

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TURKISH PAN-TURKISM AND HUNGARIAN
PAN-TURANISM: IDEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS AND HISTORICAL DIVERGENCE

AUTHORS: Attila Gökhan Dayıoğlu

PAGES: 55-74

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/4141342>

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TURKISH PAN-TURKISM AND HUNGARIAN PAN-TURANISM: IDEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS AND HISTORICAL DIVERGENCE

Abstract: The historical interactions between Hungarians and Turks, commencing in the 14th century and continuing until the end of the 17th century under Ottoman rule, established a foundation for renewed affinities during the nation-building processes of the 19th century. Theoretical and practical distinctions between Turkish Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Pan-Turanism elucidate the nature of the relationship between these two movements. Analysing the Pan-Turanism movement within the broader context of evolving nationalist ideologies in both countries reveals its inherent improbability of realization. While both movements utilized the shared cultural concept of Turanism to foster national solidarity, their differing objectives and contexts ultimately limited their long-term compatibility and effectiveness. This study aims to comprehensively understand the historical development, ideological foundations, and eventual divergence of these nationalist movements. By examining the influence of Turanism on Turkish and Hungarian nationalism, this research sheds light on the complex interplay between shared cultural concepts and distinct national contexts, highlighting the adaptive nature of nationalism in response to varying historical and political landscapes.

Keywords: Nationalism, Hungarian Nationalism, Turkish Nationalism, Pan-Turkism, Pan-Turanism.

Türk Pan-Türkizmi ve Macar Pan-Turancılığının Karşılaştırmalı Analizi: İdeolojik Temeller ve Tarihsel Ayrışma

Öz: Macarlar ve Türkler arasında 14. yüzyılda başlayan ve Osmanlı yönetimi altında 17. yüzyılın sonuna kadar devam eden tarihsel etkileşimler, 19. yüzyılın ulus inşa süreçleri sırasında yenilenen yakınlıklar için bir temel oluşturmuştur. Türk Pan-Türkizmi ile Macar Pan-Turanizmi arasındaki teorik ve pratik ayrımlar, bu iki hareket arasındaki ilişkinin doğasını aydınlatmaktadır. Pan-Turanizm hareketini her iki ülkede de gelişen milliyetçi ideolojilerin daha geniş bağlamı içinde analiz etmek, bu hareketin doğası gereği gerçekleşme ihtimalinin olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır. Her iki hareket de ulusal dayanışmayı teşvik etmek için ortak kültürel Turancılık kavramını kullanmış olsa da farklı hedefleri ve bağlamları nihayetinde uzun vadeli uyumluluklarını ve etkinliklerini sınırlamıştır. Bu çalışma, bu milliyetçi hareketlerin tarihsel gelişimini, ideolojik temellerini ve nihai ayrışmalarını kapsamlı bir şekilde anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Turancılığın Türk ve Macar milliyetçiliği üzerindeki etkisini inceleyen bu araştırma, ortak kültürel kavramlar ile farklı ulusal bağlamlar arasındaki karmaşık etkileşime ışık tutmakta ve milliyetçiliğin değişen tarihsel ve siyasi manzaralara yanıt olarak uyarlanabilir doğasını vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Milliyetçilik, Macar Milliyetçiliği, Türk Milliyetçiliği, Pan-Türkizm, Pan-Turanizm.



TÜRK LÜK BİLİMİ ARAŞTIRMALARI
JOURNAL OF TURKOLOGY RESEARCH
56. SAYI / VOLUME
2024-GÜZ / AUTUMN

Sorumlu Yazar
Corresponding Author

Dr. Attila Gökhan DAYIOĞLU

a.gokhan@hotmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7197-1670

Gönderim Tarihi
Received
13.08.2024

Kabul Tarihi
Accepted
05.11.2024

Atf
Citation
Dayıoğlu, Attila Gökhan. "Comparative Analysis Of Turkish Pan-Turkism And Hungarian Pan-Turanism: Ideological Foundations And Historical Divergence." *Türk Lük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, no. 56, 2024, ss. 55-74.

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Introduction

The concept of Turanism has significantly shaped the nationalist ideologies of Turkey and Hungary, rooted in the shared cultural and historical notion of 'Turan'. This study examines the emergence and impact of Turanism on the nationalist movements in both countries, contextualizing it within the broader framework of early nationalism as a political movement.

Nationalism can be conceptualized through three primary theoretical frameworks, each with distinct objectives. The primordialist or ethnic view, articulated by Anthony Smith, posits that the sense of nationhood is an ancient and inherent feeling, metaphorically developed through cultural and linguistic bonds within large familial groups (Smith; Calhoun; Watson). The modernist or instrumentalist perspective, advanced by scholars like Ernest Gellner, Karl Deutsch, and Eric Hobsbawm, views nationalism as a product of modernity and industrial society (Gellner; Deutsch; Hobsbawm). The third perspective, ethno-symbolism, acknowledges the modern origins of national identities but emphasises their cultural and historical roots, recognising the ethnic and historical continuities within nations (Armstrong).

These theoretical frameworks reflect the dichotomy between Western European nationalism and Central-Eastern European nationalism. Western European nationalism, driven by a developed middle class, is characterized as rational, political, liberal, civic, territorial, and progressive. It developed through a bottom-up socio-political process influenced by Enlightenment ideas, linking the nation to the state and emerging from the transition from feudal societies to capitalist nation-states. Conversely, Central-Eastern European nationalism, emerging in regions with a weaker middle class, is marked by romantic, cultural, historical, authoritarian, ethnic, genealogical, and reactionary traits (Minogue; Kohn; Smith). This form of nationalism was deeply connected to historical myths and future aspirations, influenced by intellectuals who sought to establish nation-states modelled after Western Europe.

Central and Eastern Europe, positioned between the Habsburg Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Russian Tsardom, and later the German Empire, became the epicentre of nationalist conflicts. These conflicts can be analysed through three intertwined processes. The first process involved the nationalism of peoples under imperial rule and the official nationalism of multi-ethnic empires, which often relied on assimilation policies (Watson). The second process encompassed the empires' struggles for regional dominance and their attempts to exploit ethnic kin within rival empires. The third process involved the efforts of dependent peoples to establish independent states, often competing with one another. These dynamics facilitated the rise of pan-nationalism, which became a predominant force in Central and Eastern Europe.

This study aims to analyse the historical development, ideological foundations, and eventual divergence of these nationalist movements, providing a

comprehensive understanding of their impact on the national identities of Turkey and Hungary. By exploring Turanism's influence on these nationalist ideologies, this study will shed light on the complex interplay between shared cultural concepts and distinct national contexts, highlighting the adaptive nature of nationalism in response to varying historical and political landscapes.

A Comprehensive Analysis of Turanism and Its Historical, Cultural, and Political Significance

Understanding the concept of Turan, which became integrated into the pan-nationalism movement in the 17th century but had acquired significance much earlier, is crucial for comprehending Hungarian Turanism and Turkish Pan-Turkism. The concept of Turan first appears in the works of Iranian and Arab scholars in the 6th century, where it signifies family or homeland with the suffix "-an". It is defined as the name given by the Iranians to the region north-east of Iran. Additionally, Turan is linked to the word Tura, describing a migrant-hostile tribe in the Iranian legend of the Avesta. By the 6th century, Turan had come to mean "the geography inhabited and ruled by Turks", popularized through the Persian poet Firdavsi-i Rumi's epic "*Shahnameh*". Between the ninth and thirteenth centuries, it was used in the Arab world to refer to "Turkish country" or "Turkistan" (Şeşen), and during the Timur period, it specifically meant "the country of the Turks".

Ibn Arabshah, in his works, defined Turan as the region encompassing Samarkand, Merginän, Khojend, Termez, Bukhara, and Khwarezm. The famous Ottoman poet of the 15th century, Firdavsi-i Rumi, used the term in his work "*Süleymanname*" to describe all the Turkish lands to the east and north of Iran. Although there is no precise date for the term's use in the Ottoman Empire, it is evident from 1786 onwards. For instance, the term "Turanian sovereign" was used for the ruler of Bukhara in correspondence with the Ottoman Empire, proposing joint action against Russia (Levi). Furthermore, a letter from the Bukhara ruler to the Ottoman sultan's deputy suggested appointing a capable and religiously strong prince as the sultan of Turan, marking the first expression of Pan-Turkist aspirations.

The term Turan was introduced to Europe in 1697 by d'Herbelot in his work "*Bibliothèque Orientale*", where it described communities of Turkish origin and the lands east and north of the Oxus River. In 1839, Ferenc Pulszky linked the origins of Hungarians to Asia and used the term to signify "Great Turkish Homeland" (Minorsky). By the 19th century, the term retained its geographical meaning, acquired linguistic and ethnic significance, and gained recognition in Europe. Christian Charles Josias von Bunsen and Max Müller used the term Turan to describe non-Aryan and non-Semitic languages, including Finno-Ugric and Altaic languages. François Lenormant used it to describe the language of the Sumerians, while Julius Oppert applied it to the

language of the Medes. Following Bunsen, who formalized Turan as an adjective for a category of people, the French orientalist Edgard Blochet, in “*Le nom des Turks dans L'Avesta*”, explicitly mentioned the unity of origin between Turk and Tura, indicating that the words meant “strength, might, brave, valiant” since at least the 6th century (Minorsky). Wilhelm Barthold and Richard Frye noted that the term was used in Sassanid literature to describe local groups in southeastern Iran (Levi). Max Müller's concept of “Turanian languages” had a significant influence on Hungarian Turanism. European scholars' definitions characterized Turan as a linguistic and cultural term used to describe non-Semitic and non-Aryan languages, eventually adopting a racial distinction.

Additionally, the concept of Turan evolved to have significant political implications in both Turkish and Hungarian contexts. In Turkey, Pan-Turkism emerged as a movement advocating for the unification of all Turkic peoples under one political entity, driven by a sense of shared heritage and destiny. This movement gained momentum in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly during the decline of the Ottoman Empire, as intellectuals and politicians sought to redefine national identity and solidarity. Ziya Gökalp, a prominent Turkish sociologist and political activist, was instrumental in shaping Pan-Turkist thought. He envisioned a cultural and political union of Turkic peoples, which he articulated in his seminal work *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (*Principles of Turkism*).

In Hungary, Pan-Turanism developed with a similar objective but within a different historical and cultural framework. Hungarian Turanists aimed to connect Hungary's national identity with a broader Eurasian heritage, emphasizing historical ties to Central Asia and advocating for cultural and political solidarity with other Turanian peoples. This ideology found expression in various cultural and political movements, influencing Hungary's national discourse and identity. Notable figures such as Ármin Vámbéry, a Hungarian orientalist and traveller, contributed significantly to Turanist thought by highlighting the historical and linguistic connections between Hungarians and Central Asian peoples (Vámbéry).

The Formation and Development of Hungarian Nationalism: Historical and Socio-Political Transformations

The formation and development of Hungarian nationalism are deeply rooted in the country's historical trajectory and socio-political transformations. The Hungarians, who migrated to their present lands in 896 A.D., became an integral part of Christian Europe when King István “Stephen” converted to Christianity in 1000 A.D. and received the crown from the Pope. This conversion marked a pivotal moment in Hungarian history, creating a clear distinction between pre-Christian and post-Christian periods. The adoption of

Christianity and the integration of European institutions and traditions significantly shaped Hungarian culture. Throughout the Middle Ages, the Hungarians were perceived by Catholic Christians and Christian Europe as the “guardians of Christianity” against the Ottoman Empire, representing the foremost European barrier to the nomadic tribes from the east. However, their defeat at the Battle of Mohács in 1526, 630 years after the ‘Honfoglalás’ (the conquest of the homeland), inflicted severe trauma on the Hungarian psyche.

Following the Battle of Mohács, Hungarian territories were divided: a huge portion came under Ottoman rule, while a smaller segment fell under Habsburg control. By 1541, when the Ottomans captured Buda, Hungary was divided into three regions: Ottoman rule, Habsburg rule, and the semi-independent Principality of Transylvania. Despite these political divisions, the Reformation had a profound impact on Hungary, particularly through the spread of Calvinism in Transylvania. This era witnessed a cultural and linguistic revival, spearheaded by figures such as Gáspár Heltai, Gáspár Károlyi, and Albert Szenczi Molnár, who produced significant literary works in Hungarian. The education of Hungarian Protestant students in Western European universities further enriched the Hungarian language and culture. However, the Counter-Reformation and the policies of Emperor Leopold I significantly stifled the Hungarian Protestant movement.

The Treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718) marked the end of Ottoman dominance in Hungary, bringing the region under Habsburg control. The anti-Habsburg sentiment that grew among Hungarians due to repressive Habsburg policies ignited uprisings led by Imre Thököly in 1673 and later by Ferenc Rákóczi II in 1703. Although these rebellions failed, they were crucial in awakening Hungarian national consciousness. Rákóczi’s uprising is recognized as the beginning of the Hungarian national revival (1711-1825) (Cartledge). The Hungarian Enlightenment, led by figures such as György Bessenyei, emphasized modernization through ethno-linguistic nationalism. Efforts to renew and perfect the Hungarian language, particularly through the establishment of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences by Count István Széchenyi, were pivotal. This movement was further bolstered by Joseph II’s enlightened absolutism and centralization efforts, which included promoting ‘pure’ Hungarian words to replace foreign terms. The resistance to Germanization, notably the imposition of German as the administrative language, led by Ferenc Kazinczy, was a significant victory for Hungarian cultural identity. The movement garnered support from Enlightenment thinkers and romantic nationalists, including Ferenc Kölcsey.

The oppressive experiences under the Austro-Hungarian Empire prompted Hungarians to seek solace in their ancient history. This search for identity laid the groundwork for Hungarian nationalism, with the Hungarian language emerging as a core component. The mid-19th century proverb “a

nyelveben él a nemzet” (“a nation lives in its language”) encapsulates this sentiment. From this period onwards, proficiency in Hungarian and recognizing native speakers of Hungarian as part of the Hungarian nation became prerequisites for national and cultural identity. This era also saw a renewed focus on pre-Christian Hungarian history, inspired by Johann Gottfried Herder’s emphasis on history and folk literature, which directed Hungarian intellectuals towards national values.

The American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 challenged the European Harmony of 1815 and set the stage for the Hungarian Revolution of 1848-1849. This period was characterized by liberal, rationalist, individualist, and libertarian ideals, which laid the groundwork for Hungarian nationalism (Waterbury). However, a huge part of Hungarian population, predominantly peasant, remained loyal to Austria. The initial phase of the Hungarian national movement, driven by secular and enlightened elites (Önen 31-32) like Kazinczy, focused on mobilizing the Hungarian populace through the promotion of the Hungarian language and culture.

The liberal and nationalist movement, which embraced the libertarian ideals of the French Revolution, worked towards the politicization of Hungarian ethnicity under leaders like Lajos Kossuth. A significant milestone was the adoption of Hungarian as the official language in 1843-1844 (Molnar). The April Laws and the national resistance movement initiated on March 15th, 1848 brought Hungary closer to its independence goals. However, the revolution, which briefly controlled Hungarian territories, was ultimately quashed by Austria with Russian support. The alignment of Slavic minorities with Austria and the Russian Empire’s support reinforced the perception of a Slavic threat, contributing to a sense of isolation and insecurity among Hungarians. These feelings played a crucial role in shaping the ethno-cultural orientation of Hungarian nationalism.

The Habsburg Empire’s diminishing influence following its losses to Prussia prompted internal reforms, leading to the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1867. This dual monarchy granted Hungary significant autonomy, though not equal to Austria (Watson). The continued presence and cultural demands of Slavic minorities were met with policies of assimilation. This period saw a resurgence of interest in Hungarian history, particularly pre-Christian heritage. Turkological studies gained popularity, led by figures like Sándor Körösi Csoma and Ármin Vámbéry, fostering pro-Turkish and pro-Ottoman sentiments due to shared threats from Russia and Slavic entities (Kushner).

Following the establishment of the dual monarchy, Hungary experienced economic growth under the influence of German and Jewish populations (Deak). Changes in population distribution and relations with minority groups, along with the persistence of aristocratic and property-based land ownership

structures, contributed to the rise of a new form of nationalism. The Habsburgs' sympathies towards Slavic elements and the close relations between Russia and Slavic minorities heightened Hungarian perceptions of external threats. This environment facilitated the emergence of Turanism, an ideology supported by young aristocrats, middle-class nobles, and intellectuals. Turanism, emphasizing Hungary's historical legacy, security in Europe, and resistance to socio-political liberalization, became a significant form of Hungarian nationalism in the early 20th century.

The Formation and Development of Hungarian Turanism in the Context of Hungarian Nationalism

The concept of Turan gained prominence in Hungary during the latter half of the 19th century, influenced by the increasing geopolitical focus on Central Asia. Grounded in the ethno-cultural affinities among Central Asian peoples, Turanism sought to create political unity among all Turanian tribes. This ideology significantly shaped Hungarian nationalism, drawing on historical geography and emphasizing race, language, and culture. Hungarian Turanism, as a manifestation of pan-nationalist thought, underscored lineage and language, resonating with Hungarian aspirations for identity and liberation from historical subjugation.

Hungarian historical and cultural tradition places significant emphasis on 'östörténet' (ancient history) and 'honfoglalás' (homeland conquest), marking 896 A.D. as a pivotal milestone in Hungarian identity. This period denotes the conquest of the Carpathian Basin by the Hungarian tribes, which laid the foundation for the Hungarian state. The subsequent Christianization of Hungary under King István in 1000 A.D., who wore the crown sent by the Pope, further integrated Hungary into the Christian European fold, distinguishing the pre-Christian and post-Christian periods in Hungarian history. Despite this integration, the Hungarians maintained a unique identity, often positioning themselves as 'guardians of Christianity' against the Ottoman Empire, which was perceived as the primary threat during the Middle Ages.

Hungarian Turanism emerged prominently in the early 20th century among the intelligentsia, who looked to the East for historical and cultural connections. Initially, it was a niche interest but gradually began to acquire political significance, particularly among the highly educated upper-class Hungarian nobles and intellectuals. Figures like Árpád Zempléni were instrumental in this early phase, though Turanism initially struggled to gain widespread public support. However, publications emphasizing Hungarian grievances against Western Europe and perceived security threats posited that Hungary's true allies were in the East (Zempléni 230).

In 1910, the Hungarian Orientalists successfully established the Turáni Társaság (Turanian Society) under the leadership of Alajos Paikert, Béla

Erődi, Ármin Vámbéry, and Count Pál Teleki. Modelled after the British Central Asia Society, this organization aimed to promote scientific and political engagement with the East. However, internal disagreements about the definition of 'Turan' and its ethno-racial implications sparked debates within the Society (Demirkan 44-45), hindering its activities until 1912 and limiting its influence on both the Hungarian scientific community and public opinion.

The Turáni Társaság (Turanian Society) began publishing the journal *Turan* in 1913, which prioritized scientific inquiry into the economic, cultural, and sociological aspects of Asian and Turanian countries, as well as linguistic research. The journal played a crucial role in developing the concept of economic Turanism, which gained prominence before and during World War I (Demirkan 48). Turanian ideas, disseminated through the Society and the journal, split into two strands: defensive Turanism, focused on Hungarian isolation and security within Europe, and expansionist Turanism, aimed at Hungarian economic expansionism. These ideas became integral to Hungarian nationalism, reflecting the political strategies of the era.

The dual nature of Hungarian Turanism -defensive and expansionist- allowed it to serve as a flexible framework for Hungarian foreign policy, particularly in the context of Eastern expansion. Despite the overlapping goals of these strands, their interplay and occasional emphasis on one over the other created nuances within the Turanist ideology. The Turáni Társaság (Turanian Society), while ostensibly a scientific organization, ultimately aligned its activities with Hungarian economic and strategic interests. The Society's intellectual aim of scientific inquiry was complemented by a practical goal of economic expansion in the East, facilitated through alliances with the Ottoman Empire (Teleki 3). Hungarian Turanists believed that Hungary was unique power to lead the Turanian world in the East.

Hungarian Turanism thus evolved beyond a mere ideology of isolation and security, becoming a vehicle for economic and strategic ambitions (Önen 42-46). The concept even inspired the establishment of the Hungarian Eastern Society, modelled after the British East India Company. Turanism, with its dual focus on security and expansion, complemented Hungarian national interests (Ablonczy 90), particularly during the volatile pre-World War I period. While initially driven by fears of Slavic and Germanic threats, World War I saw a strategic shift. The German-Hungarian alliance redefined Turanism, framing it as an antidote to Pan-Slavism and aligning it with German interests (Nagy 74-75).

During World War I, the idea that Turanism could counteract the potential dominance of Slavic and communist forces in Europe gained traction. This perspective facilitated the notion of an artificial 'Mitteleuropa' based on Turanian-Germanic cooperation (Nagy 17). The economic wealth of the East was seen as a strategic asset for Teutonic states, aligning Hungarian Turanism

with German imperial ambitions. This relationship underscored the similarity between Hungarian Turanism's 'Hungarian to the East' policy and Germany's 'Drang Nach Osten' (Drive to the East) strategy (György).

In conclusion, Hungarian Turanism developed as a multifaceted ideology influenced by historical, cultural, and political factors. It evolved from a sense of isolation and security to become a comprehensive framework for Hungarian national and economic expansion. The interplay between defensive and expansionist Turanism reflects the complex nature of Hungarian nationalism and its adaptation to changing geopolitical contexts. This dual approach allowed Turanism to serve both as a mechanism for addressing national security concerns and as a strategic tool for economic and territorial ambitions.

The Emergence and Evolution of Turkish Nationalism: Historical, Cultural, and Political Influences

Turkish nationalism emerged in the latter half of the 19th century, catalysed by the economic semi-colonization of the Ottoman Empire, external pressures from European states, and the urgent need to devise new policies to maintain internal cohesion. Prior to this period, nationalist sentiment among the Turkish and Ottoman intelligentsia was notably weak, largely because the political, cultural, and religious structures of the Ottoman state were antithetical to the principles of nationalism. The rise of nationalist movements among the Empire's Christian subjects in the Balkans and the concomitant development of concepts such as homeland, nation, equality, and freedom severely challenged the Ottoman system. These movements, supported by Western European powers and Russia, sparked separatist uprisings in regions like Serbia, Romania, Greece, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Crete, and Rumelia, initiating the gradual fragmentation of the Ottoman Empire.

The 18th century marked the beginning of important educational reforms within the Empire, leading to the formation of a Turkish intelligentsia and the infiltration of Western political thought, including nationalism, into Ottoman society. By the 19th century, the increasing separatist movements and the establishment of nation-states by minorities within the Empire raised profound concerns among the emerging Turkish nationalists. They grappled with foundational questions of national identity: "Who are the Turks, and what common values do they share?" Historically, 'Turk' was the preferred term that often used pejoratively to describe the rural and uneducated people of Anatolia (Arnakis 25). In response, Turkish nationalists sought to culturally and linguistically redefine the concept of 'Turk', formulating a new sense of 'Turkishness'. They began to idealize the Turkmens of rural Anatolia, who, despite being neglected by the Ottoman state and urban intellectuals, had preserved their language and culture.

This climate of anxiety among Turkish nationalists led to efforts to strengthen the Turkish language. From the late 18th century, the idea of nationalism, propelled by reformist ideals, began to permeate various domains, gaining particular traction in literature. Writers and intellectuals produced numerous works espousing nationalism, addressing themes such as homeland and nation. However, Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals initially favoured the concept of ‘Ottomanism’-which aimed to encompass all Ottoman citizens- as articulated in the 1839 Tanzimat Fermanı (Tanzimat Edict). Abdülhamit II’s reign (1876-1909) saw a shift towards ‘Islamism’ to counter the nationalist movements among Christian subjects and unify the Muslim population within the Empire.

Despite the lack of substantial support for Turkish nationalism within the Ottoman Empire, the ideology found fertile ground among the Turkish elements within Russia. The Slavic discrimination and political and economic oppression imposed by the Russian Empire on minorities, especially Muslim Turks, coupled with the earlier exposure of Turkish intellectuals to European nationalism, significantly contributed to this development (Georgeon 15). Influential figures such as Melekzade Hasan Bey, Mirza Fethali Ahundov, Hüseyinzade Ali Bey, Ağaoğlu Ahmet, Mehmet Emin Resulzade, Ismail Gaspiralı, and Yusuf Akçura played pivotal roles in spreading Turkish nationalism within the Ottoman Empire.

While Turkish nationalism developed alongside modernization movements in the 19th century, it was initially overshadowed by modernism, Westernization, Pan-Ottomanism, and Pan-Islamism. Modernization and Westernization aimed to create a new society grounded in scientific and logical values, Pan-Ottomanism sought to unify society under the concept of Ottoman citizenship, and Pan-Islamism aimed to unite all Muslims against Western Europe. Revolutionary studies on the Turkish language, Western literary genres, and efforts to purify the Turkish language were crucial in fostering Turkish nationalism.

Genç Türkler (The Young Turks) emerged as a populist, patriotic, and intellectual movement, arguing that institutional changes and a new identity were essential for the Empire’s survival. They incorporated nationalism into Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, aiming to create a national consciousness among Muslim Turks. Turkish nationalism, which emerged relatively late compared to other European nations, began to take shape within the framework of Ottoman reform movements at the turn of the 20th century. Despite the Empire’s continual involvement in wars, Turkish nationalism matured through literature, history, and Western-style educational institutions¹.

¹ Genç Türkler (The **Young Turks** also known as the Young Ottomans) emerged in the late 19th century as a reformist movement led by Ottoman intellectuals and military officers. Institutionalized under the name İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti (**Committee of**

The delayed emergence of Turkish nationalism was partly due to the late development of a national Turkish bourgeoisie. Although the idea of a national state had begun to take root among Ottoman intellectuals, the initial focus was on Ottomanism, which sought to unify the Empire's diverse populations. As minority groups developed their own national ideologies, Ottomanism lost its influence, paving the way for Turkish nationalism inspired by European, particularly French, German, and Austro-Hungarian intellectuals. European research highlighting the Central Asian origins of Turks captivated Ottoman intellectuals, nurturing the growth of Turkish nationalism within the Empire².

The challenging wartime environment, the rise of nationalist movements among Christian elements, and the marginalization of minorities prompted Turkish nationalists to draw inspiration from Turkish history and language. Initially driven by a desire to save the state from imperialist threats, Turkish nationalism sought not only political salvation but also solutions to broader problems within the Empire. The decline in Ottoman intellectuals' belief in national culture and their hesitation led them towards nationalism, which had successfully shaped Western European societies (Köseoğlu 208-209). Nationalist mobilization among Christian elements within the Empire united Turkish and Muslim intellectuals and minorities concerned about the Empire's survival, resulting in a concerted effort to save the Empire and integrate nationalist sentiments with Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism.

Union and Progress), this movement aimed to counter the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire through modernization and Western-style reforms. Initially characterized by a heterogeneous political structure, the Young Turks gradually united around a nationalist ideology focused on consolidating the unity of Muslim Turks. The movement synthesized nationalism with Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, striving to mitigate the impact of separatist movements among the empire's diverse ethnic groups and to foster unity within the Muslim population. By the early 20th century, the CUP guided educational reforms, contributing to the spread of national consciousness and establishing the foundation of modern Turkish nationalism through studies in literature and history (Hanioglu).

² The delayed formation of a **national Turkish bourgeoisie** in the Ottoman Empire can be attributed to the Empire's 'millet system', which traditionally assigned commercial and professional roles to non-Muslim minorities, leaving the Muslim-Turkish population more concentrated in rural areas and military-administrative roles. Consequently, the economic and intellectual capital necessary for developing a cohesive national ideology emerged later among Turks compared to Christian minorities in the Empire. By the late 19th century, Ottoman intellectuals increasingly looked to **European nationalist theories**, particularly from France, Germany, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which emphasized ethnic identity and historical continuity. European Orientalist studies also introduced the notion of Central Asian Turkic origins, inspiring Ottoman thinkers to explore Turkish identity and heritage beyond the Ottoman framework, thereby fueling the rise of Turkish nationalism.

In the late Ottoman period, Turkish nationalism developed as a ‘prescription for salvation’ within the framework of Turkism. This ideology became politicized with the İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti (Committee of Union and Progress), focusing on instilling national consciousness among Turks and creating a cohesive national identity. With the loss of the Ottoman Empire’s European territories, the popular idea of Ottomanism waned, giving rise to Turkism, which employed a racially charged language influenced by romanticized notions of a golden age. Associations and intellectuals advocating for Turkism aimed to spread Turkish nationalism and establish a national consciousness. These efforts demonstrated that Westernism, Islamism, and Ottomanism were no longer effective, leading to the rise of Turkism as a politically and socially significant movement.

The effects of external pressures and internal challenges on the formation of Turkish nationalism was profound. As the Ottoman Empire faced increasing territorial losses and internal strife, the need to unify the remaining territories under a common national identity became paramount. Intellectuals and reformers began to draw from the rich history and culture of the Turks, emphasizing the importance of the Turkish language and heritage. This period saw the rise of various cultural and literary societies dedicated to the study and promotion of Turkish identity. These societies played a crucial role in the intellectual revival of Turkish nationalism, fostering a sense of pride and unity among the Turkish population.

The development of Turkish nationalism was a complex process shaped by internal reforms, external threats, and a growing awareness of national identity among the Turkish intelligentsia. It evolved from a reactionary movement against external pressures into a proactive force seeking to redefine and unify the Turkish nation. This transformation was marked by a shift from Ottomanism and Islamism to a more focused and culturally grounded Turkish nationalism, which laid the foundations for the modern Turkish state.

The Emergence and Evolution of Turkism and Pan-Turkism: Intellectual, Cultural, and Political Dimensions

Turkism, as an intellectual and political movement, emerged within the Ottoman Empire during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It was propelled by the need to forge a cohesive national identity amidst the Empire's political and social upheavals. Initially, Turkism was confined to the intellectual realm, focusing on linguistic unity and the purification of the Turkish language from Arabic and Persian influences. Prominent figures such as Ali Suavi, Şemsettin Sami, İbrahim Şinasi, Ziya Pasha, and Ahmet Cevdet Bey championed the simplification and modernization of the Turkish language, setting the stage for Turkish nationalist thought (Berkes).

During the Tanzimat Period, “Ottoman Turkish” was a coined term to define the Turkish language, introducing it as a subject of political and social

debate. This linguistic reform, known as “scientific Turkism” in the 1870s, played a crucial role in fostering national consciousness. Despite these efforts, Turkism remained limited to cultural and linguistic spheres until the early 20th century, coexisting with the dominant ideologies of Ottomanism and Islamism.

The groundwork for Turkism’s political dimension was laid in the 1890s through linguistic research supporting the unification of Turkic peoples. This intellectual movement gained momentum under leaders like Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura, particularly after the Balkan Wars disillusioned many with Ottomanism. Turkism, influenced by German Romantic nationalism and the Central and Eastern European concept of the nation, sought to create a standardized Turkish national identity through cultural and ethnographic unity (Kazemzadeh).

Yusuf Akçura played a pivotal role in transforming Turkism into Pan-Turkism. In his seminal 1904 article *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset (Three Types of Politics)*, Akçura analysed three political paths for the Ottoman Empire, ultimately advocating for Pan-Turkism. This ideology aimed to unite all Turkic peoples based on shared cultural, social, and religious values, proposing religious unity through racial unity and supporting expansionism. However, Pan-Turkism initially struggled to gain traction due to its nascent ideological framework and the complexity of integrating diverse Turkic groups (Akçura).

The Second Constitutional Era (1908) marked a significant turning point. The newfound freedom of expression and organization allowed for the establishment of nationalist associations. *Türk Derneği* (The Turkish Association) (1908-1911) and its journal *Türk Derneği Dergisi (Turkish Association Journal)* and *Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti* (Turkish Homeland Society) and its journal *Türk Yurdu (Turkish Homeland)* became crucial platforms for promoting Turkish nationalism. These organizations³, led by intellectuals like Ziya Gökalp, Ömer Seyfettin, and Ali Canip, emphasised linguistic unity and cultural renewal, contributing to the intellectual foundation of Turkism.

³ On the eve of World War I, the Ottoman Empire faced an accelerated process of territorial loss across Eurasia and sought to mitigate the rising influence of nationalist movements within its borders. This shared interest in Turanian heritage and a parallel ideological pursuit fostered a closer relationship between the Ottoman Empire and Hungary. Hungary’s Turani Tarsasag (Turan Society) found counterparts (Önen 29-32; Ab-lonczy) in Ottoman institutions such as the *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth), *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland), and the *Türk Bilgi Derneği* (Turkish Information Association). Official correspondence from the period reveals exchanges and mutual aspirations to coordinate efforts between these groups. During this time, Müftüoğlu Ahmet Hikmet Bey—who served as Consul General in Budapest from 1912 to 1918 and was among the founders of the Turkish Hearth—played a pivotal role in strengthening connections between Turkish and Hungarian Turanist movements (Yıldırım; Çiftçioğlu and Vere-sova 312).

The idea of Turanism, influenced by Hüseyinzade Ali Bey and further popularized by Ziya Gökalp, emerged as a potent nationalist ideology during this period. Gökalp's poetry and writings, particularly the poem "Turan", embedded the concept of Turan within Turkish nationalist thought. Initially, Turanism had cultural connotations but began to adopt a political dimension as it was embraced by the İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti (Union and Progress Party), especially in the lead-up to World War I (Gökalp). The political upheavals in Russia in 1917 further legitimized Turanist and Turkist ideas, providing an opportunity for these concepts to be discussed and adopted more broadly. The Turkic peoples' aspirations for unity and independence from Russian domination resonated with the Turkish nationalist movement, adding a geopolitical dimension to Pan-Turkism (Kazemzadeh). Pan-Turkism, a broader ideology within Turkism, sought the political, cultural, and linguistic unification of all Turkic peoples across the Ottoman Empire, Central Asia, and beyond. It was driven by the belief in a common Turkic heritage and aimed at the establishment of a Turkic state or a federation of Turkic states. This vision was particularly appealing during the decline of the Ottoman Empire, as it provided an alternative framework for national identity and unity (Kushner).

The rise of Pan-Turkism was closely linked to the decline of Ottomanism and Islamism. Ottomanism, which aimed to create a supranational Ottoman identity inclusive of all ethnic groups within the Empire, lost its appeal after the Balkan Wars and the increasing nationalism among the Empire's Christian populations. Similarly, Islamism, which sought to unify Muslims under the Caliphate, was insufficient to address the national aspirations of the Turkic peoples. Pan-Turkism filled this ideological void by offering a vision of Turkic solidarity and rejuvenation (Gökalp).

The collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 and the subsequent independence movements among the Turkic peoples in Central Asia and the Caucasus provided a real-world context for Pan-Turkist aspirations. The idea of a united Turkic world gained traction as these regions sought to break free from Russian control. The Baku Congress of 1920, attended by various Turkic delegates, exemplified the momentum of Pan-Turkism, although the subsequent Soviet consolidation of power curtailed these aspirations (Kazemzadeh). The formation and development of Turkism and Pan-Turkism within the context of Turkish nationalism were driven by a complex interplay of intellectual, cultural, and political factors. From its roots in linguistic and cultural reform, Turkism evolved into a potent political ideology that sought to unify Turkic peoples and create a cohesive national identity amidst the decline of the Ottoman Empire. Key intellectuals like Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp played crucial roles in shaping these movements, which eventually became cornerstones of the modern Turkish state. The geopolitical shifts of the early 20th century further reinforced the relevance of Pan-Turkism, embedding it deeply within the nationalist discourse.

Analysis of Turkism-Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Nationalism-Pan-Turanism: Differences and Similarities

Turkism-Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Nationalism-Pan-Turanism are intellectual and political movements that emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These movements, while distinct in their specific goals and contexts, share several similarities in their quest to establish cohesive national identities based on cultural, linguistic, and historical foundations. This analysis explores the differences and similarities between Turkism-Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Nationalism-Pan-Turanism, focusing on their historical contexts, intellectual foundations, and political objectives.

Turkism initially focused on cultural and linguistic unity but evolved into a political ideology aiming to unite all Turkic peoples based on shared cultural, social, and religious values. Pan-Turkism advocated for the establishment of a Turkic state or a federation of Turkic states, driven by the belief in a common Turkic heritage (Kazemzadeh). The movement gained momentum under leaders like Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura, especially after the Balkan Wars disillusioned many with Ottomanism. The Second Constitutional Era (1908) allowed for the establishment of nationalist associations, which promoted Turkish nationalism through platforms. Pan-Turkism was further legitimized by the political upheavals in Russia in 1917, which provided a geopolitical dimension to the movement (Gökalp).

Hungarian Turanism aimed to create a political unity among Turanian tribes based on historical, cultural, and linguistic commonalities. The movement sought to establish cultural and political solidarity among Turanian peoples, including the Hungarians, and emphasized Hungary's historical legacy and security in Europe (Kazemzadeh). The establishment of the Turáni Társaság (Turanian Society) in 1910 under leaders like Alajos Paikert and Count Pál Teleki was crucial for promoting Turanism. The Society's journal "Turan" played a significant role in developing the concept of economic Turanism, which emphasized both defensive and expansionist aspects. The movement also sought alliances with the Ottoman Empire and emphasized the importance of Turkological studies (Teleki 1; Önen 407).

Both movements initially focused on cultural and linguistic unity. Turkism aimed to purify the Turkish language and promote a standardized national identity, while Hungarian Turanism emphasized the importance of Hungarian language and ancient history (Berkes; Kazemzadeh). Additionally, both movements were influenced by the geopolitical contexts of their times. Turkism and Pan-Turkism gained momentum in the context of the declining Ottoman Empire and the political upheavals in Russia. Similarly, Hungarian Turanism emerged in response to Hungary's historical experiences with Ottoman and Habsburg rule and the geopolitical shifts in Central Europe (Kushner).

Beyond their political frameworks, both Turkism and Hungarian Turanism exerted substantial influence on cultural life, impacting literature, education, and public consciousness. In Turkey, Turkism's focus on linguistic purity inspired a body of literature that celebrated a unified Turkish identity, contributing to a sense of historical continuity and national pride. Hungarian Turanism similarly promoted an exploration of Hungary's "eastern" heritage, supporting scholarship on folklore and historical narratives that underscored Hungary's distinct cultural lineage. These cultural influences helped entrench the ideological foundations of each movement, embedding their ideals within public consciousness and shaping intellectual discourse surrounding national identity.

Prominent intellectuals drove both movements, articulating the ideological foundations and political strategies. Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura were key figures in Turkism and Pan-Turkism, while Ferenc Pulszky and Ármin Vámbéry played significant roles in Hungarian Turanism. Both movements sought to create a cohesive national identity amidst political and social upheavals. Turkism aimed to redefine Turkishness in response to the declining Ottoman Empire, while Hungarian Turanism emphasized Hungary's historical and cultural legacy to foster national solidarity (Berkes).

Despite these similarities, there were significant differences in the scope of national unity, evolution of political ideology, historical contexts, and geopolitical strategies between Turkism-Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Nationalism-Pan-Turanism.

The distinct emphasis in Turkism on establishing a unified Turkic state underscores the Ottoman Empire's fragmentation and the Turkish nationalists' search for a cohesive identity amidst imperial decline. In contrast, Hungarian Turanism's focus on cultural rather than territorial unity reflects Hungary's historical experiences of partition and foreign domination, particularly under Ottoman and Habsburg rule. These ideological divergences illustrate how each movement adapted its nationalist aspirations to align with the unique challenges and historical trajectories of its respective nation.

While Turkism and Pan-Turkism aimed to unite all Turkic peoples across a broad geographical expanse, including Central Asia and beyond, Hungarian Turanism focused on the cultural and political unity of Turanian tribes with a particular emphasis on Hungary's historical and cultural connections (Akçura). Turkism evolved from a cultural movement to a potent political ideology advocating for the unification of Turkic peoples and the establishment of a Turkic state or federation. In contrast, Hungarian Turanism, while having both defensive and expansionist strands, primarily emphasized cultural solidarity and historical continuity without a strong emphasis on territorial expansion (Gökalp). Turkism emerged within the specific context of the declining Ottoman Empire and the rise of nationalist movements among its Christian

subjects. Hungarian Turanism, on the other hand, was shaped by Hungary's experiences with Ottoman and Habsburg rule, the Battle of Mohács, and the subsequent division of Hungarian territories (Kushner). Pan-Turkism was particularly influenced by the political upheavals in Russia and the aspirations of Turkic peoples for independence from Russian domination. Hungarian Turanism, however, was more focused on Hungary's security and cultural revival within the context of European geopolitics, emphasizing alliances with the Ottoman Empire and promoting Turkological studies (Teleki 1).

In contemporary contexts, elements of both Turkism and Turanism persist within national rhetoric and cultural policies in Turkey and Hungary. Turkish nationalism, for instance, continues to draw on Pan-Turkist themes, fostering diplomatic and cultural ties with Turkic-speaking Central Asian nations and emphasizing a shared heritage. Hungarian Turanism, though less politically influential, has experienced a revival in cultural spheres, with events and organizations dedicated to celebrating Hungary's "eastern" heritage and Turanian connections. These modern developments underscore the enduring relevance of Turkism and Turanism, highlighting their lasting legacy in shaping national identity and cross-cultural affiliations in Turkey and Hungary.

Turkism-Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Nationalism-Pan-Turanism were both significant movements that sought to create cohesive national identities based on cultural, linguistic, and historical foundations. While they shared similarities in their intellectual foundations, cultural focus, and geopolitical influences, they differed in their scope of national unity, evolution of political ideology, historical contexts, and geopolitical strategies. These movements played crucial roles in shaping the national identities and political strategies of Turkey and Hungary, respectively, and continue to influence contemporary nationalist discourses in both countries.

Conclusion

The evolution of Hungarian Turanism and Turkish nationalism in the 19th and early 20th centuries illustrates the dynamic and multifaceted nature of nationalist movements during times of imperial decline and external pressures. Both movements were responses to the challenges posed by foreign domination, internal political upheavals, and the rise of nationalist sentiments among minority groups within their respective empires.

Hungarian Turanism emerged from a sense of isolation following the 1848 Uprising and subsequent Austrian and Russian oppression. This sense of isolation spurred a turn towards the East, leading to the development of Turanism as a nationalist ideology that emphasized Hungary's historical and cultural connections to Central Asia. Initially rooted in romantic and cultural nationalism, Hungarian Turanism evolved into a politically charged movement that sought to address Hungary's internal ethnic diversity and geopolitical aspirations. The emphasis on linguistic and cultural unity, along with a

sense of historical mission, played a crucial role in shaping Hungarian national identity and foreign policy in the early 20th century.

Similarly, Turkish nationalism arose in response to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, compounded by pressures from Western imperialism and nationalist movements within the empire's diverse population. The Ottoman Empire's historical aversion to nationalism, due to its multi-ethnic and multi-religious composition, delayed the adoption of nationalist thought among the Turkish intelligentsia. However, the empire's decline and the urgent need for a cohesive national identity led to the rise of Turkism. This movement emphasized the linguistic, cultural, and historical unity of the Turkish people. The development of Turkish nationalism saw a shift from cultural and linguistic concerns to political aspirations, particularly influenced by figures like Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura. The interplay between Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism and the eventual prioritization of Turkism reflected the evolving priorities of the Turkish nationalist movement as it navigated the challenges of modernization, Westernization, and imperial collapse.

Both Hungarian and Turkish nationalisms were deeply influenced by broader trends of romantic nationalism and the ideas of nationhood prevalent in Central and Eastern Europe. The emphasis on cultural and linguistic unity, historical continuity, and the creation of a national consciousness were central to both movements. However, the specific historical contexts and political dynamics of Hungary and the Ottoman Empire led to distinct expressions of nationalism that addressed the unique challenges faced by each nation.

In examining the differences, while Turkism and Pan-Turkism aimed to unite all Turkic peoples across a broad geographical expanse, including Central Asia and beyond, Hungarian Turanism focused on the cultural and political unity of Turanian tribes with a particular emphasis on Hungary's historical and cultural connections. Turkism evolved from a cultural movement to a potent political ideology advocating for the unification of Turkic peoples and the establishment of a Turkic state or federation, whereas Hungarian Turanism primarily emphasized cultural solidarity and historical continuity without a strong emphasis on territorial expansion.

In conclusion, the formation and development of Hungarian Turanism and Turkish nationalism illustrate the complex interplay of cultural, linguistic, and political factors in the face of imperial decline and external pressures. These movements not only sought to define and preserve national identities but also aimed to position their nations within the changing geopolitical landscape of the early 20th century. The legacies of these nationalisms continue to influence contemporary understandings of national identity and political strategy in both Hungary and Turkey, highlighting the enduring relevance of these historical movements in shaping modern national discourses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ablonczy, Balazs. *Pal Teleki (1879-1941)*. Budapest, 2007.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1998.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Yeni Türk Devletinin Öncüleri: 1928 Yılı Yazıları*. Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2020.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.
- Armstrong, John. *Nations Before Nationalism*. University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Arnakis, George. "Turanism: An Aspect of Turkish Nationalism." *Balkan Studies*, c. 1, no. 1, 1960, ss. 19-32.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. Bilgi Yayınevi, 1973.
- Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Cartledge, Bryan. *The Will to Survive: A History of Hungary*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Çiftçiöğlu, Ferdi and Veresova, Erika. "I. Dünya Savaşı Sırasında Türk-Macar Yakınlaşması: Nezaket Örnekleri." *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 68, 2021, ss. 310-325.
- Deak, Istvan. *The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848-1849*. Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Demirkan, Tarık. *Macar Turancıları*. Selenge Yayınları, 2020.
- Deutsch, Karl. *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. MIT Press, 1966.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Georgeon, François. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri: Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*. İletişim Yayınları, 2024.
- György, Balazs. "Nacionalizmus es Turanizmus. Gondolatok Egy Teveszme Történetéről." *Világosság*, c.7, no. 3, 1966, ss. 162-167.
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Kazemzadeh, Firuz. "Pan Movements." *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Science*, c. 11, no. 2, 1968, ss. 365-370.
- Kohn, Hans. "Pan-Movements." *Encyclopaedia of the Social Science*, c. 11, no. 2, 1935, ss. 554-567.
- Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. Van Nostrand, 1955.
- Köseoğlu, Nevzat. "Türk Milliyetçiliği İdeolojisinin Doğuşu ve Özellikler", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, 2003.
- Kushner, David. *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism, 1876-1908*. Cass, 1977.
- Levi, Scott. "Ortaçağ Orta Asyası'nda Türkistan ve Turan." *Türkler Ansiklopedisi*, c. 1, 2002, ss. 388-392.
- Minogue, Kenneth. *Nationalism*. Methuen, 1967.

- Minorsky, Vladimir. *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. London, 1934.
- Minorsky, Vladimir. *Turan*. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı İslam Ansiklopedisi, 1988.
- Molnar, Miklos. *A Concise History of Hungary*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Nagy, Lajos. *A Turanizmus: Mint Nemzeti es Nevelesi Ideal*. 1915.
- Nagy, Lajos. *A Turanizmus: Mint Nemzeti, Faji es Vilageszme*. Budapest, 1918.
- Önen, Nizam. "Turancı Hareketler: Macaristan ve Türkiye (1910-1944), Ankara Üniversitesi PhD Thesis, Ankara, 2003.
- Smith, Anthony. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Blackwell, 1986.
- Smith, Anthony. *National Identities*, Penguin Books, 1991.
- Snyder, Louis. *The New Nationalism*. Cornell University Press, 1968.
- Snyder, Louis. *Macro-Nationalisms*. Paragon House, 1990.
- Şeşen, Ramazan. *İslam Coğrafyalarına Göre Türkler ve Türk Ülkeleri*. Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2020.
- Teleki, Pal. "Bevezetö". *Turan*, c. 1, 1913.
- Vámbéry, Arminius. *Travels in Central Asia: Being the Account of a Journey from Teheran Across the Turkoman Desert to Khiva, Bokhara, and Samarcand*. Ulan Press, 2012.
- Waterbury, Myra. *Between State and Nation: Diaspora Politics and Kin-State Nationalism in Hungary*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Watson, Hugh. *Nations & States: An Inquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. Westview Press, 1977.
- Yıldırım, Tahsin. *Son Şehbender Müftüoğlu Ahmet Hikmet*. Ötüken Neşriyat, İstanbul, 2020.
- Zempléni, Árpád. *Turáni Dalok. Mondai és Törtéelmi Hősénekek. 1900–1910*. Franklin-Társulat, 1910.
- Ziya Gökalp. *Türklemek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1976.
- Ziya Gökalp. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Kadro Yayınları, 1977.

YAZARLARIN KATKI DÜZEYLERİ: Birinci Yazar %100.

ETİK KOMİTE ONAYI: Çalışmada etik kurul iznine gerek yoktur.

FİNANSAL DESTEK: Çalışmada finansal destek alınmamıştır.

ÇIKAR ÇATIŞMASI: Çalışmada potansiyel çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.