily on this religious discourse by claiming to be the messiah (*soter* in Greek) figure in Eastern cultures.[440]Famed Roman poet Virgil supported

---

[437]Ibid., 83

[438]According to Adrian Goldsworthy, although Julii family's contributions to the early Roman Republic were sparse, their claims to antiquity could be traced back to the family's settlement in Rome after the destruction of Alba Longa by the Roman King Tullus Hostilius in 7th century BC. The family claimed even more ancient and divine ancestry, linking themselves with Iulus, founder of Alba Longa, a Latin city in Italy whose royal line produced Remus and Romulus, stating their family name came directly from him. Moreover, Iulus was the son of the mythic figure Aeneas and the grandson of the goddess Venus and human Anchises, a member of the Trojan royal family. Livy and Virgil admit that there might have been other versions of this ancestry story of the Julii, but still Caesar's public statements, linking his family to Venus, are taken in face value by the Roman people, as Goldsworthy puts it, they were *"...fairly widely known and presumably not of recent invention."*Adrian Goldsworthy, *Caesar; Life of a Colossus.* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006), 32-33.

[439]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 103, 107

[440]Ibid., 120-21.

his patron Octavian's claims to divinity in his flattering poems dedicated to him. In these poems Octavian's ancestral links corroborated and connections between himself and Aeneas were strengthened.[441]It is also important to point out here that Bosch doesn't use the name of Venus when presenting these events. He refers to the deity, which Iulia family claims as their ancestors, as *Mother Goddess.* However, we know from ancient sources that Caesar and Octavian use the word Venus for their patron deity.[442]

In addition to a more traditional narrative of the emergence and rise of the Roman state, this textbook emphasizes the importance of Anatolia in Roman history and examines it from many different angles, from more obvious perspectives such as geopolitics and economics to relatively obscure and subtle connections of the origins of ethnic groups and cultures. This search for cultural and genealogical links has been one of the greatest undertakings of the Turkish historical thesis, which has sought to place Anatolia in a position from which almost all the high cultures of the East and the West originated. However, we can also observe here that the ethnic connections are taking a back seat to the East-West connections constructed through the creation and diffusion of cultural elements. We can read this change as a reflection of the shift in Turkish historiography in the 1940s, where the focus of archaeology and history shifted from the study of Anatolia's prehistoric or earlier past, especially the study of Sumerians, Hittites, and other cultures of the region along with Stone Age findings, with the aim of confirming the autochthony of the Turks in Anatolia, to the diffusion and transmission of different cultures in this region by focusing on the study of classical antiquity through classical archaeology and the translation of Western literary classics. This approach still sought to represent the cultural impact and significance of Turkish culture, synthesized with ancient Central Asian ancestry and Anatolian and Aegean cultures, but racial categorizations along with the use of prehistoric archaeology, anthropology and philology began to fell out of favor.[443]In Bosch's article, *The Particularities of Anatolia in History*, presented in The Second Turkish History Congress in 1937, Bosch links Hittite people's phenotypes found on stone carvings with the phenotype of 1930s Anatolian people. In this textbook, *The Outlines of Roman History* published in 1940, Bosch does not go into such racial categorizations. Even though he finds cultural throughlines between Romans, Etruscans and *Elymian* people of Sicily with Anatolia, main linkages he constructs between them are made using cultural arguments. For example,

---

[441]Ibid., 122.

[442]Goldsworthy, *Caesar*, 33.

[443]Suavi Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative", 42.

he only links the cultural and social influences of Romans to Anatolia through the Roman's own claims of ancestry while pointing to the political discourse of Roman upper classes tracing their origins to Asia Minor. On the other hand, we see that Brandenstein, in his articles on the origins of Etruscans, suggests the possibility of Etruscans originating from Central Asia and from that perspective claims that Etruscans and Turks might have been at least culturally related. Corroborating this cultural similitude through the similarities between Turkic and Etruscan languages. Conversely, Jacopi only defends the idea that Etruscans originated from Anatolia, validating this claim by pointing out similarities between the Etruscan language and languages of other Anatolian peoples such as, Lydians and Hittites. Bosch, as mentioned before similarly links, in his 1937 article, the language of Hittites with Turkish through similarities in words. In this textbook, on the other hand, there are no references to Hittites. Maybe more importantly, there are no references to the pre-historic past of Anatolia, despite Bosch including references to the *Mother Goddess's* origins in the Stone Age in his article, there are no similar claims in his textbook from 1940. This can also be attributed to the aforementioned shift in historiography.

Unlike the racial categorizations, emphasis on the religious influence of Anatolia on the ancient Greeks and Romans is consistent between Bosch's article and textbook on Roman history. We observe a similar consistency in Rohde's works on the *Mother Goddess* of Anatolia. Bosch and Rohde had presented articles in The Second History Congress in 1937, *The Particularities of Anatolia in History* and *Rome and Anatolian Goddess* respectively. They also published works in 1940; Rohde published Büyük Ana; Magna Mater where he edited and expanded his arguments and ideas found in his previous article from 1937 and Bosch published his textbook on Roman history, The Outlines of Roman History. In the works from 1937 and 1940 we can observe the thesis that diffusion of religious symbols, practices and traditions of Anatolia had a lasting impact on ancient Greek and Roman cultures persisted. Furthermore, both Rohde and Bosch claimed that this influence went onto effect early Christianity.[444] In fact, as mentioned before Rohde claims that the religious connections of Anatolia to other religions went deeper than suggested in 1930s.[445]Thus, Rohde and Bosch, by emphasizing the Anatolian religious impact not only on ancient Greece and Rome but also on Early Christianity, situate cultural elements of Anatolia as one of the most important parts of European civilization. This view was

---

[444]Rohde only implicitly mentions the influence of Anatolian religions on Christianity in his first article. Rohde, Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi, 235, 237; However, in his otherarticle published in 1940 he is direct about the impact of the *Kybele* and *Attis* cults on Christianity. Rohde, Büyük Ana; Magna Mater, 14; Similarly Bosch explicitly says that the *Mother Goddess* cult's symbols and practices had a persistent influence on Christianity. Bosch, Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı, 9-10.

[445]Rohde, *Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlahesi*, 235.

in line of 1940s Turkish historiography's focus on Humanism ideals and its employment of classical archeology to find links between Anatolia and Western cultures. Conversely, this still represented a different perspective than the European understanding of the origins of their own culture, which generally neglected the Eastern influences on the ancient Greek and Roman cultures.

For this reason, it would be intriguing to juxtapose the views of Bosch, Rohde, and other scholars, which are discussed here, who underscored the significance of Eastern cultures, notably Anatolian cultures, in world history, with historian Martin Bernal's thesis in his book Black Athena and the archaeological findings on Troy studied by Manfred Korfmann.

As argued by Martin Bernal in his book *Black Athena*, the European model replaced the models built by the ancient Greeks themselves in the 18th and 19th centuries to comprehend their cultural origins. This model totally ignored the Afro-Asian roots of Greek culture and came up with a racist, Eurocentric, and chauvinist model. It emphasized the uniqueness and whiteness of Greeks within the Eastern Mediterranean. This was because Europeans of the 18th, 19th, and early 20th centuries would never accept the proposition that the ancients Greeks, whom they revered as the founders of their great and superior civilization, were debtors to and admirers of Egyptians, Semites, and other Afroasiatic peoples. The Afroasiatic civilizations, according to the European scholars, were characterized by backwardness and inferiority in modernity; because of that, it could never be the case that the Greeks borrowed from them. In his book, Bernal lays down an argumentative alternative theory about the beginnings of ancient Greece and classical civilization.[446]

Using this argumentation, Bernal claims that ancient Greece was strongly influenced by its interactions with the neighboring cultures of North Africa and West Asia, particularly Egyptians and Phoenicians, whom he proposes colonized parts of ancient Greece, reverting back to the types of ancient stories told by Greeks about their own origins. He quotes those Western perceptions of Greece changed in the 18th century due to which Western academia began discounting substantial influences of Egypt and Phoenicia upon ancient Greek civilization. Though it is important to add here that Bernal's work is extensively criticized for its reliance upon ancient Greek mythologies and speculative assertions along with its mishandling of archaeological, historical, and linguistic sources.[447]He argues that the perception of Greece by the West changed in the 18th century and led to a bias among Western scholarship to deny any significant influence of Egypt and Phoenicia upon ancient Greek

---

[446]Bernal, *Black Athena*, 2.

[447]Ibid., 21, 22-23.

civilization.[448] However, it should be noted that Bernal's work is highly criticized for its reliance on ancient Greek mythology and speculative assertions alongside its mishandling of archaeological, historical, and linguistic sources.[449]

Bernal's book is pertinent and valuable for this thesis precisely because it offers a redefinition of the origins of European civilization while employing similar sources and methods to corroborate its arguments in a similar vein to the works this study focuses on, while, on the other hand pursuing different goals. Bernal employs archeological and linguistic findings to emphasize the Afroasiatic influence on the ancient Greek culture while corroborating this evidence using ancient Greek myths and stories, particularly those of Herodotus which highlighted the significant impact of Southern and Eastern influences on the Greek culture. Thereby, Bernal challenges the Eurocentric approach of 19th and 20th century history writing on ancient history which presented the ancient Greek culture to be unique in the Eastern Mediterranean. We observe a similar approach in the works examined in this study. Bosch and Rohde present archeological and linguistic evidence to demonstrate the deep-rooted religious connections between Anatolia and Rome and ancient Greece. They indicate, citing Herodotus and Ovid, that these linkages between Roman and Greek cultures with Anatolia were known and appreciated by the Romans and Greeks themselves. Moreover, Brandenstein, Jacopi, and again Bosch, using the same methods and sources, trace the origins of the Etruscans and Romans to Anatolia. In doing so, they emphasize Anatolia's place in world history and place the influence of Eastern culture at the origins of Western culture, thus challenging the main paradigm of Western historiography's understanding of its own past. However, as we have seen in the examination of the Turkish Historical Thesis in the previous chapters, and as Bernal has been similarly criticized, they base most of their conclusions on disputed archaeological and linguistic evidence, and they rely on stories from ancient sources to substantiate these conclusions.Since the discourse found in the ancient sources confirms their goals of highlighting the Eastern, especially Anatolian, influences on the Romans and Greeks, they do not critically analyze the claims made in these sources.

Manfred Korfmann's archaeological work on the ancient city of Troy provides us with another reexamination of the origins of European culture. Korfmann was a German archaeologist who participated in archaeological expeditions in Africa and the Middle East. He came to Çanakkale, Turkey in 1982 to understand the city of Troy in the

---

[448] Ibid., 26-28, 29.

[449] Critiques of Bernal's work are too many to count. For a good summary of the criticism towards Bernal's thesis, arguments and his sources and methods see: Jacques Berlinerblau, *Heresy in the University: The Black Athena Controversy and the Responsibilities of American Intellectuals*, (N.J., New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1999).

ancient context of the region. In this way, unlike many other archaeologists, he did not come with the sole purpose of verifying the stories of Homer, but to put the city in its historical context.[450]From the perspective of the works of Homer, the city of Troy was conceptualized through the lens of ancient Greece, and scholars of various disciplines, classicists, historians, archaeologists, approached the study of this city and its culture from this perspective. Korfmann, on the other hand, did not approach Troy from an ancient Greek perspective, as many of the previous archaeologists who studied the ancient city did. Instead, he sought to study Troy by placing it in its ancient Anatolian context. Instead, he aimed to study Troy by putting it in its ancient Anatolian context.[451]He began directing excavations at Troy in 1988. 50 years after archaeologist Carl Blegen's last excavations in the region, and the longest continuous study to date.[452]Korfmann changed the world's view of Troy by arguing that it was part of an ancient Anatolian civilization rather than ancient Greek civilization.[453]The most important contribution of Korfmann's excavations to Troy and Bronze Age archaeology was the discovery of a large Bronze Age sub-city in Troy. Thus, it was understood that the part of Troy within the defensive walls constituted only a small part of the settlement during the entire Bronze Age (3000-1300 BC), and it was proved that Troy, together with its lower city, was actually a continuously growing and urbanizing settlement throughout the Bronze Age.[454]

The Luwian, a special dialect of Hittite, hieroglyphic writing on a bronze seal found during Korfmann's excavations in 1995 is the first written document found in the Bronze Age layers of Troy.[455]The script used on the document indicated Troy's status as either part of the Hittite empire or the city's close political and diplomatic connections with Hittites.[456]Many other archaeological finds showed that Troy belonged to the Anatolian culture. The city's settlement system and defense systems, wall and moat structures found in layer VI/VIIa of Troy were similar to Anatolian settlements from the same period.[457]The pottery found in this layer also conformed to Anatolian styles, and it is highly probable that the other Mycenaean pottery

---

[450]Joachim Latacz, Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery. Translated by Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 20-21).

[451]Ibid., 20.

[452]Ibid., 9.

[453]Ibid., 21.

[454]Ibid., 22-24.

[455]Ibid., 49.

[456]Ibid., 66-68, 69-70, 71-72.

[457]Ibid., 37.

found were imitations of popular styles.[458]Funerary practices included house-shaped tombs and cremation while religious practices included domestic worship of Anatolian deities. The artifacts—among them, a stone pedestal topped by a clay structure and a bronze effigy of an Anatolian deity—were found in a domestic context. Moreover, Troy had a stone cult tradition, as was the case in Anatolian practices among the Hittites, where big stones were positioned as spiritual protection; seventeen such stelai were found at Troy, mostly at fortress gates, and are probably associated with the reverence of the Anatolian god Appaliunas, who is considered very close to the Greek god Apollon.[459]Furthermore, Troy revealed a stone cult practice, as with the Anatolian tradition represented by the Hittites, with large stones (stelai) set up for spiritual protection. Seventeen such stelai were brought to light at Troy, mainly in the vicinity of fortress gates, which might be related to the worship of the Anatolian god Appaliunas-a deity very close to the Greek Apollon.[460]According to Korfmann, they all highlight the Anatolian cultural influences on Troy's material culture, religious practices, and urban planning features. Korfmann also investigated the political relations between the Troad Region, Troy and its surrondings, and the Hittite State in the Late Bronze Age. In Hittite sources, Hittite kings are said to have made expeditions to this region. According to some scholars, the settlements and political centers in the Troad region were vassal centers of the Hittite State.[461]Korfmann, together with philologists and other archaeologists, conducted research on this subject until the end of his life.

What Korfmann has done with his work provides an interesting parallel to the work of Bosch and other scholars mentioned above. By focusing primarily on the archaeological findings and comparing them to the archaeological material found in other parts of Anatolia, Korfmann shifts the focus of the study of Troy from the Western-centered study of Homer to the study of the city itself in the ancient context of the region. In this way, Korfmann demonstrates that Troy is primarily a part of Anatolian culture. We observe a similar effort at recontextualization in Bosch's work. As demonstrated earlier, Bosch emphasizes the importance of Anatolian culture's impact on Rome from multiple perspectives: political, social, religious, and cultural. More importantly, he points to Anatolia as the original homeland of the Romans by examining the founding myths of Rome and the ancestral discourse of the Roman elite, which traced its origins back to Troy. Unlike Korfmann, however, he can't

---

[458]Ibid., 39.

[459]Ibid., 39-40.

[460]Ibid., 40.

[461]Ibid., 112, 114.

point to any solid archaeological evidence to support his claims. Thus, the ancestral connections he draws must be based on ancient sources.

Korfmann's connection of the city of Troy to the Hittite Empire offers other parallels as well. As discussed in the previous chapters, the study of ancient Anatolian cultures, especially the Hittites, was crucial to the Turkish historical thesis's goal of emphasizing the importance of Anatolia in world history while also constructing ancestral connections between the Turks and the Hittites so that Turkish political claims to Anatolia would have the support of ancient history. Brandenstein and Jacopi's arguments in their aforementioned 1937 articles can be read as an attempt to provide a similar link between the Turks and the Etruscans through Anatolia to the Hittites and Central Asia to ancient Turkish cultures in that area. Brandenstein explicitly points out that the Etruscans came from Central Asia, and while he doesn't claim that they were of Turkish origin, he claims that the similarities between the ancient Turks and the Etruscans cannot be denied. Jacopi, on the other hand, shows the similarities between the Etruscan language and the Hittite languages that link these two cultures. By linking the Etruscans to these peoples and places, Brandenstein and Jacopi implicitly extend the reach of Turkish culture to Italy. Korfmann does not attempt to make such a connection by creating a chain of Turkish, Hittite, and Etruscan cultures. However, by demonstrating the city of Troy's connection to the Hittite Empire, he recontextualizes Troy as part of ancient Anatolia rather than part of ancient Greece.

6.   CLEMENS BOSCH'S TEXTBOOKS ON THE ALEXANDER THE GREATS EMPIRE AND HIS SUCCESSORS: *THE OUTLINES OF HISTORY OF HELLENISM, PART I AND II*

In June 1940, Bosch renewed his contract with the Turkish government for another four years to continue his work at Istanbul University. As usual, his new contract included a clause requiring him to publish works related to his field of study. As a result of this contractual obligation, Bosch wrote two more textbooks. *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender İmparatorluğu*[The Outlines of the History of Hellenism; Chapter I, The Empire of Alexander the Great] and H*elenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri*[The Outlines of the History of Hellenism; Chapter II, The Hellenistic States up to their Connection with the Roman Empire]. The first was published in 1942, but its preface is dated January 1940.[462]The Chapter I was translated into Turkish by Afif Erzen, who was an assistant in Ancient History at Istanbul University. The second book was published in 1943, while its preface is dated June 1941.[463]It was translated into Turkish by Sabahat Atlan, who was also an assistant in the Ancient History Department of Istanbul University. This period between the writing of the prefaces and the publication of the textbooks may indicate that Bosch's work took longer than expected or that there were some complications in the publishing process. Both books were published by Istanbul University.

In the prefaces to each book, he repeats the same sentiment from his textbook on the Roman Empire, that these works are not a substitute for more detailed histories, and that for this reason the textbooks should not be taken as the sole authority on the subject, but as a supplement to the lectures themselves.[464] Bosch also points to

---

[462]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, Foreword.

[463]Bosch, Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım, Foreword.

[464]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, Foreword; Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, Foreword.

the fact relevant primary sources are used to verify the validity of the information given. Thus, unlike his Roman history, where only the names of some of the ancient historians were given without citations to particular works, here in these textbooks he gives several citations to different works on different subjects. For example, he cites J. G. Droysen's work *Geshichte Des Hellenismus* [History of Hellenism], dated 1836,[465] for intellectual history and history of philosophy, Alfred Weber's *Felsefe Tarihi*[466] [History of Philosophy] and for religious history he cites Eduard Norden's book *Agnostos Theos.*[467] The citations are given in the text itself, there are no footnotes. Moreover, there are no references sections in the either of the textbooks.

Bosch's textbooks on Hellenistic period can be understood as two parts of one unified work of Hellenistic history. Even though, Bosch says that index is to be included at the end of the second book,in my copy[468]of the work index is not present. First book consists of 6 chapters, 56 sub-headings, a chronology of events of the period, two lists of Achaemenid and Argead dynasties' kings and an explanation of the pictures in the appendix. The second one is made up of 8 chapters, 68 sub-headings, a chronology of events, a list of Alexander's Successor kings from all dynasties and an appendix with pictures. There are more maps compared to the Roman history textbook, depicting not just the geopolitics of the period but also the many battles that took place during this time. The explanations of the pictures in the appendix are more detailed and extended compare to Bosch's earlier work as well. Similar to his other works, Bosch benefits greatly from the time he spent in the Istanbul Archeology Museum, using the photos of the many artifacts in its collection, particularly coins and medallions. There is also a great abundance of photos from different collections, such as Vatican, Naples and Paris. Bosch uses the coins as reference in many occasions in both of these textbooks. The date of minting, symbols and names on the coins are used to construct an argument by themselves or to corroborate other historical sources and ancient myths and stories. Frequency in which Bosch consults numismatic evidence seems to be higher in his Hellenistic histories compared to his Roman history textbook. This might have stemmed from two reasons. Firstly, Bosch authored his textbooks on the history of the Hellenistic period in a later date than his Roman one. In this time frame he might have gotten better acquainted with the coin collection of the İstanbul Archeology Museum. Second reason, and

---

[465]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım,* 1.

[466]Here Bosch gives a full citation of the source: Alfred Weber, *Felsefe Tarihi*, Türkçeye çeviren: H. Vehbi Eralp, İstanbul. Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 163.

[467]Here Bosch cites Eduard Norden's work Agnostos Theos but does not give a full bibliography and date. Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 2.

[468]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım.*

in my opinion more likely option, has two layers. In the textbooks where he is examining the Hellenistic period the number of political entities, he is examining is more compared to the polities that are analyzed in Roman history. In this period the focus is on more than one empire and thus the variety and number of coins increases exponentially. Thanks to this increase in variety, Bosch is able to compare and contrast many aspects just by examining coinage themselves.

The two works are complementary and linked by the larger narrative of the rise and spread of Hellenism throughout the Mediterranean, along with the history of the fall of the Hellenistic states with the rise of the Roman Empire. The first book deals with the exploits of Alexander himself, with lengthy descriptions of his battles and political maneuverings and the political dissolution of his empire alongside the wars of the successor kingdoms. It also includes the background of Alexander's conquests, the socio-political, cultural and military situation of the Eastern Mediterranean states, such as the Macedonian Kingdom, the Achaemenid Empire and the successor kingdoms of Alexander the Great. The second book focuses mainly on the geopolitical struggles between the successor kingdoms until the rise of Rome as the preeminent political power in the region. In the first textbook on the history of the Hellenistic period, similar to his Roman history textbook, Bosch interweaves the examination of socio-political and cultural issues with retellings of war and political events. In the second textbook, especially after the inclusion of the Roman Republic in the narrative, Bosch allows more space for socio-cultural elements to stand on their own. This is more evident in the chapters dealing with Anatolia. Bosch devotes the last two chapters of the book to the political, social, and cultural impact of Hellenism in the Mediterranean and its larger implications for world history. Because of the space given to them, these topics are explored in greater depth and detail, something that is lacking in the Roman history textbook.

The reasoning behind the names of the two books should be noted. Bosch attributes the choice of using the name "history of Hellenism" to Johann Gustav Droysen. Bosch states, in ancient times the word Hellenism denoted a certain aptitude in using the Greek language. Droysen, in his work History of Hellenism, moving from this perspective coined the term Hellenism to describe the phenomenon of Greek language's dissemination in the Mediterranean basin and Asia Minor, and this language's transformation into the language of the intellectuals of all nations and people groups. At the same period, Greek culture cross pollinated with the cultures of these regions, thus from that point onwards the word Hellenism connoted a mix of cultures, ideas and languages that encompassed an immense area of land and large amounts of people. Bosch uses Hellenism in this context, as a more comprehensive cultural cat-

egory beyond just the ethnic Greeks or Greek speakers.[469]Bosch also uses the term Hellenistic frequently as well. In the narrative the term refers either to the time period or the states that emerged during this period, i.e. Hellenistic states. However, Bosch seems to be employing Hellenism and Hellenistic interchangeably. Although, as mentioned before, Hellenism is used for the cultural category that emerged as a consequence of the Alexander the Great's conquests and his subsequent cultural and social policies that encouraged cultural exchange and cross pollination. While Hellenistic is used as either political category denoting states that rose after the death of Alexander and that were ruled by upper classes of Greek acculturation or as a historical category referring to the time period between start of Alexander's conquests in 323 BC and death of Cleopatra in 30 BC. We should also note that, Bosch considers Roman Empire as a continuation of Hellenism culture, hereby he dates the end of Hellenism to the start of 4th century CE.[470]I will refer to the time period and the states Bosch examining as the Hellenistic period and Hellenistic states/kingdoms. For the culture that emerged after Alexander's conquests I will refer as Hellenism.

From the preface of the first textbook, Bosch continues to develop the ideas present in his earlier works. Here he explains that since Asia formed the heart of Alexander's empire, he felt it necessary to give more detailed information on certain subjects than he had in his Roman history textbook, since this subject was of even greater importance for Turkish history.[471]This statement can be understood in relation to the focus of the Turkish history thesis on finding the original homeland of the Turks. As mentioned in the introduction of my dissertation, both Anatolia and Central Asia were presented as the origins of the Turks and Turkish culture. Although great emphasis was placed on Anatolia for geopolitical and cultural reasons, each region had its own function in the historical narrative through which scientific-political arguments were constructed or confirmed. The function of Central Asia was to be even older than that of Anatolia, the point of creation and diffusion of Turkish culture. In his article on Anatolia and the Roman history textbook, Bosch emphasized the importance of Anatolia in the history of human civilization because the scope and focus of these works were aimed at an examination of Anatolia. On the other hand, in the Hellenistic history textbooks, although the emphasis on Asia Minor is still present, the geographical and historical scope of the works allowed Bosch to present the aspects of the even more ancient homeland of the

---

[469]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 1.

[470]Ibid., 3.

[471]Ibid., Foreword.

Turks, Central Asia, while being able to use the name of Turk to depict several peoples that Alexander the Great encountered during his conquests. The arguments about Central Asia and its inhabitants will be discussed later.

6.1 The Emergence of Hellenism: The Alexander the Great's Empire

As Bosch notes in the introduction to The Empire of Alexander the Great, Alexander's conquests became the primary catalyst for monumental change in the Mediterranean region. In addition to Alexander's military success, his political practices and social and cultural reforms were integral to the emergence of Hellenism. For this reason, Bosch examines the political, social, and cultural structures of Alexander the Great's empire to show how diverse practices, rituals, cultural understandings, and traditions merged and evolved over time to create a new way of life for many of the peoples of the Mediterranean, Iran, Central Asia, and beyond.

One of the first cultural transformations occurred during Alexander the Great's conquest of Persia. After the capitulation of the Persian capital, Babylon, Alexander established himself as king of the Persians, while promising the various central and local ruling classes of the Persian Empire who submitted to his authority the continuation of their previous political and socio-economic arrangements.[472]At this point, not all of the Persian lands had been occupied, and many Persian elites had still not surrendered to Alexander, choosing instead to negotiate with him, offering Alexander half of the Persian Empire.[473]Alexander refused and chose a path of conquest, envisioning himself going to the ends of the world, beyond Persian and Greek lands, to rule over everything and everyone or nothing at all.[474]

Here Alexander's ambition of creating a state that dominated the whole world is in full display. As Bosch points out, the idea of world domination and the creation of a polity designed to rule the whole world, in short, universal domination, was not unique to Alexander. In fact, the roots of this idea could be found in both Eastern and Western cultures. It was present in cultures such as the Hittites, the Assyrians, and in various other disparate cultures around the world. This demonstrates the near universality of the idea of universal rule. However, Bosch points out that Alexander's construction of his own empire differed from the old formula. Like the

---

[472]Ibid., 31.

[473]Ibid., 48.

[474]Ibid., 48.

many cultures before him, Alexander sought to rule the entire world, but unlike the many ancient examples he observed and imitated, he sought not to favor the domination of any one cultural group or nation. Alexander wanted to create a state in which different cultures and peoples would be equal under the law, and all peoples would have the same rights, responsibilities, and opportunities under Alexander's authority. In this arrangement, no one group of people would have a monopoly on political power. According to Bosch, this was a rather novel idea for the time, and it was precisely in his methods that Alexander differed from his predecessors who had set their sights on world domination.[475]

Alexander's policy of adopting the symbols and titles of the places he conquered, along with his willingness, indeed his encouragement, to continue the previous political, social, and cultural practices and arrangements, stemmed from his idea of building a world empire by creating loyalty and consent among his subjects. Furthermore, Alexander not only allowed the continuation of the rituals and practices of the present cultures over which he ruled, but he actively pursued a policy of cross-pollination of Greek culture with the various cultures of the East in many areas. Alexander sought to harmonize cultures from Persia to India and from Central Asia to Egypt by adopting their cultural and political practices himself and by publicly encouraging or dictating them to his people. On several occasions, this practice helped him to further consolidate his rule and his subjects' loyalty to him. Nevertheless, Bosch draws our attention to the tensions among his subjects caused by the constitution of Alexander's ideal empire. Alexander the Great's methods of building his empire alienated his Greek allies and especially his Macedonian subjects for two main reasons. These people expected to reap the benefits of their victories over the Persian Empire by acquiring land, wealth, and titles. They also expected that their efforts would be rewarded, according to Greek tradition, with a chance to dominate their old enemies and subordinate them to the political will of the Greek and Macedonian upper classes, especially the military elite that formed the backbone of Alexander's army during his conquest of the Persian Empire. Their wishes were dashed, first, when they realized that Alexander had no intention of stopping at the western parts of the Persian Empire and had set his sights on a greater ambition, the conquest of the known world.[476]Second, they were disappointed to learn that Alexander would retain the current ruling elite of the Persian Empire, which consisted of people from many different cultures. Along with this decision, Alexander had also decided to treat his subjects equally, which meant that people from many different cultures would be able to participate in the exercise of political power in his

---

[475]Ibid., 79.

[476]Ibid., 48.

empire.[477]The combination of these two practices meant that, on paper, neither the Greek nor the Macedonian elite would be considered any different from any other of Alexander's subjects. In this way, Alexander would adopt the traditions of his former enemies and wear the various symbols of the conquered peoples, while at the same time giving these defeated people the same respect and honors that he would give to the people he fought alongside to defeat.[478]Bosch regards this as a departure from both the Greek's and Alexander's earlier goals of national domination.[479]Alexander's approach to ruling gained the ire of his Greek subjects, causing friction, rebellion and mutiny amongst his men in several occasions.[480] However, Bosch praises Alexander's methods and puts great emphasis on them for the creation of the culture of Hellenism.

The political practices and cultural policies of Alexander the Great's empire at the height of its expansion are remarkable for understanding the subsequent cultural impact of Hellenism. The empire of Alexander the Great was actually the unification of a number of independent states into a supra-state community, none of which was in any way subordinate to the others. This unification was not secured by treaties between the individual states-as Bosch showed in his earlier textbook to be the case with the Roman Empire-but was centered in the person of Alexander himself. Alexander achieved this unification by concentrating in one person all the sovereign powers of all the countries he ruled. Bosch clearly shows that Alexander always knew how to act according to the different political positions he held in different parts of the empire, and that he always made this clear to all. Thus, Alexander was a king of Macedonia, a great king of Persia, the head of the Corinthian Union for the Greeks, and a pharaoh for the Egyptians. In the Persian Empire and elsewhere in Asia, Alexander considered himself the successor of the Persian king Darius. He ruled the former territories of the Persians and Asia as the one with the symbols of authority and the seal of Darius. He would wear the regalia of the Persian kings and receive his Asian subjects on a golden throne and with courtier gifts at special ceremonies. On the other hand, he would meet and discuss with Greek and Macedonian subjects without standing on ceremony.[481]This was especially true during battles, when Alexander allowed any of his soldiers to address him in any manner, but in civilian settings only his officers and courtiers were allowed

---

[477]Ibid., 104.

[478]Ibid., 104.

[479]Ibid., 48.

[480]Ibid., 68,78, 102, 104-105, 107.

[481]Ibid., 108.

in his presence.[482]At the same time, the political traditions and institutions of these peoples and countries were preserved. There was no transition of political customs between them during Alexander's lifetime.[483]

In addition to titles and symbols, Alexander also used religious legitimation to ensure his political dominance. After conquering Egypt, Alexander organized a trip to the temple of Zeus-Amon in Libya. Bosch says that neither ancient nor modern historians have been able to make sense of Alexander's visit to the oasis of Siva, an ancient site of religious prophecy. However, he suggests that this visit to the temple of Zeus was not intended for the Egyptians, but was a gesture to his Greek subjects. At the temple, Alexander was welcomed by the high priest as the son of Amon, and secrets were revealed to him. In the eyes of the Greeks, this made Alexander the son of Zeus, and they came to believe that it was here that Zeus gave his son prophecies of world domination.[484]From that point on, Alexander asked to be treated as a divinity by the Greeks. However, the fact that Alexander achieved greatness through such a ceremony, rather than through military or political coercion, increased his legitimacy and authority in the eyes of his Greek subjects. However, this issue of divinity was used by Alexander only in the eyes of his Greek subjects, because neither in Macedonia nor in the other Asian cultures over which he ruled was it common for a person to claim divinity. In Greece, on the other hand, it was common enough for political leaders to claim divinity. According to the Greeks, the realm of the gods was not an otherworldly realm, but the presence and actions of the gods were directly felt and interacted with by human beings. In fact, in Greek culture, the gods were merely idealized human beings. People who had achieved great success in their lives could enter the realm of the gods and were honored as such.[485]It was natural for Alexander to want to be seen in such a status, and the worship of Alexander was not a tribute to his real person, but to his otherworldly person, or rather to the otherworldly source from which he drew his strength. Bosch sees Alexander's recourse to such a tradition as a means of legitimation and consent as quite appropriate in its historical context.

Alexander the Great's cultural policies had their background in the efforts of earlier Macedonian kings. As Bosch points out, the Macedonian rulers considered their domain to be behind the social and cultural level of other Greek polities. For this reason, they sought to imitate their neighbors in these areas. Although Alexander

---

[482]Ibid., 107.

[483]Ibid., 106.

[484]Ibid., 50.

[485]Ibid., 107.

succeeded in imposing his political will on these Greek states, he too was influenced by his predecessors and his mentor Aristotle to follow a similar path in promoting the arts and sciences under his own rule. Along the way, Asian cultural elements influenced Alexander's tastes and decisions in the cultural field, but according to Bosch, Alexander preferred Greek culture to Eastern cultures in this matter.[486]Therefore, the intellectual and religious life of his palace took place entirely within the framework of Greek culture. He invited many Greek poets, historians, philosophers and men of letters to his court and was in constant contact with them. In his later years, however, he was also surrounded by Egyptian, Indian, and Persian philosophers and men of letters. Bosch shows that Alexander was no stranger to the intellectual and artistic movements in Asia and had a vested interest in promoting them through the patronage of artists and scholars.[487]However, in the plastic arts, painting and sculpture, he shows that Alexander preferred the Greek school, pointing out that he always used Greek masters in his painting and building projects. According to Bosch, Alexander, who had grown up with the aristocratic Greek education of the time, would not have liked the more idealistic depictions of nature, man, and other subjects by Egyptian and Asian artists because of the importance of naturalism in Greek art, to which he had been accustomed from an early age. Bosch says that Alexander became more sympathetic to these styles as he grew older and became fonder of splendor.[488]The reason Alexander promoted the arts and culture of this East, Bosch suggests, was not because he wanted to elevate any one of these cultures to a dominant position, but because he wanted all the different ideas and cultures in the empire to grow and develop harmoniously. In this way, an independent and higher culture, a world culture, would emerge from all these cultures. His affinity for Greek culture and art was simply a personal choice on Alexander's part. But his desire for the unification of Greek and Eastern cultures was also a political desire.[489]If this desire were to be realized, every intellectual in Alexander's empire would have to feel at home everywhere. To achieve this goal, he embarked on an enormous policy of ceremonial and public display. The fusion of cultures could only be the result of the fusion of the people, the nations, that carried those cultures. According to Bosch, Alexander's goal was to eliminate the contrast between East and West. To this end, Alexander encouraged the intermarriage of his subjects from different cultures.[490]As Bosch points out, Alexander practiced what he preached

---

[486]Ibid., 122.

[487]Ibid., 122.

[488]Ibid., 123.

[489]Ibid., 123.

[490]Ibid., 123.

and set an example for his subjects by marrying the Turanian princess Roksana in 327 BC.[491]To ensure that those close to him would follow his example, in 324 BC he organized a magnificent wedding banquet in Susa, where Macedonian men were married to Persian women.[492]As mentioned earlier, Alexander also continued to promote Persians and eastern Iranians among his subjects to high positions and to enlist them in the army. In this way, both his government and his army began to take on the cosmopolitan appearance Alexander desired. At the height of Alexander's power, his army became a microcosm of the entire population of his empire. Although Greek and Macedonian officers and aristocrats objected, the army was made up of Turans, Persians, Egyptians, Anatolians, Greeks, and Macedonians - all Alexander's subjects.[493]

6.2 Critique of Alexander

Several points that persist from his Roman History ar Bosch's criticism of lawlessness, the use of arbitrary force, and the monopoly of political power. In both textbooks on the history of Hellenism, there are several people whom Bosch criticizes for practicing the aforementioned acts; for example, one of the successor kings, Demetrios Poliorketes,[494]and the king of Pontus, Mithradates VI,[495]are both disparaged for their negligence of political precedence and their use of unnecessary violence. However, Bosch criticizes no one more for their actions than Alexander the Great himself. Although Bosch praises him for his many talents and successes, especially his talent for adopting the symbols and practices of his enemies and his military prowess,[496]he doesn't refrain from criticizing his disregard for the lives of his subjects, his neglect of the political traditions that keep his allies together, and, most importantly, his excessive and relentless ambition for conquest, which, according to Bosch, cost Alexander the loyalty of his allies and subjects. Alexander the Great's relentless ambition and unstoppable drive for conquest are at the forefront of the narrative. There are two concrete and telling examples that demonstrate these

---

[491]Ibid., 123.

[492]Ibid., 123-24.

[493]Ibid., 124-25.

[494]Bosch, *Helenizm Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 20-21.

[495]Ibid., 115.

[496]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 31, 23, 36, 46.

traits of Alexander's character. When Alexander was offered a large amount of tribute and half of the Persian Empire after his victories over the Persians on the field of battle, despite the protests and consternation of his generals, Alexander did not accept the offer, but decided to pursue a policy of domination over all or nothing. Bosch explains the situation this way: *"...the tremendous and diabolical ambition of Alexander's nature strove to transcend all that was considered reasonable."*[497] The most extreme display of Alexander's ambition presented itself in his desire to reach the ends of the world. His military campaigns towards Central Asia and India were the result of that want for world domination.[498] Here in these campaigns, he pushed his men almost to the brink of extinction, making both his men and his generals unhappy to be fighting a war so far from home, and in most cases without any benefit to themselves, the only thing keeping them from mutiny in most cases was Alexander's personal charisma and his authority gained through countless victories.

However, even these traits were called into question when he persecuted one of his advisors, Kalistenes, a historian and publicist who accompanied Alexander on all of his campaigns, recording his deeds and publishing propaganda for his rule. Kalistenes was by all accounts a valued advisor and personal friend of Alexander's, but he, like many other Greeks in Alexander's court, opposed Alexander's adoption of Persian customs. When a plot to assassinate Alexander was discovered among the king's young guards, who had been trained by Kalistenes, Alexander took Kalistenes' opposition as a sign of treason and suspected him of being part of the plot against his life. Kalistenes was arrested without a trace and taken with the army to India, where he was executed by Alexander's order after seven months of imprisonment without any solid evidence of his guilt.[499] For many Greeks, this case, along with Alexander's war-mongering and neglect of the welfare of his troops, made him a tyrant. Bosch sides with the ancient Greek sources on this point, emphasizing Alexander's disregard for legal, social, and political precedence, which caused sociopolitical disruption while monopolizing political power in Alexander's hands, and his use of arbitrary force, even against those closest to him, as signs of tyranny. In Bosch's narrative, this view of Alexander is a sticking point and comes up several times. Bosch's emphasis on these points may indicate to us the high regard in which he held legality and checks on absolute political power and the arbitrary use of force. It should be noted, however, that Bosch does not cast a negative light on Alexander's claims to divinity and his use of religion as a political tool of legitimation. In fact,

---

[497] Ibid.,48.

[498] Ibid.,69-73, 83.

[499] Ibid.,79-80.

as noted above, he finds it reasonable in its historical and social context. For Bosch, the same was true of Caesar's and Augustus' claims to divinity. I argue that Bosch is able to historicize the actions of these figures in such a way that he condemns only those actions that were considered unreasonable or unacceptable even in their own historical contexts.

6.3 Hellenism's Encounter with Rome

In the second part of his histories of the Hellenistic period, *The Hellenistic States until their Juncture with the Roman Empire*, Bosch once again touches upon the subject of the *Mother Goddess* cult of Anatolia and devotes a whole sub-heading to the subject. From this point on, Bosch makes his greatest claim found in his works examined in this thesis so far; he directly states that the origins of the Romans were in Anatolia. He retells the story of the transport of the *Mother Goddess* to Rome and examines in detail the peculiarities of the cult and its impact on Roman society and culture. According to the story, in the waning years of the Second Punic War, the Roman public was in an existential crisis. The Roman people were driven to look for divine help and salvation in every corner. The Roman priesthood decided to intervene to maintain public order and to guide the people through the hardships. They consult religious texts called *Sybils* from the time of the Roman Empire. The texts suggested that if Rome ever faced a threat like this, artifacts of the *Mother Goddess* from the temple in *Pessinus* should be brought back to Rome and placed among the other Roman gods so that Rome could achieve victory over its enemies.[500]Five statesmen are chosen to lead a diplomatic mission to Pergamon in 205 BC. They request Attalos I (King of Pergamon) to allow them to take back the holy stone which fell from the skies (a black meteorite) which represented the *Mother Goddess* and was at the center of her worship. This diplomatic mission became the first official visit to Anatolia by the Romans.[501]In 204 BC, the holy stone is brought back to Rome and placed in the temple of Victoria (Goddess of victory). In 194 BC, the date which the stone is brought to Rome is declared a holiday and began to be celebrated annually. In 191 BC, a dedicated temple is constructed for the *Mother Goddess* and the holy stone is transported here.[502]Bosch repeats his claims about the Mother Goddess which he made in his 1937 article. He says that this cult is older

---

[500]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 83-84.

[501]Ibid., 84.

[502]Ibid., 84.

than its worship in Greek and Roman cultures, and its roots can be traced back to various ancient peoples of Anatolia in different names such as; in Lydia *Kybele*, in Phrygia *Kubile* and in Hittite *Kubaba*. Bosch states, as he previously done in his other works, that the *Mother Goddess* herself was the mother of all other deities. In Rome she was considered to be the mother of Aeneas, bolstering Aeneas' claims to divinity in Roman religion.[503]On the other hand, Bosch claims that this religious explanation is just a mystified version of the real history of Etruscans migrating to Italy from Anatolia to found the city of Rome.[504]According to Bosch that meant Romans' search for the Mother Goddess signified a return to their roots in a time of extreme hardship and existential crisis. Here Bosch finally says the quite part out loud:

"Since the Romans sought help from the Mother Goddess of Pessinus at the most critical juncture of their history, this event can mean nothing else but an appeal from Romans to the first source of their power and an official affirmation [by the Roman state] *that the origin of their state was in Anatolia."*[505]

So, Bosch states that, in 204 BC, with the reception of official Roman delegation on Anatolian soil, Roman state opened itself to Eastern influences, and by the time Rome became an empire cultural impact of the East, particularly the influence of Anatolian cultural traditions, was felt all over the empire, in fact, becoming the dominant and guiding source of political, social and cultural practices and traditions of the Roman state and society. Bosch sets forth the allusions of Ovid about Octavian's divinity and ancestry which inextricably tied with Anatolia as evidence for the start of this greater cultural transformation of the Roman empire.[506]

6.4 Turks in Hellenistic History

The chapters about Alexander's Central Asian campaigns in the book, *The Empire of the Alexander the Great*, contain references to ancient Turks. While retelling Alexander's campaigns and other political events in Central Asia, Bosch, uses the terms of *Türk* and *Türkmen* nearly interchangeably to describe different ethnic and cultural groups and sometimes states themselves. For example, he refers to a group

---

[503]Ibid., 84.

[504]Ibid., 84.

[505]Ibid., 85. The translation is mine.

[506]Ibid., 85.

of cavalries *Türkistan* cavalry.[507]Use of all these names gets confused from several perspectives. Bosch, does not clearly categorize what these names mean and who they represent. Sometimes place names, ethnic group names and political entity names are mixed without any differentiation. Nevertheless, these people and the events they partake in occupy an important part of Bosch's narrative and he refers to these people and their relations with Alexander in many different contexts. We can surmise that this importance and particularly the names that were used might have been derived from the Turkish History Thesis. As mentioned before in the discussion on Turkish historiography in 1930s and 1940s, studies and research on Central Asia was a crucial part of Turkish History Thesis's drive for finding the original homeland of the Turks. According to THT, Central Asia was the propagation point of the Turkish race and Turkish culture. The Turks had already constructed an advanced civilization here in prehistorical times, between 7000 and 8000 BC, before migrating to Anatolia and thus enabling the diffusion of their advanced civilization. Bosch seems to include and prominently feature these Turkish or Turkic peoples in his narrative, while also demonstrating their political and military prowess in the face of one of history's most famous military minds, Alexander the Great, perhaps as a way of bridging the prehistoric Turks with the ancient Central Asian peoples. In doing so, he presents a narrative of the continuation, even the flourishing, of the Turkish people and their advanced culture in the region.

6.5 Political, Social and Cultural Features of Hellenism and their Impact on World History

In first his text book on history of the Hellenistic period, The *Empire of the Alexander the Great*, Bosch compares a few of the socio-political and cultural features of Classical Greece and the Hellenistic Period. This examination creates a basis for a study of the emergence and diffusion of Hellenism in the Mediterranean basin, which he dedicates a long and detailed chapter to in his second text book, *The Hellenistic States until their Juncture with the Roman Empire.* Here he also discusses the greater implications of Hellenism in world history.

After Alexander's death, there was a great struggle among his generals to claim his empire. During this time, many successor states to Alexander the Great's rule arose in Greece, Anatolia, Syria, Egypt, Iran, and Central Asia to the borders of India. The successor kingdoms were different from the Greek states of the classical

---

[507]Ibid., 76.

period. Moreover, the Greek rulers of these states tended not to share Alexander's vision of a universal empire with a strong emphasis on the creation of a common cosmopolitan culture. Nevertheless, the legacy of Alexander the Great's political, social, and cultural policies and practices, as well as more practical concerns such as geopolitical and demographic issues, pushed Alexander's heirs to pursue paths similar to those Alexander had taken. In turn, according to Bosch, the aftermath of Alexander's empire became a time when features of Hellenism solidified and made their mark on world history through the actions of the successor kingdoms. For this reason, Bosch places great emphasis on examining various facets of these states, from their political systems to their art, and from their social structures to the composition of their armies. As a result of his research and analysis, Bosch asserts that Hellenism, thanks to the vast expanses of space and time it endured, had a lasting and profound influence on many cultures, most notably Rome. Bosch points out the many connections between Roman culture and Hellenism and examines several of them in all of his ancient history textbooks. He also shows how, through the Roman Empire, several cultural traits of Hellenism were adopted by the nascent Christianity. In addition, Bosch accepts Rome and Christianity as pillars of European culture, and thus of modern culture. Furthermore, as mentioned above, he emphasizes the weight of the influence of Eastern cultures, especially those of Anatolia, on Hellenism compared to Western cultures. In doing so, Bosch constructs many through-lines between European civilization and its product, modernity, with Eastern cultures. Through this linkage, he tries to demonstrate their importance for world history, while suggesting that European civilization had several parts of its roots in the East.[508] To understand how he makes this connection we need to look at how he constructs the features of Hellenism.

In the classical period, the polis, or city-state, was considered the ideal political structure by the ancient Greeks themselves. According to Bosch, the small population of the polis was united under a national identity. In this governmental structure, the people directly and independently administered the affairs of the state.[509] The officials of the city-states were elected by the people's assembly from among the city's inhabitants for a term of one year.[510] A citizen was a member of the state, and the state was his home. In the polis, those who did not understand the Greek language were considered barbarians.[511]

---

[508] Ibid., 177-179.

[509] Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 1.

[510] Ibid., 2

[511] Ibid., 2

The political structures and practices of the Classical and Hellenistic periods differed in several ways. Bosch states that unlike the polis, the Hellenistic states were tied to dynastic family structures, lacked national unity, and their people were dependent in their political affairs on the will of others over whom they had no power. This means that the political structure of the Hellenistic states was absolute monarchy. The national unity of the city-states of the Classical period was lost due to the spread of cosmopolitan social structures brought about by the territorial expansion of Alexander's successor kingdoms. During the Classical period, monarchies existed in the Greek lands, but kings never held absolute power. Bosch points out that absolutist rule in this period was established only as a result of an illegal seizure of power; the resulting regime was called tyranny, and this type of rule was traditionally frowned upon by the Greeks. In such cases, it was the duty of all citizens of a polis to oppose the tyrant with physical force in order to save the homeland.[512]Bosch underlines that absolute rule was generally not accepted by the Greeks. One of the most important representations of this was the ability of almost any citizen to assemble and discuss political issues with the king, as demonstrated by Alexander the Great's own treatment of his Greek subjects. He points out that the idea of absolutism originated in Eastern cultures; Egyptian pharaohs, Mesopotamian rulers, and Persian great kings were examples. The idea was adopted by Alexander, especially the ceremonial traditions and symbols of authority that legitimized the ruler while mystifying his presence by keeping him separate from his subjects. In Eastern political traditions, kings were also legitimized by their religious character, the person of the king was embedded in a religious milieu, and the monarch was also deified.[513]In contrast to the understanding of divinity in Greek culture, the divinity of the ruler in Eastern cultures created a great distance between the ruler and his subjects, giving the ruler an aura of invulnerability and inscrutability that enhanced the king's mystique and legitimacy. As noted above, most traditions were used separately in Alexander's reign. Each practice or tradition was applied only to that portion of Alexander's subjects who would respond most favorably to the display, while Alexander's successors adopted these practices and traditions almost wholesale to solidify their hold on power and thus establish their absolute rule.[514]At this point Bosch again reveals to us some of the connections between Rome and the East. He argues that the cult of the king, who wielded absolute power through his divinity, which spread to Rome and then through Rome to Europe, had its roots in the Greek cult of the founder and savior, and another root in the Egyptian cult of

---

[512]Bosch, Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım, 138.

[513]Ibid., 140.

[514]Ibid., 142.

the god-king pharaohs.[515] By demonstrating its roots and later influences, Bosch points to the adoption of absolutist monarchy by Greeks from Eastern cultures as one of the first and most important changes in Greek political culture and as one of the defining characteristics of Hellenism.[516]

Territorial expansionism and the resulting cosmopolitan demography were also aspects adopted from the Eastern empires. This was in stark contrast to the city-states of the Classical period, where conquest for land was rare and the population was relatively homogeneous.[517]The expansion of the state's territory and the diversification of its citizenry went hand in hand with the notion of world domination of the ancient Eastern empires and Hellenistic states. These states sought recognition of their international power, and almost all of them attempted to become world states, as Alexander had tried to do. As the size and power of the state increased, the rights of the individual decreased. The rights and independence of subjects were curtailed, and the state had ultimate authority over people's property, family, and lives.[518] This was similarly a departure from the Classical Period where rights and obligations of citizens were highly valued and protected fiercely.

The Hellenistic states were administered by a well-educated and experienced class of officials with common manners and ways of life. They were generally selected from the sons of aristocratic families and trained to be professionals in their respective fields. There were also a large number of lower-level officials who came from the lower classes and were trained as thoroughly as their aristocratic counterparts.[519]In this way, education was of great importance to society. It ensured that all officials were held to similar standards and were united in their visions and goals. They also had the same rights and responsibilities and were considered equal before the law, which encouraged loyalty to the state. In this way, the culture of Hellenism permeated everywhere, uniting the upper classes of all people of all nationalities. This well-educated cadre worked within a political structure in which existing local practices and traditions were harmonized and adapted by a newly established Greek ruling class.[520]According to Bosch, the purpose of the organization of the states of the Hellenistic period for the administration of the state was to make collective

---

[515]Ibid., 141.

[516]Ibid., 138.

[517]Ibid., 138.

[518]Ibid., 139.

[519]Ibid., 145.

[520]Ibid., 146-47.

use of the auxiliary resources of large countries and to place them entirely at the disposal of the government, and from this point of view this organization was perfect. Nevertheless, these states were decimated and fell into the hands of the Romans, who were far inferior in organization. Bosch attributes this to absolute monarchical rule. He points out that the system was prone to collapse because of the reliance on a single strong personality at the head of such governments. The complexity of the socio-political structure of the Hellenistic state was also an important factor. The checks and balances on the power of the monarch were limited, and the main, and in most cases the only, institution that held the state together and gave legitimacy to the government was the king himself. In this situation, it was a problem when the royal family degenerated for various reasons and produced individuals of weak character. Bosch emphasizes that this problem was seen in Hellenistic states, as in any form of government based on hereditary succession, and that it became one of the main reasons for the collapse of these states.[521]

The idea of nation and how Greek and Eastern cultures approached the idea of national unity is central to Bosch's narrative. He points to national consciousness as one of the core tenets of the Greek polis of the Classical period. He also emphasizes that the idea of the nation was an alien concept to Eastern cultures. In most cases, the dominance of the ancient Eastern states was based on a specific nationality, with the invading peoples constituting the dominant stratum. However, the will of the absolute king could also include in this dominant stratum people belonging to the peoples under his subjection, and in this way the common feelings and national unity of the higher stratum were disrupted.[522]There had never been an attempt to fuse the conquered peoples into one nation through the integration of language, customs, and manners. For this reason, national unity could not be observed in almost any of the Eastern states. In Greece, however, despite the diversity of political structures, the same origin, the same language, and the same history, in other words, national identity and consciousness, have always been important. The social structure of the Hellenistic states was a combination of these two perspectives. Alexander had tried to fuse these two ideas, trying to create a cosmopolitan ruling class of administrators and intellectuals who shared a common culture and spoke the same language. However, Alexander was unable to complete his plans before his death. His successors continued his legacy, and both Seleucus I and Ptolemy I attempted to build their states around such an upper class with a common national

---

[521]Ibid., 147.

[522]Ibid., 139.

identity.[523] Several methods were used to construct this national unity. The Hellenistic rulers tried to acculturate the disparate ethnic groups of their lands in the Greek-Macedonian way, encouraging the adoption of these cultures by making these non-Greek subjects equal in rights and duties to Greek individuals. They also moved Greek and Macedonian subjects from different parts of their domain or from other countries and settled them in certain cities. In these cities, even though the number of Greek settlers in these settlements might be small, the dominant culture would still be Greek, thanks to the stimulation and promotion of culture through social and cultural policies. In this way, at least in the city, the language, traditions and ways of life were standardized to be Greek. At the same time, this meant that many cities in the Mediterranean became very similar to each other.[524]Thus, cities became the places of production and reproduction of culture of Hellenism.[525]According to Bosch, especially in the cities, a sense of unity and common identity began to develop between the local ethnic groups and the Greeks, creating a relatively unified ruling class.[526]However, the same policies that worked in the cities were not able to penetrate the countryside, and therefore Hellenistic culture was not as successful in spreading to these regions.[527]Failing to create a common national identity through the creation of an urban elite, the Hellenistic rulers resorted to the religious elements of their absolute rule to create a community out of the disparate parts of their subjects.[528]

6.5.1 State and Society

The homogenization of upper-class culture had a profound effect on the rest of the social structure of the Hellenistic states. The upper classes of almost all Hellenistic states became the same: they all spoke Greek, practiced similar arts and sciences, and shared similar tastes and lifestyles. No matter where individuals came from, once they received an education, they were not alienated from the upper classes. In this case, at least among the upper classes, nationality had all but disappeared, and the most important element of initiation into the upper classes was knowledge of

---

[523]Ibid., 140.

[524]Ibid., 158.

[525]Ibid., 158.

[526]Ibid., 140.

[527]Ibid., 140, 158.

[528]Ibid., 140

Greek. The Attic dialect, which had become the language of public Greek literature and intellectuals in the Classical period, retained this position in the Hellenistic period. Thanks to the expansion of the Hellenistic states and their cosmopolitan population structure, a new language of commerce and writing, the *Koyne* dialect of Greek, emerged, into which many foreign influences penetrated. This dialect was used throughout the Hellenistic world.[529]In this case, at least among the upper classes, nationality had all but disappeared, and those with this common education, training, and language saw themselves as citizens of the world rather than citizens of a state or city. In this cosmopolitan society, Bosch argues, the contrast between Greeks and barbarians disappeared. According to him, the word barbarian was used by the Greeks only for people who did not understand Greek and was not used to denigrate people. In the Hellenistic period, the word barbarian lost this meaning. By this time, there was a class distinction between intellectuals and non-intellectuals. Bosch attributes this change to the cohesive social and political policies of Alexander the Great, which he used to lay the foundation for a world empire. As mentioned earlier, these policies were organized so that different peoples had equal rights. The Macedonian aristocracy, in particular, opposed these policies and regulations out of nationalistic sentiments. Because of this opposition, Alexander could not take his policies very far. However, the seeds he planted took root and manifested themselves in the later Hellenistic states and became the beginning of the unifying elements of Hellenism.[530]

Bosch emphasizes that this idea of cosmopolitanism was the main force that united Asian and Greek cultures. Asian influence first manifested itself in the courts of Alexander and his successors. Alexander's adoption and use of Persian court customs and symbols, and the continuation of these practices by his successors, is a prime example. Bosch shows, however, that this influence in the courts had negative effects on the social structure of the Hellenistic states. The civic equality that had previously existed in relations between the various classes disappeared and was replaced by a new class consciousness that led to the emergence of social antagonisms. Bosch observes that while the standard of living of the upper and middle classes rose dramatically, the attitude of the court toward the other classes mirrored the attitude of the upper classes toward the lower classes. The difference in living standards and wealth between the upper and lower classes became extreme toward the end of the Roman Republic.[531]

---

[529]Ibid., 158.

[530]Ibid., 159.

[531]Ibid., 159.

According to early Greek thought, any kind of professional activity was unworthy of a free and wealthy citizen, but now even among the higher classes, permanent professional classes began to emerge. Standing armies, for example, made an officer a profession, a profession that was given a prestige commensurate with its importance and that required a long and costly period of preparation. Similarly, administrative needs created a permanent class of civil servants. The same thing happened in education, especially in the Classical period, when education was in the hands of private teachers who, in addition to their teaching careers, were engaged in all sorts of sciences and arts. In this period, teachers were also salaried and began to work under certain institutions, thus increasing the efficiency of educators.[532]

Bosch examines how this professionalization and wealth disparity led to collisions in the social order. The living conditions of the lower classes were now as limited as they had been in the past. The concentration of wealth, especially land, in the hands of the upper classes caused peasants to migrate to the large cities, bringing with them a restless proletariat whose livelihood was provided by the state. Bosch describes in detail how this happened in Rome in his textbook on Rome. Here he shows that this situation was common to almost all Hellenistic states. He emphasizes that the example of Caius Gracchus, a famous Roman tribune of the people, distributing bread to the people, is similar in all other Hellenistic states. Disagreements between classes increased the frequency of disturbances and riots. Bosch even suggests that social unrest in Greece helped Macedonian rule over the Greeks to continue. The Macedonian kingdom supported the domination of the upper classes in the various Greek cities over the lower classes and maintained its rule with the support of these upper classes. Similarly, the Romans based their rule in the eastern provinces on these local upper classes.[533]

6.5.2 Civilizations, Nations and Barbarians

All throughout the textbook on history of the Hellenistic period the idea of nation and national unity take center stage. However, Bosch does not give a description for what he means when he uses the word nation[534]in either of his textbooks. Bosch's conception of nation becomes clearer later on; he depicts the wars between the Greeks and the Persians in 5th and 4th centuries, from the perspective of Greeks,

---

[532]Ibid., 160.

[533]Ibid., 160.

[534]The word used in Turkish is "millet".

to be a "national struggle."[535] Bosch retells this struggle as a struggle between two different societies; on the one hand, a Persian state with a cosmopolitan imperial structure, and on the other, Greek city-states united under a common culture. The idea of Panhellenism, which the ruling elite and intelligentsia of many Greek city-states attempted to construct in the early decades of the 4th century, also comes to the fore.[536]This idea envisioned an alliance of Greek states, led by Athens and Sparta, formed to fight Persia. Bosch describes this plan as not just an alliance, but a political union of peoples who belonged to the same nation. Although he never explicitly describes it, we can glean from Bosch's perspective and the construction of his narrative what he means by a nation here. According to Bosch, a nation is an entity made up of a people with common goals, a common language, and a common culture, as well as common manners and a common way of life. To construct his idea of the Greek nation in the textbook, he chooses to emphasize the similarities between the various Greek city-states rather than the differences. He focuses on the existence of an intelligentsia that wasn't bound by the boundaries of the city-states, but instead worked hand in hand toward common goals under a common Greek culture. This group of intellectuals, along with the upper classes of many polis, repeatedly sought to preserve the Greek way of life and culture against external threats.[537]Moreover, Bosch emphasizes the common political practices and religious beliefs and rituals as indications of a common national identity.[538]This concept of nation is repeated in the narrative of Bosch's textbooks in several other places in different contexts. Bosch presents several of the Anatolian kingdoms that emerged during Diadochi Period[539] as having a national characteristic. He cites the kingdoms of Bithynia, Pontos, and Cappadocia as examples, pointing to the cultural unity of the demographic structure of these kingdoms and the national symbols on the gold coins minted by the state as evidence of the national unity of these states. However, he does not elaborate on the content of this evidence. Bosch compares the above-mentioned Anatolian states of the same period with the city-states of mainland Greece. He demonstrates that these city-states remained politically and culturally relevant even after the dissolution of Alexander's empire due to their economic output, population density, and the number of influential intellectuals and ideas they could produce at the time. However, because these

---

[535]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 3-4, 5.

[536]Ibid., 5-6.

[537]Ibid., 5.

[538]Ibid., 2-3.

[539]Period in which several generals of Alexander the Great created their own kingdoms from the parts of the Alexander's empire.

polities insisted on preserving their institutions and independence, they were never able to use their common cultural heritage to unite under a common national state similar to the Anatolian kingdoms. Bosch attributes the unwillingness or inability of the mainland Greeks to create a polity with a national character to the attachment of these peoples to their ideals of the polis. The emphasis of this political structure on the political representation of all citizens and the political independence of the city made them ill-suited to be part of a larger polity.[540]The citizens of the polis feared that a larger state structure might have curtailed some of the rights of the cities and their citizens out of a need to exercise more power over more resources, land, and people. Nevertheless, Bosch places great emphasis on the nation in his narrative. According to him, the nation goes hand in hand with the existence of a common high culture, a culture that includes language, ideas, practices, rituals, and common goals. For this reason, Bosch seems to present the nation-state as an ideal to be aspired to. We see a reflection of this in his depictions and comparisons of "civilized" and "uncivilized" peoples.

Bosch's idea of nation is intertwined with his idea of being civilized and possessing high culture, or as he puts it: "to be part of the cultivated world. Bosch does not give a clear description of what "barbarian" or "uncivilized" means in his narrative, nor does he describe what cultured means. However, we can get a picture of Bosch's understanding of these labels through the people to whom he assigns these names. We can see in several places in his textbooks that he uses the word barbarian similarly to how the Greeks and Romans used it in ancient times. There are several examples of this. The most outstanding example of Bosch's attitude toward peoples he considers barbaric is his description of the Celts. Bosch refers to the Celts as a barbarian people group and describes various Celtic peoples as having a monolithic culture, despite the vast geographical area in which these peoples lived.[541] Bosch's description of the Celt's cultural and physical attributes, similarly stereotype them into a type of people who are violent and dangerous. They are mainly characterized by their cruelty towards civilians, ferocity in battle and their recklessness in the face of death.[542]Both in his textbook on Romans, T*he Outlines of Roman History*, and in *The Hellenistic States until their Juncture with the Roman Empire*, he paints the Celts as simple marauders. In Roman history his target is the Gauls,[543] for their

_____

[540]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 1-4.

[541]Bosch states that starting from 5th and 4th century BC the Celts lived in an area encompassing Southern Germany, France, Spain, Northern Italy, Balkans and Britian. Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 33.

[542]Ibid., 34.

[543]Name of the Celtic peoples that resided in modern day France, Belgium and Northern Italy.

138

sacking of Rome[544] and the Galatian Celts for preferring plunder over conquest of lands.[545]Bosch goes as far as to celebrate King of Bergama Attalos I's victory over the Galatian Celts and Attalos's reception as a savior, defining this victory as the salvation of the cultured world from darkness.[546]Apart from the Celts, there are several other peoples which Bosch depicts as "uncivilized" or "barbaric" without going into further detail. He depicts the Illyrians as "thieving pirates" because of their pirate operations against the Greeks and Romans in the Illyrian Sea.[547]In another example, he states that Ptolemian Egypt was surrounded by "uncivilized" countries while explaining the geopolitics of Egypt in 3rd century BC, although here he doesn't give any particular names and doesn't elaborate this point further.[548]

There is also another layer in which Bosch judges the "level of civilization" he examines. This layer is relatively more subtle but nevertheless perceptible in the narrative. The best example of this is his comparison of Rome and Carthage. Bosch describes the form of the Carthaginian state and contrasts its political practices with those of Rome. The Carthaginian state was an oligarchy, a republic ruled by a small group of aristocrats. Wealthy merchants and industrialists[549] dominated. The government was headed by two judges, called suffet, appointed for each year, and two senates, one large and one small. The people were given the right to vote and they had to be consulted on important matters. But in reality, the people could exercise their political influence only in very few instances. Mercenaries were used in wars, and Carthaginians themselves served as soldiers only when the need arose. Conquered nations were treated as slaves and oppressed by heavy taxation. According to Bosch, despite its wealth, Carthage possessed, under these circumstances, a less stable societal structure than Rome had. Because in Rome, the obligations and rights belonging to citizens were divided equally among them. Military service was compulsory and equal for all, and the structure of the state was based on the voluntary cooperation of all subjects and the fulfillment of their duties.[550]Both of these aspects of Roman social structures ensured that interests of the citizens and the

---

[544]Bosch, *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları*, 23-24.

[545]The Galatians were a branch of Celtic peoples who migrated to central Anatolia in the middle of 3rd century BC. Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 69.

[546]Attalos I, King of Bergama, received the title Soter (Savior in Greek) by defeating the Galatians and freeing many of the Greek kingdoms of Anatolia from being tributary states of the Galatian Celts. Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 68-69.

[547]Ibid., 65-67.

[548]Ibid., 21.

[549]The word Bosch uses here is sanayiciler (Industrialists in Turkish). He probably means land owners who produced and traded commodities in large scale. Bosch, Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları, 38.

[550]Ibid., 38.

state aligned, enabling the construction and continuation of a more stable society.

We can see in which criteria Bosch judged different people groups and states from this contrasting of the Roman and Carthaginian structures and practices. As I have pointed out before, in the chapter where Bosch's textbook on Roman history, Bosch puts great emphasis on the rule of law and citizens sharing obligations and rights equally. He seems to value citizens taking responsibility in protecting their rights and their way of life through and fighting against external and internal threats through both civic responsibility and martial strength. Furthermore, he disparages the use of unnecessary force, especially towards civilians and defeated foes. From the cultural perspective, he praises several features and values of settled people, such as the production of philosophy, sciences and arts. In several points in his narrative, he also underlines that existence of a shared consciousness of a common past, a common language and a shared language as crucial for the unity of society. Although, Bosch never explicitly states it, it is clear that he deems a culture with the above-mentioned elements a nation that possesses a high culture. He also describes imperial polities and other states that had a cosmopolitan/ international composition, such as Rome in the later stages of the republic and Persia. Although, Bosch attributes cultural unity and unity of common goals to Celts he still doesn't consider them to be a nation or civilized. In fact, he classifies them as barbarians. It is also interesting to point out that, as mentioned before, although Bosch states that the word barbarian was not used as a negative word instead it was just employed to categorize people who could not speak Greek.[551] As shown above, Bosch himself seems to use it disparagingly for many groups of people. From this perspective, we can observe that Bosch not only considers whether a state structure or culture is efficient or not, but also seems to morally judge his subjects for their practices. This can be seen in his criticism of both political entities, such as the Celts and Carthaginians, and people, such as Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, and Sulla. Bosch's tendency can be attributed to the nature of his work and his sources. The fact that the works in question were textbooks for students may have led Bosch to be laxer in his criticism of his sources, leading him to convey the discourse of the sources directly to the students, both in the case of his primary ancient sources and secondary sources from the 19th and early 20th centuries. In this case, his depiction of Hellenistic period's cultures to be uniform is notable. Although it is clear that Bosch was able to contextualize and historicize many other issues, such as his retelling of the use of religious discourse by Caesar and Alexander, without passing moral judgment on them. It is interesting that the same care was not taken with the issues of common national identity, high culture-low culture and civilized people versus barbarians.

---

[551] Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 158.

6.5.3 Religion

Bosch considered Hellenism's most decisive and lasting impact on world history to be religious. He notes that the mixing and merging of religions, made possible and encouraged by Hellenistic rulers beginning with Alexander the Great, led to the spread of monotheism, first in the Mediterranean basin and then throughout the world.[552]Bosch emphasizes the fact that the three major monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, either originated or developed in and around the cultural influence of Hellenism. Bosch demonstrates that Hellenism was instrumental in the emergence and especially the spread of Christianity. This is so, Bosch argues, because Hellenic culture, from its inception, showed a tendency toward the abandonment of polytheism and the unification of the entire religious world. The unification of religions was one of the ambitions of Hellenism, along with the creation of a cosmopolitan social structure and the construction of the universal state. In this way, it was also a continuation of the goal of establishing a single world empire and the recognition of a single authority, an absolute king, over the world.[553]

Bosch emphasizes how Hellenism came to merge many different beliefs, religious practices, and deities. According to the Greek traditions and beliefs of the time, humanity was actually one, and different cultures were merely different expressions of the same universal truth that the world belonged to all humanity. This led to the general acceptance of different religions practiced by different nations.[554]On the other hand, Bosch emphasizes that the religious traditions of several pagan cults were unable to survive in the face of Hellenism, which increasingly permeated society. Over time, many pagan polytheistic cults disappeared, but they were not replaced by any kind of atheism. In fact, belief in a single God or divine power deepened, while many of the traditions and practices of the old cults were subsumed into this belief system.[555]Bosch shows that irreligious sentiment did not take hold even among the educated upper classes, where atheism could more easily take root, because they too believed in the goddess Tyche, the goddess and embodiment of fate.[556]Tyche was a new form of the Anatolian *Mother Goddess* who was worshipped under the names of *Kybele* in Asia Minor, *Ishtar* in Mesopotamia, *Astarte* in Syria,

---

[552]Ibid., 161.

[553]Ibid., 161.

[554]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 2.

[555]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 161.

[556]Ibid., 161.

Isis in Egypt, *Demeter* in Greece, and *Eryx* in Italy.[557]In ancient Eastern cities, there was a cult dedicated to this deity, and she was considered the patron and ruler of the city. She was the controller of the fate of the world, kings, empire, and people, and the patroness of other deities. As an all-pervading deity, she spread throughout the Mediterranean basin. In Rome, her Latin name was Fortuna, and Sulla, Roman general and statesman, recognized her as his patron.[558]

There were other gods that were accepted and considered universal in Hellenism. One of them was Serapis. He was a syncretic god who originated from the worship of the Egyptian Osiris and Apis. Greek Pharaoh Ptolemy I Soter ordered his widespread popularization in the third century BC as a way to bring the Egyptian and Greek people of the Ptolemaic Kingdom together.[559]Bosch underlines that the characteristic feature of all these deities was that they had universal domain and were accepted throughout the world. At the same time, he says, each of these deities claimed to be the sovereign of the whole universe, and the followers of this claimant regarded all the other deities as forms that manifested certain aspects of the being of their own specific deity. Thus, each of these religions tried to unite the other religions to itself, and in the end, cults such as Zeus-Helios-Serapis or Isis-Tyche-Selene were established, which were cults of many deities mixed with each other. According to Bosch, these pantheistic combinations were among the phenomena that facilitated the spread of monotheism.[560]Other than the gods themselves, many forms of traditions, practices and rituals of worship were beginning to fuse together and were transmitted to later periods. All these cults had secret pacts, mysteries, and they inculcated in the devout that there is life after death.[561]

In Bosch's and Rohde's works we can observe how these religious practices and traditions were transformed over centuries to later influence early Christianity, and in fact continued to persist, in a way or another, long after both the Hellenistic states or Rome had fallen.

---

[557]Ibid., 161.

[558]Ibid., 166.

[559]Ibid.,162.

[560]Ibid., 162.

[561]Ibid., 162.

6.5.4 Impact of Hellenism on World History

Bosch lays out the geographic extent of Hellenism's spread, showing how its political influence made its way from Greece to northern India and Turan (referring to Central Asia) and all the regions in between, such as Egypt, Iran, and Mesopotamia, through the expansion of Hellenistic states, beginning with the empire of Alexander the Great and continuing with the kingdoms of his successors. The cultural influence of Hellenism extended beyond the political borders of the Hellenistic states, influencing the cultures of France, Spain through Roman conquests.[562]Bosch points out that the constitution of Hellenism's influence on cultures varied depending on the region in which the cultural exchange took place. At the beginning of the period, Greek influence was greater in the western regions, such as Anatolia and mainland Greece, while in the eastern regions, such as Iran, Mesopotamia, and Central Asia, Egyptian and Persian influence was more influential. However, Bosch claims that as Hellenism developed, the influence of Eastern cultures became more dominant in the mixture of culture.[563]In fact, with reference to Eduard Norden's work, *Agnostos Theos*, Bosch also argues that, according to the historiography of his time, it became generally accepted that Asian cultural elements constituted the more preeminent and enduring parts of Hellenic culture, and that during the Hellenistic period the Easternization of Greek culture was of greater magnitude than the Grecization of the East.[564]Bosch states the deepest impact was on religions, claiming that the Eastern religious practices and traditions dominated Greek religions.[565]On the other hand, Greek arts and sciences persisted in the East, and continued to influence Eastern societies after the fall of Hellenistic states. Bosch demonstrates this persistence from several angles. He gives several examples art influenced by Greek styles (Pictures of which are included in addendum) produced in North of India and in Turkistan. He points to the adoption of the name Philhellenes (Friend of the Greeks) by the Parthian rulers. Alongside these, he emphasizes the deep impact of Greek sciences and philosophy on Islamic culture as indication of the lasting influence of Hellenism.[566]

Bosch states that the political history of Hellenism ended at the end of the 1st century BC when the Hellenic states joined the Roman Empire. However, the cultural

---

[562]Ibid., 177-78.

[563]Ibid., 178.

[564]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 2.

[565]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 178.

[566]Ibid., 178.

influence of Hellenism continued into the imperial period of Rome. The culture of the Roman Empire was a combination of Eastern cultures, Hellenism, and Latin culture.[567]Because of that Bosch challenges older historiography, which considered the expansion of Rome into Asia Minor as the end of Hellenism. Bosch argues that it is not correct to think of Rome as a separate era from Hellenistic era. In fact, he states that the idea of world cultural unity represented by the Roman empire is in fact a concept of Hellenism. Therefore, the end point of the Hellenistic period, for Bosch, was the fall of the Roman state.[568]

Bosch underlines that unlike some other cultures Roman culture was not completely subsumed by Hellenism, on the contrary, Roman intellectuals' insistence of preserving the Roman aspects of their culture led to creation of different strand of Hellenism mixed with Latin features. Thus, the Bosch states that the Roman period could be seen as the second period of Hellenism's diffusion and development. At this stage of Hellenism's development, through the cultivation of Roman and Greek intellectuals of each tongue, Latin was situated as the language of the western parts of the Roman Empire while Greek entrenched itself in the eastern provinces. In this new culture of the Roman Empire, the Eastern influences increased continuously and manifested itself on the most important parts of public life. In fact, Bosch even states that Eastern cultures triumphed over Rome during this period. According to him, this point is very important for the world history the fact that the Eastern cultures established a superiority over Rome. Important parts of Eastern cultures were transferred to modern European cultures. This is because Rome served as a basis for the emerging political systems of European states during the Middle Ages.[569]

According to Bosch, the most important achievement of Hellenism in world history, the unification of the various religions of different peoples, was achieved in the first period of the Roman Empire. This means that the emergence and spread of Christianity is the most important element of Hellenism in Bosch's narrative. It becomes a leitmotif in his works, and he relates it to the spread of Anatolian culture throughout the world. Indeed, he finds direct connections between the religious practices, symbols, and traditions of Anatolia and Christianity. His claim that the influence of Eastern cultures on Greek culture was greater than vice versa should also be understood from this perspective. We can also see his argument about the diffusion of Eastern cultures, especially those of Anatolia, as the main thesis of the two textbooks on the history of Hellenism. Bosch goes to great lengths to show

[567]Ibid., 179

[568]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım*, 2-3.

[569]Bosch, *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; II. Kısım*, 179.

where these cultures came from and how they transformed the Greek states and, in turn, how the Greeks influenced the Romans. Bosch establishes a genealogy of political, social, and cultural transmissions that links the prehistoric elements of Eastern cultures, especially those of Anatolia, to European culture and even to modernity. By constructing this link, he situates the East as the progenitor of, in his words, several historically significant cultures, such as Persian, Egyptian, Hittite, and Sumerian, while showing the deep and lasting influence on the rest of the cultures of the Mediterranean basin, such as Greek and Roman cultures.

7.   CONCLUSION

This thesis examined and discussed several works of German émigré scholar Clemens Bosch as its main focal point. His works were compared and contrasted with other foreign scholars working in Turkey during the 1930s and 40s in the context of University Reform, Turkish History Thesis and Turkish history writing's shift towards humanism in the 1940s. Several conclusions can be made based on this examination.

One of the main goals of this dissertation was to show that the works of Bosch and his colleagues attempted to reimagine the roots of Western civilization by locating its birthplace in the East, particularly in Anatolia, but that this approach was not uniform or monolithic, rather it varied from scholar to scholar and also evolved over the years. In the 1930s, Turkish historiography was preoccupied with challenging Western conceptions of Turks through racial categorizations that portrayed Turks as the progenitors of many different world civilizations, and thus equal or even superior to Westerners. In the 1940s, as relations between Turkey and the West improved, Turkish historiography shifted to a more humanist understanding of history, emphasizing cultural diffusion and the synthesis of different cultures in Turkish identity. In both approaches, reimagining the past and resituating the roots of cultures were prominent practices.

Through that examination, this thesis demonstrated that neither the content nor the discourse of the THT were completely unique to their time and place. The works pertaining to the THT were influenced by a myriad of sources and approaches found in the historiographies of the late Ottoman Empire and the early Republican Turkey and the social sciences and history writing of Europe in early 20th century. Thus, this study also demonstrated that the impact of the Turkish History thesis on German professors was much more limited than previously thought, and that the work of these professors should be considered in a multidimensional way, taking into account different influences.

The thesis further demonstrated that in late 20th century similar methods and

sources were used by other scholars to different ends. In order to demonstrate this point, this thesis juxtaposed Turkish historiography of the early Republican period with 20th century historical works that aimed to reimagine or recontextualize the ancient past. In this respect, the works of Martin Bernal and Manfred Korfmann were employed as suitable examples of these approaches.

This study also sought to reimagine the relationship between German émigré scholars and the Turkish government by demonstrating that the narrative of the THT was not -or could not be- imposed wholesale on émigré scholars by the Turkish government. On the contrary, in some cases, construction of this narrative was the result of the convergence of the methods, sources and interests of both the scholars tasked with working on the scholarly-political program and the interests of the Republic of Turkey. Thus, through that examination the thesis also presented the relationship between the Turkish government and the émigré scholars as a collaboration rather than an outright imposition.

In the articles presented in the Second Turkish History Congress(1937), anthropological and linguistic explanations of historical phenomena were supported by archeology and corroborated by a historical examination of myths and stories found in ancient written sources such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Ovid, and Livy. These explanations are used to support some of the key arguments of the Turkish History Thesis. For example, anthropological evidence, stone tools, human remains, etc., found in Anatolian archaeological sites dating back to the Stone Age are used to emphasize the antiquity of the cultures of this region. The persistence of these artifacts in various cultures of Anatolia is traced through the Bronze Age and Classical Antiquity, using linguistics, archaeology, especially numismatics in the case of Bosch, and ancient written sources to construct cultural connections and highlight continuities from Central Asia through Anatolia to Greece and Italy.

This thesis showed that Bosch's article similarly contains anthropological, archaeological and linguistic arguments. For example, he examines the racial characteristics of modern and ancient Anatolia, stating that modern people of Anatolia belong to the same racial group as those who lived in Neolithic times. Bosch also points out linguistic similarities between the Turkish and Hittite languages. However, since his main expertise is classical antiquity, his main points are about the transmission of political, social, and cultural elements from Anatolia to Rome. Bosch claims that after a certain point, the center of gravity of the Roman Empire shifted to Anatolia, and in time, Anatolian aristocratic families came to represent both political power and cultural elegance, going on to change the shape of the empire. Among the myriad influences of Anatolia on Roman culture, Bosch also refers to religion.

Bosch traces the cult of the *Mother Goddess* from Anatolia to Rome, noting that this religious transmission was one of the most important legacies of Anatolia in world history, as it managed to influence early Christianity through the institutions of Rome. This idea of Anatolian aristocratic families or Anatolian ancestry of Latin families plays an important role in his Roman textbook. Bosch refers to the founding myths of Rome and the ancestral political discourse used by Roman aristocratic families to support the connections he constructs between Anatolia and Rome. He traces Roman families' claims to divinity through Troy to Anatolian goddesses and heroic Trojans. Here, Bosch emphasizes this connection between Troy and Rome as it was emphasized by the Romans themselves. For the Romans, Troy was a mythical cultural link to the glorious heroes of the ancient past and, through them, a gateway to divinity, which is why it was also used as a political tool. For Bosch, on the other hand, this connection serves as another link in his narrative to underscore the depth of Anatolia's impact on world history.

Bosch continued to develop these ideas in his textbooks on Roman and Hellenistic history. Here, however, we can observe the change that took place in Turkish historiography in the 1940s. In these works, there is almost no mention of race; instead, arguments are now based on high and low culture. Bosch emphasizes the value of these concepts: Urbanized societies, with a central government, civic values *meaning the mutual fulfillment of obligations between the state and citizens and among citizens- a society based on the rule of law, and people united under a common identity, culture, and language, which, according to his interpretation, constitute a nation. According to Bosch, the possession of these characteristics elevates a culture to high culture. In his textbooks, the Romans, ancient Greeks, Carthaginians, Persians, and Egyptians - though he doesn't count Imperial Rome, the Persian Empire, and the Greek successor kingdoms as nations because they were multi-ethnic and multicultural - are counted as such. On the other hand, Bosch claims that peoples such as the Galatians and Illyrians were barbarians living in tribal societies, and thus part of a low culture. Although Bosch also portrays these people as having a unified culture, without acknowledging the differences between different tribes with their own practices, it seems that in Bosch's eyes their lack of a central government demotes them to being uncivilized. In this, Bosch echoes the views of the ancient Romans and Greeks, who depicted those who could not speak Latin or Greek as barbarians. The struggle between high and low culture is particularly prevalent in his Hellenistic textbooks.

Cultural transmission and synthesis came to the fore in the narrative, especially in textbooks of Hellenistic history. Bosch contends that during the Hellenistic period the Easternization of Greek culture was more significant than the Hellenization of

the Orient, and that in the historiography of the 1930s and 40s it became widely accepted that the Asian cultural elements were more prominent and enduring components of Hellenism. Bosch asserts that Eastern religious customs and practices dominated Greek religions, suggesting that the greatest influence of the East was on religion. This development continued through the unification of the diverse religions of many peoples during the early Roman Empire and, according to Bosch, is the most significant achievement of Hellenism in human history. Indeed, as Bosch notes, the most important aspect of Hellenism in Bosch's narrative is the rise and spread of Christianity. This is a recurring theme in his writings, and he refers to it in connection with the spread of Anatolian civilization throughout the world. In fact, he discovers clear connections between Christian and Anatolian religious customs, symbols, and practices. It is important to keep this in mind when interpreting his claim that Greek culture was more influenced by Eastern cultures than vice versa. His theory of the spread of Eastern cultures, especially those of Anatolia, can also be seen as a central claim of Roman and Hellenistic history textbooks. Bosch goes to great lengths to show the origins of these cultures, how they changed the Greek nations, and how the Greeks influenced the Romans. Bosch creates a genealogy of political, social, and cultural transmissions that links European civilization, even modernity, to prehistoric Eastern cultures, especially those of Anatolia. In making this connection, he places Eastern cultures, including Egypt, Persia, the Hittites, and the Sumerians, as the ancestors of several historically great cultures, such as the Etruscans, Romans, and ancient Greeks, while demonstrating the region's profound and enduring influence on the rest of the world.

In Georg Rohde's 1937 and 1940 articles - the 1940 article is an edited and expanded version of the 1937 article, and does not significantly alter the arguments or sources of the first - Rohde focuses only on the transmission of the *Mother Goddess* of Anatolia throughout the Mediterranean basin. He relies mainly on linguistic evidence, tracing the use of words related to *Mother Goddess* worship from western Anatolia to Greece, Sicily, southern France, and Italy. He interprets the many different goddesses and their worship rituals and practices of these regions as either adaptations or aspects of the single original Anatolian deity and her Anatolian cult. Rohde refers to ancient myths and stories to further support his claims. Rohde's biggest claim is that the practices of the Anatolian *Mother Goddess* and her cult evolved over time, blended with other religious traditions in Rome, and went on to influence Christianity. Rohde points to several important and lasting influences of the Anatolian cult on Christianity: The sacrificial death and resurrection of the *Mother Goddess*' son *Attis* is compared to the relationship of the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ, the belief in an eternal afterlife, and the central role of blood and sacrifice in many Christian

sects, which Rohde claims are artifacts of the Anatolian *Mother Goddess* cult. By demonstrating a myriad of intertwined cultural and religious connections throughout the Mediterranean basin in classical antiquity, the deepest of which is the direct link between Anatolian *Mother Goddess* worship and Christianity, Rohde asserts that Anatolia's religious ties to other religions were more extensive than previously thought in the 1930s.

Jacopi and Brandenstein interpret linguistic evidence found on stone inscriptions from tombs in Italy and the western Aegean. They claim that these languages are different dialects of Etruscan, with those in Anatolia being an older version. They support their findings with stories of Etruscan migrations from the Aegean to Italy found in Herodotus. They also support this argument by finding similarities between place names in and around Anatolia with words used for Etruscans in Greek, Egyptian, and Etruscan languages. Brandenstein goes further, claiming that both the findings of "modern anthropological science" and the grammatical connections he makes between Turkish and Etruscan languages suggest that the Etruscans were, if not ethnically Turkish, of Central Asian descent and lived similarly to the Turks, as evidenced mainly by their lifestyle and material culture. On the other hand, Jacopi, finding similarities between Etruscan and Hittite languages, claims that the Etruscans were of Anatolian origin. Thus, both Jacopi and Brandenstein find different ways to connect Italy with Anatolia and even Central Asia.

In his 1987 book Black Athena, Martin Bernal challenged the Western-centered historiography of the 19th and early 20th centuries, which emphasized the uniqueness of ancient Greek culture and race in the Eastern Mediterranean, by resituating the roots of ancient Greece in Afro-Asian cultures. Bernal relied heavily on anthropological and archaeological evidence, corroborating these findings with myths and ancient written sources. However, he was also widely criticized for his methodology and handling of his sources, as he tended to shape the sources to suit his claims, while relying too heavily on ancient myths and written accounts.

In his archaeological work in the ruins of Troy from the 1980s to the 2000s, Manfred Korfmann approached and examined the archaeological evidence and ancient context of the region itself, rather than using Homer's stories as his main starting point. In doing so, he was able to recontextualize the city of Troy as primarily part of Bronze Age Anatolian culture, and most likely part of the Hittite Empire. In doing so, Korfmann reinstated the roots of a culture that Western historiography had long assumed to be part of primarily ancient Greek culture.

By examining the scholarly works that form the focus of this study, we can contextualize the relationship between German émigré scholars and the Turkish state. In

the case of Clemens Bosch, we observe not only a direct dictation of content and discourse by the Turkish state, but also an alignment of the scholar's academic interests with the scholarly-political program of the Republic of Turkey. During his time in Germany, Bosch had already envisaged a study of the Anatolian city-states during the Roman imperial period, in which the political, social and cultural significance of these cities for the empire, and their relative political and economic independence within the Roman state structures, would be underlined by an exploration of numismatic evidence supported by ancient written sources. Bosch's scholarly output focusing on Anatolia during his time in Germany, and his friend and colleague's testimony to Bosch's scholarly interests and desire to continue this planned work, confirm that Bosch's interests were similar to the historical narratives being constructed in Turkey at the time. Here, we must also consider the examples given by Ersoy Taşdemirci and Emre Dölen of the care and attention given by the Turkish government to historical issues relevant to the Turkish History Thesis. According to these examples, even though there were no criteria for the recruitment of émigré scholars, those scholars who were to be involved in the construction of the historical narrative had to be in agreement and alignment with the History Thesis. In the case of the German Hittite scholar Professor Emile Forrer, despite his qualifications, enthusiasm and willingness to establish a Hittite Institute in Turkey, he was apparently not employed by the Turkish government, most probably because of his reluctance to integrate his work into the guidelines of the THT. From this point of view, if we consider that during his stay in Turkey, Bosch was closely involved with one of the main themes of the THT, namely highlighting the socio-political and cultural importance of Anatolia in world history, we have to assume that Bosch accepted this theory to some extent. As mentioned above, the fact that his earlier scholarly work was closely related to the THT supports this idea. On the other hand, even if Bosch did not accept these theories, for whatever reason, he could have been employed for his scholarly skills, especially his expertise in numismatics, but would not have been given any scholarly tasks relating to the THT. At this point, we cannot say that Bosch's and the Turkish government's perspectives and goals were fully aligned. However, the fact that Bosch was able to pursue projects close to those he had previously envisaged makes it difficult to say that the entire historical narrative was simply imposed on him.

There are, however, a few questions that arise. Firstly, if Bosch's and the Republic of Turkey's scholarly interests coincided, why was Bosch unable to produce the aforementioned comprehensive project? Secondly, what was the significance of the latitude given to scholars like Bosch by the Turkish state in carrying out their work?

Oğuz and Nil Tekin don't offer an answer for why Bosch's grand project on ancient

Anatolian regions and city-states never came to fruition. Arif Mansel points to the Bosch's forced departure from Germany as the main culprit. However, it is interesting to note that although Bosch immigrated to Turkey, where many of the primary sources for his envisioned work existed, and he also brought with him his copies of the coins he had collected from all over Europe, he still couldn't produce any parts of this great work as he intended. From the perspective of Republic of Turkey, Bosch's work would also have been valuable and in line with the goals of both the Turkish History Thesis and 1940s humanist historiography, both of which endeavored to create historical works that underlined significance of Anatolia in world history, which Bosch's planned compilation would certainly achieve. We can see some efforts to produce this work. The Turkish government gave him permission to travel to other museums in various cities to survey their collections and collect the copies of coinage and medallions upon his request and he was able to travel to several of them. Through his work at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul University and his visits to museums throughout Anatolia, he was also able to produce several articles, monographs and some catalogues of coins and medallions which could have formed the basis of this larger work. It should be noted that he was only able to publish the coin catalogue, which he had been commissioned to produce while at the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, 12 years after he had left that institution. We can assume that his teaching and scholarly duties, together with his continued work on the catalogues, must have taken up all his time. We must also bear in mind that the onset of his illness in the early 1950s slowed down his work considerably. Apart from the personal reasons of Bosch's own inability to complete his work, there may have been other factors at play. It's possible that, similar to the situation faced by Erich Auerbach when writing *Mimesis*, there was a lack of secondary sources on the subject in the Istanbul libraries to which Bosch could have referred; there may have been a lack of experts and staff to help Bosch with his cataloguing work, and this lack of experts may also have forced his work in the Archaeological Museum collection to continue for longer than he would have liked. This line of questioning would be fruitful in uncovering the reasons why Bosch couldn't continue this work during his time in Turkey. To see whether the obstacles were institutional or due to a lack of time and effort on the part of a person faced with a monumental task.

This thesis demonstrates that there is a certain degree of singularization of discursive methods and content in the creation of historical narratives in Turkey during the 1930s and 40s. This could be understood from the perspective of an effort to follow the guidelines of a scholarly-political program that sought to construct a historical paradigm with a common scholarly language. However, this approach does not seem wholly monolithic and rigid in its approach in terms of both content and discourse,

as these could vary according to the professional interests of, sources and methods of the scholar doing the work. There may be several reasons for the Turkish state's attitude towards the scholarly production of historical narratives. One of them may be that the government did not have sufficiently powerful tools to control the scholars who were engaged in scholarly production. We have seen evidence of this in the University Reform itself, where the Turkish government has not always been able to force scholars to fulfill the requirements of their contracts. This is corroborated by the fact that many scholars, despite their obligations, did not learn Turkish, did not teach classes and publish in Turkish, and preferred to train their own assistants, whom they brought with them rather than work with Turkish students. A similar situation could have occurred in the production of historical narrative. In order to prevent this from happening in the production of the Turkish History Thesis which, as we have already mentioned, was a very sensitive issue for the Republic, those who would work on the new understanding of history in Turkey were required to accept the THT. But the fact that this condition was left to mutual agreement and acceptance, at least in the case of Professor Emile Forrer, perhaps suggests that even this condition could not be enforced by Turkey, and that Turkish officials, aware of this, made the acceptance of the THT a matter of desire on the part of the scholar. In this way, those tasked with this scholarly work would already be in agreement, at least in part, with the discourse and content of the THT. Thus, an alignment of scholarly interests would be beneficial for the production of this historical narrative. This may also have been due to the lack of sufficient number of qualified Turkish scholars to continue the work. The Cadres of *Darülfünun* had recently been purged, although there were still many scholars not all of whom were fully in line with the THT. Fuat Köprülü, for example, saw the need for a national historical narrative and advocated its construction, but he criticized the THT's use of methodology and sources of and distanced himself from this program (See 1.3.2). Nevertheless, he remained an important scholar on the academic scene in Turkey in the 1930s and 40s.

From this point of view, the Turkish government's acceptance of foreign scholars and its granting of a certain degree of flexibility to them can also be seen as a result of the lack of academics in Turkey who would be willing to use the THT to enforce the state's goals. On the other hand, there is also the possibility that the Turkish government had no such desire to impose its will in this way by dictating scholarly content and discourse. We see this in the case of Bosch and also in the case of Erich Auerbach. Both of these émigré scholars were able to continue their previous work in Turkey. In the case of Bosch, we see that he was not able to achieve the level of effort he had envisaged in Germany, but he continued to produce works along the same

lines as he had begun in Germany. Auerbach's situation was somewhat different. While fulfilling his duty to the Turkish government, he continued to work on his own project, and although he found the academic resources offered by the country to be incomplete (see 1.1), he managed to produce his magnum opus, *Mimesis*, which, although it contained no references to modern Turkey, could not have been the same without the contribution of the cultural atmosphere of Turkey. These two examples may also show that the relationship between the Turkish government and the emigrating scholars was not entirely one-sided.

In order to understand the context of this situation and to understand the contributions or detriments of scholars to Turkey, it is necessary to look at the work of individual scholars and historicize them. At the same time, the contents and discourses they produced should not be understood in a vacuum and should be compared with the contents, methods, sources and discourses of works written before, during and after them on the same or similar topics. For this reason, studies on Republic of Turkey could benefit from detailed and analytical works on scholarly works of German émigré scholars and other foreign academic who were in Turkey during 1930s and 40s. Thus, this thesis aims to contribute to the literature that attempts to historicize the work of German émigré scholars in Turkey in order to reimagine early Republican era from a more nuanced perspective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bosch, Clemens. *Das Anatolische in der Geshichte.* II. Türkischer Geschichtkongress. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1937.

Bosch, Clemens. *Roma Tarihinin Ana Hatları; I. Kısım Cumhuriyet.* Translated by Sabahat Atlan. Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı. İstanbul: Rıza Koşkun Matbaası. 1940.

Bosch, Clemens. *Tarihte Anadolu Mahsusatı.* Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Neşriyatı. İstanbul, Rıza Koşkun Matbaası. 1937.

Bosch, Clemens. *Helenizm Tarihinin Anahatları; I. Kısım, Büyük İskender İmparatorluğu.* Translated by Afif Erzen. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları. 1942.

Bosch, Clemens. *Helenizm Anahatları; II. Kısım, Roma İmparatorluğuna Katıldıkları Tarihe Kadar Helenizm Devletleri.* Translated by Sabahat Atlan. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları. 1943.

Brandenstein, Wilhelm. "Etrüsk Meselesinin Şimdiki Durumu". In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20 - 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları - Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 211-219. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010.

Brandenstein, Wilhelm. "Limni'de bulunan kitabe – Etrüsklerin Anadoludan neşet ettiklerine dair dil bakımından en ehemmiyetli delil". *In İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20 - 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları - Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 1044-1051. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010.

Hirsch, E. Ernst. *Hatıralarım – Kayzer Dönemi, Weimar Cumhuriyeti, Atatürk Ülkesi.* Translated by Fatma Suphi. Ankara: TÜBİTAK Popüler Bilim Kitapları, 1997.

Jacopi, Giulio. "Etrüsk meselesi ve bunun şarktaki Vaziyeti". In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20 - 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları - Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 1051-1061. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010.

Malche, Albert. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hakkında Rapor.* İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939.

Mansel, Arif Müfid. "Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)". *Belleten XX*, 1956, 295-303.

Möckelmann, Reiner. *İkinci Vatan Türkiye: Ernst Reuter'in Ankara Yıllar.* Translated by Ahmet Arpad. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. 2020.

Neumark, Fritz. *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar: Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları, 1933-1953.* Translated by Şefik Alp Bahadır. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Maliye Enstitüsü, 1982.

Nissen Rudolf. *Aydınlık Sayfalar Karanlık Sayfalar; Bir Cerrahın Anıları*. İstanbul: Epsilon Yayıncılık, 2023.

Rohde, Georg. *Büyük Ana; Magna Mater*. Ankara, Ankara Halkevi Neşriyatı Büyük Boy No. 23, Müze ve Sergi Şubesi. İstanbul, Kenan Basımevi ve Klişe Fabrikası, 1940.

Rohde, Georg. "Roma ve Anadolu Ana İlâhesi". In *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi İstanbul: 20 - 25 Eylül 1937 (Kongrenin Çalışmaları - Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler)*, 228-237. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2010.

Schwartz, Philipp. *Kader Birliği: 1933 Sonrası Türkiye'ye Göç Eden Alman Bilim Adamları*. Translated by Nagehan Alçı. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 2003.

Tarih-I: Tarihtenevelki Zamanlar ve Eski Zamanlar. İstanbul: İstanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1931.

Secondary Sources

Adak, Sevgi, Lamprou, Alexandros, eds. *Tek Parti Dönemini Yeniden Düşünmek*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2022.

Altunbaş, Ayşe. "Almanya'dan Nasyonal Sosyalizm Döneminde (1933-1945) Türkiye'ye Gelen Yahudiler." Master's Thesis, İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Tarih Ana Bilim Dalı. 2020.

Aydın, Suavi. "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative". In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*. edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızılyürek and Umut Özkırımlı, 36-46. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Aytürk, İlker, and Berk Esen, complier. *Post-Post-Kemalizm: Türkiye Çalışmalarında Yeni Arayışlar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 3rd. Edition 2023.

Bahar, I. İzzet. "German or Jewish, Humanity or Raison d'Etat: The German Scholars in Turkey, 1933–1952". *Shofar*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Fall 2010), pp. 48-72. 2010.

Beard, Mary. *SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome*. London: Profile Books, 2015.

Berlinerblau, Jacques. *Heresy in the University: The Black Athena Controversy and the Responsibilities of American Intellectuals*. N.J., New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1999.

Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985, v.1*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003.

Birand, Hikmet. *Türk Yüksek Öğretiminde Çalışan Alman Bilginlerinin Hizmeti Hakkında*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1960

Copeaux, Etienne. *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993); Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine.* Translated by Ali Berktay. Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları; 59. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998.

Dölen, Emre. *İstanbul Darülfünunu'nda Alman Müderrisler (1915-1918).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013.

Dölen, Emre. *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-1: Osmanlı Döneminde Darülfünun (1863-1922).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010.

Dölen, Emre. *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-2: Cumhuriyet Döneminde Osmanlı Darülfünun'u (1922-1933).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları, 2010.

Dölen, Emre. *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-3 Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye Geçiş: Tasfiye ve Yeni Kadrolar.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010.

Dölen, Emre. *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-4: İstanbul Üniversitesi (1933-1946).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010.

Dölen, Emre. *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi-5: Özerk Üniversite Dönemi (1946-1981).* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2010.

Ersanlı, Büşra. *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu, 1929-1937.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Girgin, Mehmet. "1933 Üniversite Reformu Sonrası Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman Bilim İnsanlarının Türk Eğitim Sistemine Katkıları." Master's Thesis, Erzincan Binali Yıldırım Üniversitesi, 2021.

Goldberg, Sander M. *Epic in Republican Rome.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Goldsworthy, Adrian. *Caesar; Life of a Colossus.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006.

Göksoy, Ertuğrul. "Rudolf Nissen: Cerrahpaşa Cerrahi Kliniği'ndeki Çalışmaları ve Türk Cerrahisine Katkıları". Ulusal Cerrahi Dergisi, 22 (2), 85-91 (2006).

Grothusen, Klaus-Detlev. "1933 Yılından Sonra Alman Bilim Adamlarının Türkiye'ye Göçü." *Belleten* 45, no. (1981): 537-550.

Gruen, Erich S. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *Atatürk; An Intellectual Biography.* Princeton University Press, 2011.

İhsanoglu, Ekmeleddin. *The House of Sciences:The First Modern University in the Muslim World .* New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Kadıoğlu-İshakoğlu, Sevtap. "1933 Üniversite Reformu Hakk›nda Bir Bibliyografya Denemesi".*Türkiye Araştırrmaları Literatür Dergisi*, Cilt 2, Say 4, 2004, 471-491. 2004.

Kobal, Yunus. "Üniversitelerimizin Gelişimi ve Alman Bilim Adamlarının Katkıları," Master's Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 1994.

Koçak, Cemil. *Türk - Alman İlişkileri (1923-1939); İki Dünya Savaşı Arasındaki Dönemde Siyasal, Kültürel, Askeri ve Ekonomik İlişkiler.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. 2013.

Koltz, Alfred. *Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla.* Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Abteilung Jahrgang 1942, Heft 5. Vorgelegt von Herrn A. Rehmn in der Sitzung vom 14. Februar 1942. München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1942.

Konuk, Kader. *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey.* California: Stanford University Press. 2010.

Küçükler, Osman Zahit. "Osmanlı Devletinde Eğitimde Modernleşme ve Encümen-i Daniş." PhD, Ankara University, 2016.

Latacz, Joachim. *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery.* Translated by Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Lloyd-Morgan, Glenys. "Nemesis and Bellona: A Preliminary Study of Two Neglected Goddesses." In *Concept of Goddess*, E-Book Edition, edited by Sandra Billington and Miranda Green, 120-128. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2002.

Mueller, Hans-Friedrich. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus.* New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2002.

Namal, Arın. "Ord. Prof. Dr. Phillip Schwartz'ın (1894-1977) İstanbul Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi'nde patoloji eğitimine katkıları", *Türk Patoloji Dergisi*, 19(1-2), 1-6(2003).

Ortaylı, İlber. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Alman Nüfuzu.* İstanbul: Kronik Kitap, 2020.

Öztürk, İbrahim."Atatürk Döneminde Alman Bilim Adamlarının Üniversitelerimizde İstidhamı Türk Bilim ve Kültür Hayatı Üzerindeki Etkileri." PhD Thesis, Niğde Üniversitesi, 2002.

Parla, Taha. *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2020.

Reisman, Arnold. *Turkey's Modernization; Refugees from Nazism and Atatürk's Vision.* Washington, DC, New Academia Publishing, 2006.

Reisman, Arnold. *Refugees and Reforms; Turkey's Journey.* Charleston, SC: BookSurge Publishing, 2009.

Rose, H. J. *Handbook of Latin Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine.* First Published in 1936, Reprinted with a new bibliography by E. Courtney in 1966. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Sönmez, Erdem. "A Past to Be Forgotten? Writing Ottoman History in Early Republican *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 48, no. 4* (August 8, 2021): 753–69. 2021.

Sönmez, Erdem. "Clio Between Revolution and Collapse: The Making of the Historical Discipline in the Late Ottoman Empire". *Modern Intellectual History* (2022), 1–22. doi:10.1017/S1479244322000439. 2022.

Sönmez, Erdem. "Galat-ı Meşhuru Sorgularken." *Modus Operandi*, Sayı 1 (Mart 2015): 49-80. 2015.

Taşdemirci, Ersoy. "Atatürk önderliğinde yapılan 1933 Üniversite Reformunda yabancı bilim adamlarının rolü." *Uluslararası İkinci Atatürk Sempozyumu* (9-11 Eylül 1991; Ankara) Bildirileri, Cilt II, Ankara 1996, s.787-790.

Taşdemirci, Ersoy. *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformu'nda Yabancı Bilim Adamları*. Ankara, 1992.

Tekin, Oğuz, Nil Türker Tekin. *Mülteci Bir Akademisyenin Biyografisi; Clemens Emin Bosch (1899-1955)*. Antalya: Suna – İnan Kıraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü, 2007.

Toprak, Zafer. *Bugünün Bilgileriyle Kemal'in Türkiye'si - La Turquie Kamâliste*, İstanbul: Boyut Yayıncılık, 2012.

Toprak, Zafer. *Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*. 3rd Edition, August 2023. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. Bilim Tarihi Dizisi, 2023.

Toprak, Zafer. *Darwin'den Dersim'e Cumhuriyet ve Antropoloji*. İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2012.

Üstel, Füsun. *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020.

van der Horst, Pieter Willem. *Hellenism, Judaism, Christianity: Essays on Their Interaction*. Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1998.

Widmann, Horst. *Atatürk Üniversite Reformu*. of İstanbul Üniversitesi Cerrahpaşa Tıp Fakültesi. Translated by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt. Atatürk'ün Yüzüncü Doğum Yılını Kutlama Yayınları Özel Seri; 3. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1981.

Widmann, Horst. *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*.Translated by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları, 2000.

Digital Sources

German History in Documents and Images. "Volume 7. Nazi Germany, 1933-1945. *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (April 7, 1933)."* https://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1520. Accessed: 15.02.2024.

whowaswho-indology. "Persons of Indian Studies by Prof. Dr. Klaus Karttunen. BRANDENSTEIN, Wilhelm." Accessed, February 15 2024. https://whowaswho-indology.info/936/brandenstein-wilhelm