

SOME NOTES ON SOVIET ORIENTOLOGY

Doç. Dr. Türkkaya ATAÖV

Contemporary Soviet Orientology, ranging from Asia Minor to Japan, may be accepted as a family of coordinated studies embracing a wide scope of topics. About half a century ago, books in Russian, claiming to be scientific, were not generally read: «*Rossica non leguntur.*» In contrast, works now emanating from the Soviet Union are widely known and commented upon, whether accepted or not. A whole body of researchers take up separate fields and consequently there is less and less dependence on the vicissitudes in the lives of individuals. New fields, no matter how minute they may initially look, are cultivated.

However, the roots of Orientology in that country should be sought in the first milestones the Russian scholars had erected prior to 1917. It should be accepted, in all fairness, that the pre-revolutionary Russian scientists have made a considerable contribution to the study of the East. The Soviet scholars carried on and developed the best traditions of the old Russian Oriental studies. Hence, this research will necessarily try to show as well the link, no matter how weak or strong, between the pre-revolutionary works and those after 1917. The emphasis has, of course, been on the Soviet period since this article aims to summarize the Soviet period of Oriental studies.

For the purposes of this paper, Soviet Orientology includes the Ancient Near East, Byzantium, Turkey, the Arab world, Iran, Afghanistan, Central Asia, India, South-East Asia, China, Mongolia, Korea and Japan. A study of Soviet Orientology could have begun with an analysis of Turkic studies, not only because this was perhaps the oldest discipline, but also the former Ottoman Empire embraced a good part of the Middle East, including thereby cuneiform studies, semitics, Byzantine studies, Arabic studies and Egyptology. Observing chronology, however, one may start with the Ancient Near East, sizable portion of which still falls within the present-day borders of contemporary Turkey.

Whether it is Turkey or Japan, much reference will be found in this paper to the language studies in the related fields. Soviet scholarship rightly considers knowledge of the various languages and dialects as *sine quo non* for area studies. The scientific value of this approach need not be argued, for it enables the scholar to utilize first-hand material. Tsereteli's knowledge of the Aramaic dialectology, Gordlevski's grasp of Ottoman subjects, Konrad's linguistic capabilities or Barthold's mastery over his domain, to mention a few, have enabled these researchers to carry out pioneering and creative work. Therefore, language studies have also been summarized here as part of area studies.

The material presented is, of course, not exhaustive since there is a limitation by considerations of space. A much more detailed analysis would require a separate volume, apart from the cooperation of other specialists. Nevertheless, this summary, done in a leading Western language as a result of work at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia and Africa in Moscow, with visits to similar centers in Leningrad, Baku or Tbilisi, will probably serve as a general reference to the researchers in anyone of these fields.

* * *

In the Soviet Union, area studies are being carried out at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia and Africa (formerly, the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences), the relevant institutes of the Moscow State University, the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, the Oriental Department of Leningrad State University, the Institute of History, the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (formerly, the Institute of World Economy and World Politics), the Geographical Institute, the Ethnographical Institute and the branches of the Institute of the Peoples of Asia and Africa in Leningrad, Tashkent, Tbilisi, Baku, Erivan and the like.

These institutes or branches have their own scientific journals, the most notable of which are the *Narodi Azii i Afriki* (formerly, *Sovyetskoye Vostokovoeniye*, *Problemi Vostokovoeniya*), and *Aziya i Afrika Sivodniya* (formerly, *Sovremenniy Vostok*). There are also the All-Union Scientific Association of Orientalists, with its journal *Noviy Vostok*; the Scientific Research Association for National-Colonial Problems with its *Revolutsionniy Vostok* as well as the bulletin *Natsionalniye-Kolonyalniye Problemi*; the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, with its *Mirovaya Ekonomika i Mejdunarodniye Atnasheniya*, including the Pacific Department of the last-mentioned, which brings out the *Tihi Okean*. Useful are the *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov*, *Epigraphica Vostoka*, *Zapiski Vostochnovo*

Otdeleniya Ruskovo Arheologicheskovo Obshestva, Zapiski Imperatorskovo Ruskovo Arheologicheskovo Obshestva, Semitskiye Yaziki, Palestinskiy Sbornik, Vestnik Drevney İstorii and similar publications. In addition, there are periodicals of general interest where articles pertaining to Orientalology may be found. Some of them are: *Vestnik İstorii Materialnoy Kultıri, Voprosı Yazıkoznaniya, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk, Sovyetskoye Ethografiya* as well as the *Vestnik* of various universities and several branches of the Academy of Sciences. And of course, the related headings in the *Balshaya Sovyetskaya Entsiklopediya* (55 vols.) and the *Vsemirnaya Istoriya* (10 vols.) may also be consulted.

In respect to the individual fields of study, one may start with a short presentation of the Ancient Near East.

I. The Ancient Near East

A. General :

The first scholar in Russia to work on Assyriology was V.S. Golenishev, who wrote on cuneiform texts in the 1890's. Of course, the Sumerians had invented cuneiform writing, which was later adapted to Akadian, Elamite, Hurrian, Hittite and Urartian. Hence, cuneiform archives include numerous philological, literary, historical, economic, administrative, religious, mathematical, medical and astronomical texts. P.K. Kokovsov had started the teaching of Akadian at the St. Petersburg University before 1914. M.V. Nikolsky (1848-1917) left two big volumes of ancient texts: *Dokumentı hazyaystvennoy atchestnosti drevneyshey epohi Haldey iz sobraniya N.P. Lihacheva* and *Dokumentı hazyaystvennoy atchetnosti drevney Haldey*. V.K. Silejko, who published *Votivniye nadpisi sumerskih praviteley* (1915), lectured on Akadian, Hittite and Sumerian.

The post-1917 period naturally brought the application of the historical materialist method into the interpretation of available data. It was V.V. Struve (1889-1965) who initially influenced this new development with his long report in 1933 at the Academy of History of Material Culture in Leningrad while interpreting Babylonian history in the light of Marxist theory. Analyzing the Sumerian temple archives, he asserted that the Ancient Oriental economy was a *slave* economy. He later published *Gosudarstva Lagash*, and six other works. N.M. Nikolsky (1877-1959), who opposed Struve, maintained that the Ancient Oriental economy was a *feudal* one.

In 1933, A.P. Riftin (1900-1945), a pupil of Silejko and Kokovsov, founded a chair of Semito-Hamitic studies at the Leningrad University. His monograph *Staro-Babilonskiye yuridicheskiye i administrativniye dokumentı f sobraniyah SSSR* were cuneiform tablets in hand-copy, with transcriptions, translation and commentary. Riftin's pupil I.M. Diakonov's publications showed the role of communal self-government in Ancient Mesopotamia.

The Second World War naturally halted work. All the under-graduates, I.M. Dunajevskaya excepted, who had studied Assyriology, fell at the front or during the siege. Even during the war, Nikolsky, Jr., prepared two books (while with the guerillas in the Byelorussian forests) and Struve published some articles. After the war, Lipin prepared the first educational aids (a reader and a dictionary) for students of the Akad language, the first Akad grammar in Russian and articles on Akadian texts. Cuneiform studies came to be centered not only at the University, but also at the Hermitage Museum, which possessed certain tablets. A number of young people received training there as well.

In the 1950's, Struve's idea that the Ancient Oriental society was a slave society was generally accepted. The results of the work done so far were summarized in the appropriate sections of *Vsemirnaya Istoriya* (Vol. I). Perhaps more important was A.I. Tiumenev's (1880-1959) monograph *Gosudarstvennoye hazyaystva drevneva Sumera*, in which the author, after analyzing the Sumerian temple and royal archives, agreed that Sumerian society was based on slavery. He emphasized, however, that the exploited laborers were not all war captives, but belonged to the local population, that Sumerian economy was not all state economy and finally that the «free» citizens were not too different from slaves.

I.M. Diakonov has been able to make valuable contributions in the same topic. Some of his important early works are: *Zakonı Babilonii, Assirii i Hitskava tsartsva, Narodi drevney peredney Azii, O voznikovenii pismennosti f Dvurechye*, as well as a Russian edition of the *Gilgamesh* epic. His interest in socio-economic history is partially fulfilled by *Razvitiye zemelnih atnashe-niy f Assirii, Istoriya Midii, Abshchestvenniy i gosudarstvenniy stroy drevnava Dvurechya: Sumer and Predistoriya armiyanskava naroda*. Diakonov's main idea in his long treatment of the origin of the despotic state in Ancient Mesopotamia was as follows: That society was made up of a free property-owning class and the king's dependants, the former being practically free from exploitation until the first millenium B.C. while the laboring part of

the latter did not own the means of production. Their status resembled that of the slaves. He also maintained that the family commune was preserved in the Ancient Oriental society for some time. Soviet scholarship has also accepted N.B. Jankowska's interpretation of the great Eastern empires. They arose, believes Jankowska, to force an exchange between the developed areas and the under-developed ones possessing rich raw materials on account of scarce commodities in the market.

In his *Nyekatariye voprosi agrarnih atnasheniy f Ugarite, Sotsialnoye deleniye svobodnih sloyeb nasileniya f Ugari, Selskaya obshchina i prochiye vidy zemlevladieniya f drevnem Ugarite, Hramovoye zemlevladieniye f drevnem Ugarite* and *Noviye problemi istorii Ugarita*, M.L. Heltzer wrote on the state economy and the communal organization of Ugarit. V.A. Jakobson reached new conclusions regarding the Old Babylonian and the New Assyrian periods in *Sotsialnaya struktura novoassiriyskava tsarstva, Problemi chastnava prava novoassiriyskava perioda* and *Pravovoye i imushchestvennoye palajeniye «redum» vremeni I Babilonskoy dinastii*. Y.B. Yusifov dealt with the legal affairs of the community members in Elam: *Ter min dilya rabov f Midii, Elame i Persii seredin I tisyachelyetiya do n.e.*

Sumero-Vavilonskaya matematika by A.A. Vaiman is the only monograph in Russian on the mathematical ideas of the Babylonians. Translated into English in London, it includes calculation tables and techniques, the solution of arithmetical, geometrical and algebraic problems and the like.

It can be gathered from what has been said so far that Leningrad has been the only center of cuneiform studies for a long time. The works of G.V. Tsereteli, however, made Tbilisi (Georgia) a second center. It will be more appropriate to present the basic trends of the Tbilisi school under «Urartology» below. Similarly, Erevan (Armenia) also became a somewhat important center, where Assyriology is studied by G. Kh. Sarkisyan and Urartology by N.V. Harouthiounyan. A reference has already been made to Y.B. Yusifov of Baku (Azerbaijan). In Moscow, Assyriology was represented by D.G. Reder, who drew attention to the importance of the popular assembly in Mesopotamia, and Sumerology by A.G. Kifishin. There is also some work done in Minsk (Byelorussia) by G.I. Dowgialo and in Vilnius (Lithuania) by M.L. Heltzer.

Finally, it should be added that All-Union sessions on the Ancient Orient is now being held once every four years, the first one having taken place in 1958.

B. Urartology :

Russian studies of Urartology started earlier than one might expect because northern Urartu fell within the borders of Tsarist Russia, and the old Urartan monuments presented themselves to the Russian historians. Therefore, it was no wonder that the first Urartean cuneiform inscriptions were published in Russian as early as the 1860's. *Ararat*, printed in Echmiadzin (Armenia) and *Khambawaber Rusio* of Moscow as well as *Bulletin de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersburg* and *Mélanges Asiatiques* may be looked into for these early publications.

The 1890's saw a more intimate study of the Urartean monuments. Not only M.V. Nikolsky was drawn into Urartology, but V.S. Golenischev, A.A. Ivanosky, A.A. Bobrinsky, A.A. Florensky, A.A. Kalantar, B.N. Shakhovsky and some others gathered mass of material and printed them. Among them Nikolsky published a book containing all the Urartean inscriptions in the Caucasus. This publication, which brought together photographs, transcriptions and translations, resulted from Nikolsky's expedition in 1893. Golenischev also worked on the interpretations of Urartean epigraphy, the most important of which was the inscription of King Rusa II of Urartu.

The Russian Archeological Society sponsored an expedition in 1916. A group working under I.A. Orbeli found a chronicle of King Sarduri II. The growth of Russian interest in Urartology may have been due to the successes of scientists in Germany. F. Schultz had already found about forty inscriptions, and S. Guyard, with A.H. Sayce, had deciphered them. C.F. Lehman-Haupt and W. Belck had explored the territory of the ancient kingdom of Urartu. They had made excavations at the city of Van and had already published their three-volume work.

After 1917 interest in Urartology continued. N.Y. Marr published the Sarduri II chronicle in 1922 under the title of *Arheologicheskaya ekspeditsiya 1916 goda f Van*. This publication was later found to be full of mistakes. I.I. Menschaninov's handling of the same Van inscriptions in 1935 is generally accepted as more scientific. The same author has produced three publications on Urartean grammar. G.A. Kapantsiyan published and interpreted a number of inscriptions. G.V. Tsereteli published twenty-three of such inscriptions. G.A. Melikishvili's book on the same subject includes perhaps all the known Urartean cuneiform inscriptions, with translations and comments. B.B. Piotrovsky's book on the history and culture of Urartu,

which received a government prize, must be mentioned here. N.M. Postovskaya's book on Soviet study of the Ancient Near East (1961) must be consulted (pp. 398-399, 413-417) for further bibliography.

C. Hittitology:

B.A. Tourayev's publication in 1901 on the history of the Hittites should now be accepted as a modest paper. Nevertheless, it corrects some erroneous ideas of A. Sayce and E. Chantre as well as noting the role played by the Russian General Lundquist in the discovery of Hittite monuments in Maraş, some of which was sent to the Tbilisi Museum. Hittitology took a new and upward turn with the excavations at Boğazköy. In 1925, V.K. Shileiko published a fragment of the treaty between Hattusili III and Ramses II. Four years later, he published several Boğazköy fragments from Likhaichov's collection. The first Russian translations of the Hittite laws, reflecting that society, were made in 1923 by A.A. Zaharov and I.N. Borozdin. The latter had presented his interpretation of the Hittite military feudalism in his introduction to articles on the Hittites and their culture.

The Boğazköy texts also effected the outlook of V.V. Struve, who had now abandoned the «Asiatic mode of production» idea and maintained that the Ancient Eastern society was feudal. Proceeding from the Hittite laws, he described that society as one of slavery. Further, his mistranslation of a word («*LU-antiant*» as «lover» instead of «son-in-law») had led him to jump to erroneous conclusions.

The arrival in 1936 in the Soviet Union of the Czech scientist B. Hrozný, one of the greatest Hittitologists, stirred a further interest in the subject, frustrated temporarily only by the Second World War. Following a few papers on Hittite state system and linguistics came A.V. Desnitskaya's translation of the Hittite grammar from German (J. Friedrich). This was followed by Melikishvili's big book entitled *Nairi-Urartu*, in which he analyzed the Hayaseans and the Kaskeans. From 1955 onwards, V.V. Ivanov wrote several works devoted to the old Anatolian languages. A few theses were handed in on similar topics, like that of T.V. Gamkrelidze, who concentrated on the non-Indo-European elements in the Hittite language. E.A. Menabde wrote on the development of slavery while G.G. Giorgadze devoted his thesis to the Kaskean tribes. Dunayevskaya contributed small researches on the Hattic language.

The 1958 Leningrad meeting drew seven reports from the Hittitologists. Most of these reports raised problems rather than solving them. Important

were Gamkrelidze's monograph and Ivanov's essay on the Hittite language. The latter author also published in 1965 a fundamental study on the Indo-European, primitive Slavic and the Anatolian language systems. He analyzed therein traits common to the Slavic and Anatolian languages.

The Hittites as a historical entity as such has been studied less than one would expect. Menabde's several papers, however, generalizing the social and economic history of that society, stand out as important. The same may be said of G.I. Dvgialo's analyses of heirdom to the throne and G.G. Giorgadze's papers on Hittite struggle for the control of northern Syria.

D. Semitics :

The Semitic languages (Assyrian, Aramaic, Hebrew, Phoenician, Arabic and Ethiopian) have, of course, played an outstanding role in the birth and development of civilization. Since Assyrian studies have already been referred to and Arabic will be taken up later, this section of the paper may briefly dwell on the Sabaean and Abyssinian as well as North Semitic studies.

The first name to be mentioned is deservedly P. Kokovtsov (1861-1942), who had acknowledged mastery of Arabic, Hebrew, Akkadian and Syriac. The next person, B. Tourayev (1868-1920) was first a pioneer of Ethiopian studies and later of Phoenician language. From 1897 onwards, he published the Ethiopian collections in the museums. He also paid attention to Ethiopian literature (*Efiopskaya literatura*), history (*Efiyopiya in Vizantiyski vremennik*), art (*Abissinskaya politicheskaya lubochnaya kartina moyevo sobraniya*) and language (*Efiopski yazık in Ents. slovar Brokgauza i Efrona*).

These two names began to write before 1917 but carried on in the Soviet priod as well. N. Yushmanov (1896-1946) was perhaps the first of the younger generation. Knowing Arabic, Ethiopian and modern Aramaic dialects, he brought out several papers on separate Semitic languages of Ethiopia, such as Amharic, Tigrinya and the like. Semitic research is also done at Tartu University (Estonia), where U. Mazing is engaged in Ethiopian philology and A. Gulkevich in Hebrew and Aramaic. S. Viner, I. Bender, P. Kokovtsev and I. Gintsbung worked on catalogues describing Hebrew books and manuscripts at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia.

The Georgian center deserves a special mention. Before the war, G. Tsereteli studied Aramaic inscriptions found near Mtskheta, Georgia's ancient capital. At present, research is concentrated at two institutions there: the Oriental Faculty of the Tbilisi University and the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.

During the past twenty years most of the work seems to center on linguistic studies. B. Grande, I. Vinnikov and M. Zand are engaged in Hebrew. K. Tsereteli deals with Syriac. The latter published samples of Urmian dialects, Van and Aramaic dialects of Salamas. A. Gabriyelova (Tbilisi) is studying the Aramaic dialects of Jews. Interest in Ethiopian is again rising: I. Krachkovsky's *Efiopskaya filologiya* was published in 1955. V. Starinin, K. Kalinovskaya and E. Tikov have all written on grammar and lexical problems. K. Starkova devoted her investigations to the Hebrew manuscripts. L. Vilsker and M. Sislin concentrated on the history of grammatic thinking.

As it is known, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls gave rise to Kumranistics, a new field of Semitics. The study of the Dead Sea Scrolls began rather late in the Soviet Union. Starkova's paper, which was the first work on that subject, was ten years late. Later, I. Amusin as well studied the scrolls and devoted several papers to it.

The Aramaic tablets found at ancient Nisa (Turkmenia) has been studied closely in the Soviet Union. M. and I. Dyakonova and V. Lifshits wrote on them. M. Bogolyubov published fragments found in Aswan. In Baku, R. Huseynov is studying the Turkic nations using Syriac sources. In Erevan, Kh. Melkonyan is doing the same in respect to the Armenians.

Literary studies have been taken up only recently. A. Borisov, I. Braginsky, and G. Gluskina study literature in Hebrew, G. Tyutryumova and E. Gankin Ethiopian literature. There is a growing trend of translations to introduce the Semitic language literature to the Soviet readers.

There are regular journals devoted to Semitic problems, some of which were mentioned in the introductory paragraphs to this paper. Finally, the Semitists have been holding nation-wide conferences beginning from 1964. The transactions of conferences are published.

E. Egyptology :

In 1917, there were only three Russian Egyptologists known in the outside world: V.S. Golenishchev, O. Lemm and B. Tourayev. It seems that Egyptology took root in that country mainly on account of their pioneering work. Nevertheless, they represented the «old school». Even V.V. Struve, Tourayev's pupil, was limited by the traditional approach, that is, primarily in history and the history of culture. Struve was, of course, a prominent Orientalist, and at the same time a classisist, with an excellent

mastery of Greek and Latin. Hence, he could deal with the interaction of cultures. It is generally acknowledged that he achieved that in *Manifon i yevo vremya*. Apart from such studies on Hellenic Egypt, Struve devoted some attention to Egyptian mathematics. His work, based on a papyrus now at the Pushkin Museum, is *Mathematische Papyrus des staatlichen Museum der schönen Künste in Moskau* (Berlin, 1930).

Struve has also concerned himself with the socio-economic structure of Ancient Egypt. The analysis of such a problem naturally demands historical-philosophical views on the historical process in general and the history of the Ancient Middle East in particular. He established systematically that slavery played considerable role in the Ancient Orient as a social-economic phenomenon. It was already known, however, that slavery existed in Ancient Egypt. Struve, on the other hand, not only set forth that there had never been feudal relations there at that time, but also he found *two* types of slaves: one of the «antique» type, nearly identical to the Greek or Roman slaves, deprived of all rights, and the second type of «Oriental» slaves, who were somebody's private property but not so deprived of «rights» like the «antique» type. He called this relationship «early slave-owning» because Egypt, and the Ancient Orient in general, had not yet attained the level of development that would necessitate slave ownership as it existed in Ancient Greece or Rome. Struve's ideas on this have then caused discussions, which have still not subsided.

There have been others who dwelt on the same topic. Yu. Ya. Perepelkin investigated the socio-economic structure of the countries of the Pharaohs during the Old Kingdom, while T.N. Savelyeva concentrated on the agrarian system in the same epoch, V.I. Avdiyev, D.G. Roeder, I.S. Katznelson and K.K. Zelin on agrarian relations in the Second and First Centuries B.C. and O.D. Berlev on kings' slaves. Perepelkin's two-volume monograph on the uprising of Amenhotep IV may be mentioned separately. V.I. Evgeneva, Yu. P. Frantsev, I.G. Frank-Kamenetsky, I. Lurie, I. Livshits, M. Mathiew and E.N. Maximov study culture —especially religion— in Egypt. V.V. Pavlov, S. Khodjash and Mathiew have been paying attention to Egyptian art. Mathiew's history of Egyptian art is generally evaluated as outstanding. Several works from the Soviet collections (Moscow Museum papyri No. 127 and 167, Hermitage papyrus No. 1115) were published in the recent years. A reference should also be made here to Soviet Coptology. P.V. Ernsteddt has published Coptic texts and A.I. Elanskaya has prepared studies on all the Coptic dialects.

II. Byzantium

Byzantium is being studied in many Soviet centers, the most important of which is undoubtedly the Sector of Byzantine Studies of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which publishes *Vizantiyski Vremennik*. The Leningrad scholars work at different institutes while those in Sverdlovsk group around the Chair of Universal History of the Urals University, in Tbilisi at the Institute of Oriental Studies and in Erevan at the Institute of History.

Two major themes of Soviet Byzantology are the socio-economic problems and the cultural legacy of that civilization. The former approach concentrates on the development of the society, with its inherent contradictions and the latter on art, archeology and manuscripts. These two themes are not actually separate and do meet at certain points, however.

Those who have worked on agrarian relations and the position of the peasantry have dwelt on the problems of feudalism in Byzantium, that is, the replacement of the slave-owning system by feudal formation. Two illustrations may be M.V. Levchenko's *Materiali dilya vnutrenney istorii vostochnoy rimskoy imperii V-VI vv.* (in the *Vizantiyskiy sbornik*) and Ye. E. Lipshits' *Vizantiyskoye krestyanstvo i slavyanskaya kolonizatsiya*. Urban life and urban-rural relations complete this trilogy. Examples may be G.L. Kurbatov's *Rannivizantiyskiy gorod* and A.P. Kajdan's *Derevniya i gorod f Vizantii IX-X vv.*, respectively. They all show the characteristics of agrarian relations in the early period, the free peasants and the colons, the turn to large-scale farming and trend towards feudalism. The features of the early Byzantine *polis*, cities as centers of crafts and trade and the new elements, led to the feudalization of towns. There is also information on the organization of trade and crafts and of commerce, whether local or overseas. Class struggle is of course connected with all these problems. The political parties, the Blues and the Greens, the scientific reality behind the ideological rifts and the popular movements have certainly attracted their attention. Some examples are: A.P. Diyakonov, *Vizantiyskiye dimi i faktsii f V-VII vv.* (in *Viz. sb.*) F.L. Kurbatov, *Vosstaniye prokopiya (365-366 gg.)*, A.P. Kajdan, *Krestyanskiye dvijeniya f Vizantii f X v. i agrarnaya politika imperatorov Makedonskoy dinastii* (in *Viz. vre.*: 1952), E.V. Ydaltsova, *Narodniye dvijeniya f Severnoy Afrike pri Yustinayane* (also in *Viz. vre.*: 1952). The heretical movements such as Arianism, Bogomilism, Iconoclasm and Hesychasm have been interpreted as different ways of mass struggle against state power. One may see Ye. E. Lipshchits' *Ocherki istorii viza-*

tiyskava obshestva i kulturi and M. Ya. Syuzyumov's *Problemi ikonoborcestva f Vizantii* in *Ucheniye zapiski Sverdlovskava Gos. Pedagogich. ins.* (1948). Paulinism, the largest of the anti-feudal heretic movement, has been studied through Armenian as well as Greek sources. One may consult K.N. Yuzbashyan's *Povestvovaniye Aristakesa Lastivertsi*.

The last centuries of Byzantium is also covered. Papers are concerned with the Latin and Nicaean Empires (F.I. Uspenski, *Ocherki po istorii Trapezundskoy imperii*; A.A. Vasilyev, *Latinskoye vladichestvo na Vostoke*; K.N. Yuzbashyan, *Klassovaya barba f Vizantii f 1180-1204 gg. i chetvyortiy krestoviy pahod.*), the Palaeologus era (A.A. Vasilyev, *Padeniye Vizantii*), struggle against the Turks by different classes (B.T. Goryanov, *Vosstaniye zilotov f Vizantii*; Z.V. Udaltsova, *Barba partii f Peloponese vo vremya tur-yetskava zavoyevaniya po dahhim vizantiyskava istorika Kritovula in Sredniye veka*, 1951; Z.V. Udaltsova, *Barba vizantiyskih partiy na florentiyskom cobore i rol Vissariona Nikeyskava f zaklyuchenii unii in Viz. vre.*, 1950) and the role of Genoa and Venice in dividing Byzantium (N.P. Sokolov, *Obrazovaniye Venetsianskoy kolonialnoy imperii*; E. Che. Skrijnskaya, *Genueztsi f Konstantinopole f XIV v. in Viz. vre.*, 1947).

Late Byzantine feudalism, the complex agrarian system of the later period, including the immunity of the appandages of churches, monasteries and large estates as well as the causes of the fall of Byzantium has been the subject of many works, such as B.T. Goryanov's *Pozdnevizantiyski feodalizm*, A.P. Kajdan's *Agrarniye atnasheniya f Vizantii XIII-XIV vv.*, B.T. Goryanov, *Krupnoye feodalnoye zemlivladieniye f Vizantii f XIII-XV vv. in viz. bve.* (1956), and also by Goryanov, *Vizantiyskoye krestyansvo pri Paleologah in Viz. vre.* (1950).

Some research has been done on the influence of Byzantium on the neighboring countries and nations. Byzantium certainly influenced the Slavs, including the Rus. N.V. Pigulevskaya, M.V. Levchenko, A.P. Kajdan, and G.G. Litavrin have studied Byzantium-Slav relations. Relations with the West, especially Italy, and the Eastern countries figure out prominently in Soviet Byzantology. Especially N.V. Pugilevskaya has written three books on Byzantium's relations with Iran, India and the Arab lands.

Some important Byzantine sources have been translated into Russian. They include certain histories (Procopius, Agathias, Nicephorus, Comnena, Chalcocodyles), chronicles (Cameniates, Peter of Alexandria), legal records (compiled by Uspenskiy, Beneshevich and Lipshits), a treatise on agriculture and a guild charter. Important for university work is a collection of Byzan-

tine documents on socio-economic subjects (*Sbornik dokumentov po sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy istorii Vizantii*), and a general history book (M.V. Levchenko, *Istoriya Vizantii*).

The Soviet scientists have unearthed vast amount of archeological material from the remains of the old Byzantine cities formerly erected on the northern Black Sea shore. The Section of Archeology and Early Christian and Byzantine Art was set up in the 1920's, and excavations had already begun. Research in Tiritaka, Mirmekii and Ilurat shows that these three cities had a revival in the Middle Ages after the Hun invasion. Mangupa and Eski Keremen offer laboratory studies of Medieval villages. Chufut Kale at Bahchesaray and Inkerman at Sebastopol have also been excavated.

Substantial contribution has been made to the study of Byzantine art. D.V. Aynalov is perhaps the first name after 1917. Several others went to centers like Istanbul and Trebizond, later publishing their reports. Special mention should be made of T. Schmit's monograph: *Die Koimesiskirche von Nikaia* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1927). The Soviet scholars have also paid attention to the inter-relation between the art of Byzantium and that of the neighboring countries, primarily Russia. Byzantine art has certainly influenced Russian, Balkan, Caucasian and Turkish art (mostly architecture). More important, however, is the birth and development of «national schools» of art in the periphery of Byzantium. One can see interactions in Palestine, Crimea or in Egypt.

A glance at the catalogue of Greek astrological manuscripts will give the student of Byzantology an idea of the valuable records in the museums and the libraries of the USSR. They pertain to what is available not only in Moscow and Leningrad, but also in Tbilisi, Erevan and some other cities. N.P. Likachev has considered Byzantine seals as sources for studying socio-economic history, culture and art. Catalogues of Byzantine coins have begun to be published.

In short, the Soviet scholars have been better able to study the «Oriental» characteristics of Byzantine feudalism and Byzantine impact on the neighboring Eastern European and Near Eastern nations as well as the nations of the Soviet Union.

III. Turkic Studies

A. Turkish Language and Literature :

Russian interest in Turkey and the Turkic-speaking peoples is old. Not only the Russians had early contacts with the Ottoman Turks, but

also many Turkic-speaking peoples became part first of Tsarist, and later Soviet Russia. Ancient contacts with the Turks have left their mark on the language of the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians. It is said that the study of Turkic languages was initiated even at the time of Peter the Great. Therefore, in the course of two-hundred years many Turcologues came to the fore: V.V. Barthold, I.N. Berezin, L.Z. Budagov, O.N. Böhtlingk, V.A. Bogoroditsky, V.A. Gordlevski, V.V. Grigoryev, N.I. Ilminsky, P. Desmuisons, P.M. Melioransky, V.V. Radlov, V.D. Smirnov, A.E. Krimsky, E.K. Pekarsky, A.N. Samoilovich, N.F. Katanov, P.S. Savalyev, V.V. Veliaminov-Zernov.

All these names had attained fame during the Tsarist period. The revolution tried to preserve and carry over the philological techniques of the old Russian school. The Turkic languages were now second in the USSR only to the Slavic tongues. The Turkic languages were spoken in five union republics (the Azerbaijan, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen and Uzbek SSR), six autonomous republics (the Bashkir, Chuvash, Karakalpak, Tatar, Tuva and Yakut Autonomous republics) and two autonomous regions (the Gorno-Altai and Khakass Autonomous Regions). Sections of the population speak Turkic tongues in several republics, such as the Kumiki and the Nogai in Daghestan, the Gagauz in Moldavia, the Azeri in Nakhichevan and the like.

After 1917, new educational and research centers were opened to meet new tasks. In 1918 Orientalist institutes were opened in Tashkent and Kiev. A school of Oriental studies started in Kharkov. The Lazarev Institute of Oriental Languages and the Department of Oriental Languages of Petrograd University were reorganized. A Turkestan People's University was opened in Tashkent in 1918. An Oriental department was established at the Azerbaijan State University. In Kazan, there was a department of Tatar language and culture. The Crimean State University was founded.

One of the immediate tasks was to provide new alphabets for the Soviet East. The Arabic script was replaced either by Latin letters or by the Cyrillic alphabet. Orthography, phonology and graphic systems of the new alphabets were worked out in this connections. The grammatical structure, phonetics and lexicon of entirely unstudied languages were analyzed and educational aids for schools were prepared. National cadres of scientists sprang up in the Turkic speaking areas. Thus, the language, literature and history of the Altay, Chuvash, Balkar, Karachayev, Kumik, Khakassk, Nogay, Shortsy and the Tuva are studied along with the Azeri, Kazakh, Kirgiz, Tadjik,

(mostly Persian influence), Turkmen, Uzbek, Tatar, Bashkir and Yakut. Institutes are functioning wherever these republics, autonomous republics or regions are located. Apart from Moscow, Leningrad, Tbilisi and Tartu, the Turkic languages are taught in Tashkent, Samarkand, Ashkhabad, Alma-Ata, Frunze, Baku, Kazan, Yakutsk and other eastern centers.

For a considerable period in the past, scholars tackled the practical problems of developing the alphabets and rules of the languages and writing books for educational purposes. In the last twenty years, however, phonetics and grammar of the modern Turkic tongues, lexicography and lexicology, dialectography and dialectology, history of the formation of the Turkish national tongues, the ancient Turkic records, the «Altaic» theory, old Turkish manuscripts and history of Turkic philology are also being studied.

The study of sound structure goes back to Bogoroditsky, the founder in Kazan of the first experimental phonetics laboratory in Russia. Perhaps the last important link in that chain is G.P. Melnikov, who applied the methods of mathematical logic to the problems of Turkic phonetics. The Ashmarin, Budagov, Pekarsky, Radlov and Verbitsky dictionaries may be found at the origin of the lexicographical tradition. Today, the list of Turkic dictionaries is a very long one. Turkic dialectical study was started in 1860 by Radlov and developed by Katanov, Pekarsky and Malov. Now, all the research institutes of all related regions have sections or groups specialising in dialectology. Turkic written records have been extensively published. There has been wide research on Ali Sher Nevaî (Navoi), Fuzulî (Fizuli), Kutadku Bilik, Baburname, Sedjere-i Türk, Dede Korkut and the like.

Any summary of the literature of the Turkic peoples would be a mere caricature of the actual wealth. Not only the works of contemporary writers, but also those contributing since the remote times have been printed, with a separate wealth of commentaries on their artistic value. All from Navoi or Nizamî down to Ghafur Ghulam or even Anar Rızayef, of the youngest generation, are available in print, generally in the form of collected works that run into many volumes for each. (They are also translated into Russian and other tongues for the readers of the neighboring nationalities.) It would be an extremely long list if one enumerates even the outstanding representatives of Turkic literature. It is possible to suggest, however, general histories such as the *Azerbeycan Edebiyatı Tarihi* (published in Baku in the Azeri language in three volumes). Such series may be found in respect to the literature of the other Turkish-speaking peoples.

Similarly, the literature of Turkey may also be considered as well-covered here. Many Soviet Turcologues have expressed to this writer that Turkey possesses the most developed literature in the whole of Asia (and Africa). Due attention has been given to the history of Turkish literature as well as individual novelists, short story writers, poets and playwrights. With more emphasis on the modern names, Turkish literature is extensively covered from Namık Kemâl, Tevfik Fikret or Ömer Seyfeddin up to the very contemporary ones, excluding almost none. Although there are still occasional studies on the old writers such as Reşat Nuri (Ahmed Ahmedov's dissertation) or Halit Ziya (Alkayeva's dissertation), interest is mostly in the younger generation. Nazım Hikmet is, of course, published very often and much has been written on him. Among a few dozen of important commentators and translators, Ekber Babayef, who has a dissertation on his poetical and dramatic art, a number of books and articles on him apart from bearing the responsibility of editing the 8-volume collected works in Turkish, is doubtless in the foreground of all. From Kemâl Tahir's historical novel *Devlet Ana* to Aziz Nesin's humour, contemporary Turkish writing is well reflected in Russian translations.

B. The History, Economy and Geography of Turkey :

The pre-revolutionary Turcology was mainly philological. Nevertheless, some works on Turkish history may be found. The diplomat P.A. Levashov, the travellers M.P. Vronchenko, I.N. Berezin, and P.A. Chihachiov made important beginnings. V.D. Smirnov's study of medieval Turkey is meaningful even today. A.E. Krimsky wrote on the history of the Turks and of Moslems. V.V. Bartold published his *Halif i Sultan*.

After 1917, Turcology was based on an analysis of Turkish, Russian, Middle Eastern, Western European and American sources, embracing all phases of history, international relations, economics, government and geography. Books and articles multiplied, and a journal entitled *Sovyetskaya Turkologiya* started its publication in Baku. Two general reference works are, of course, *Bibliografiya Turtsii* (2 vols.) by A. Sverchevskaya and T.P. Cherman.

Soviet interest in Turkey started with the National Liberation Struggle of the Turkish people (1919-1922). One of the first political acts of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, set up on April 23, 1920, was to propose to the RSFSR to establish diplomatic relations. A treaty of Friendship and Brotherhood was signed in Moscow on March 16, 1921. Both facing Wes-

tern imperialism, friendly relations developed. In the same year, the famous Soviet commander and statesman M.V. Frunze visited Turkey as head of a special mission. His travel notes and reports are very interesting. They may be found now in his *Sobraniye sochineniy*. Equally interesting is M.P. Pavlovich's (M. Weltman) book *Revolutsiyonnaya Turtsiya*. So is G. Astahov's *Ot sultanata k demokraticeskoy Turtsii*. V. Gurko-Kriazhin is another name known along with the Turkish national liberation movement. Apart from his articles, one may see his *Istoriya revolyutsii f Turtsii*. Further, Irandust's *Dvijushchiye sili kemalistskoy revalyutsii* is an attempt to analyse the course of the Kemalist revolution. The purpose of A. Melnik (whose later publications are signed as A.F. Miller) in his *Respublikanskaya Turtsiya, Turtsiya: yeyo istoricheskoye proshloye i nastayshchiye* and *Turtsiya* was to review Ottoman history. A.M. Shamsaddinov has written much later (1966) *Natsionalno-osvoboditelnaya barba f Turtsii : 1919-1923*.

Although the initial Soviet interest in Kemalist Turkey was this country's anti-imperialistic policies and her successful war of national liberation, Soviet scholars later dwelt on every phase of Turkish history. The famous Gordlevski was a specialist on Turkish medieval history. Among his many works, perhaps *Gosudartsva Seldjukov Maloy Azii* is the most important. A.M. Valuiski's *Feodalny sroy Turtsii f XV-XVI vv.* is still valuable. A.S. Tveritinova's *Sosstaniye Kara Yazıcı Deli Hasana f Turtsii* has stirred comments. Her *Vtoroy trektat Kochibeya* may also be read with profit. The 1953 edition of the *Vizantiiski Vremennik* was issued in relation to the 500th anniversary of the conquest of Istanbul by the Ottoman Turks. It carries a number of scientifically provocative articles. The first volume of A.D. Novichev's *Istoriya Turtsii* is on «Epoha feodalizma».

The 1908 Young Turk revolution is discussed by H.Z. Gabidullin, E. Yu. Gassanova, A.A. Alimov, A.M. Valuiski, and H.M. Tsovikian. Miller's *Mustafa Pasha Bayraktar* is an unusual piece of erudition. Yu. A. Petrosyan has mostly published on the *Noviye Osmani*. G.L. Bondarevski's *Bagdadskaya doroga* is an exposition of German penetration into the Middle East. The Soviets have of course published on the Lausanne Conference, the Turkish Straits and US plans in the Middle East. Articles on the first two topics may be found in the earlier issues of the *Noviy Vostok*. Miller and B.M. Potshveria have written on American interest in Turkey. Turkey's foreign policy has been commented upon by V.M. Alexeev and M.A. Kerimov and her internal policies by P.P. Moiseev, M.A. Gasratyan, Yu. N. Rosaliev and others.

There are of course a number of general history books on Turkey, notably by Miller, Shamsaddinov and Novichev. There are also documentary publications in the field of history, the most important of which are the *Razdel Aziatskoy Turtsii: Po sekretnim dokumentam b. ministerstva inostrannih dyel* and the Russian translation (in four volumes) of Mustafa Kemâl's *Nutuk*. In many Soviet works on Turkey, there are frequent references to *Put' novoy Turtsii*, as the *Nutuk* is known in the Soviet Union.

The economy of Turkey was discussed as early as 1923 by Sokolsky and later by I. Butayev. The first work on Turkish economic geography was by S.L. Zashuk (1924). Melnik and B.M. Danzig also wrote on economy and geography. P.M. Jukovsky's *Zemledelcheskaya Turtsiya* is still a monumental work (908 pp.) on Turkish agriculture. He was assisted in this research by 29 colleagues whose names appear as co-authors. Among the later publications on physical geography stand out S.N. Matveev's *Turtsia: Aziatskaya Chast*. A comparatively new work on economic geography is Ludshuweit's *Turtsiya*. The economy of modern Turkey is analyzed by Danzig, Moiseev, Novichev, Rozaliev, R.P. Korniyenko, N. Kiryeyev, I.V. Alibekov and V.P. Smirnov.

IV. Arabic Studies

A. Arabic Philology:

Perhaps the greatest authority in this field was I.Y. Krachkovsky. About 250 of his works are devoted to this subject. He was the first to publish *Risalat el-Melaike* by Abu'l-'Alâ el-Ma'arri, as well as *Kitab el-bedii*, *Kitab el-edeb* and *Fusul et-tamathil fi tabashir as-surur* by 'Abd Allah ibn el-Mu'tazz. Another outstanding name was A.E. Krimski. In the 1930's and after, a young group of Arabists joined these authorities: B.I. Belyayev, A.A. Dolinina, I.M. Filshinski, L.S. Nekora, N. Purtseladze, M.A. Salye, D.V. Semyonov, A.F. Sultanov, A.B. Khalidov, N.K. Usmanov, D.I. Yusupov and others.

Two recent general works on Arab literature are a survey by I.M. Filshinski and a collective work. The former traces the development from the «djahiliyya» period down to the Eighteenth Century. There are of course several monographs devoted to the individual Arab writers. Most of them are dissertations on Omar Fakhurî (Yusupov), Taha Husayn (Halidov), Muhammed Dib (I.S. Receptova), Tefvik el-Hakim (Usmanov), Mahmud Taymur (Furtzeladze), Raif Huri (A. Ahmedzanov) and Djordji Zeydan (E.G. Arasli). There are dissertations dealing with Arab thought: on Ibn Khaldun (S.M. Batsiyeva), Ibn Sina (Y.N. Zavadovski), Salâma Mûsâ

(F.F. Nesterov), el-Ma'arri (S.G. Shiroyan), el-Ghazali (G.M. Kerimov) and the like.

The Leningrad branch of Oriental studies houses 12,000 Arabic manuscripts. There are more than that in Tashkent. Scholars have studied and published quite a few of them. Some interesting ones are: Ibn Fadlan's description of his voyage up the Volga; the charts of Ibn Medjid (the Arab pilot of Vasco da Gama); *Risale* of Abu Dulaf; a treatise on chemistry by Abu Bakr ar-Râzi, etc.

The language itself is widely studied in the academic circles. One early «Arabic Reader» (by Ode-Vasilyeva) came out in 1926. Two years later, N.V. Yushmanov brought out a grammar. Kh. K. Baranov's Arabic-Russian dictionary was finished during the war. Several Arab dialects were studied beginning with the 1930's. There is also a very small Arab minority in Soviet Central Asia, whose dialect has been studied by G.V. Tsereteli and I.N. Vinnikov. K.S. Kashtaleva attempted to establish the chronology of different parts of the *Koran* by investigating the terms philologically. New textbooks of Arabic were printed lately. N.S. Kamensky's book had appeared in 1952. A.A. Kovalyov and G. Sh. Sharbatov's came out in 1960. V.S. Segal wrote his own in 1962. Specimens of modern Arabic literature appeared one after another (Vasilyeva, Pisarevski). They were followed by grammar tables (B.M. Grande, A.S. Lekiasvili). A.D. Mehmedov published his own Arabic grammar in Baku. A group of Azeri Arabists (Agazade, Efendiyev, Aslanov, Dzhahani, Shams Yusufi) have prepared Arabic textbooks for the elementary and secondary schools. In Tashkent, Khalidov, S. Ganiyev and A. Bakhadyrov have done almost the same. At Tbilisi, Tsereteli has prepared an interesting reader of Arabic. Tsereteli has summed up his 22-year-long investigation of the Arabic spoken in Central Asia in four volumes. He has also prepared an Arabic-Georgian dictionary. There is also an Arabic-Azerbaijani dictionary.

B. History and Economy of the Arab Countries :

In the Nineteenth Century, Orientalists were making little differentiation between linguistics, literature and history. Only a few (like N.A. Mednikov, V.V. Barthold and A.A. Vasiliev) seemed specialized in independent areas such as medieval Arab history. There was also the material by E. Kovalevski, A.S. Norov, A.A. Rafalovich and P. Uspenski, who had journeyed into the Arab lands and had written about it.

After the October Revolution, Soviet scholarship was interested in contemporary national liberation movements. The All-Russian Scientific Association of Orientalists had been created in 1921 at the suggestion of Lenin. M.L. Pavlovich (Weltman), who wrote on Turkey as well, was its head until 1927, the year of his death. He had a number of publications on imperialist policy in the Middle East. V.A. Gurko-Kryazhin also studied imperialist policy in that region. Kitaigorodski (*Egipet f barbe za nizavisimost, Aljir, Tunis, Marokko f borbe za nizavisimost*) and Podorolski (*Egipet i Angliya*) followed the same course. K.A. Troyanovski, in his *Sovremenny Egipet*, over-estimated the level of capitalist development in Egypt and under-estimated the role of the national bourgeoisie.

Bartold, who enjoyed world fame at the time of the October Revolution, continued his works until death. Although he still over-emphasized the cultural phenomena and seemed less interested in questions of economic and social relations, his knowledge of Eastern languages and qualifications as a researcher made his finished works valuable. The Byzantist F. Uspenski and A.U. Yakubovski also continued to work fruitfully after 1917.

After the 1930's, the economic and political problems of the Arab countries were taken up. With the approaching of the war, internal policies were pushed to the background and Great Power diplomacy in this area was analysed. Two meetings of the Arabists took place in 1935 and 1937, *Trudi pervoy sessii arabistov* and *Trudi ftoroy sessii Assotsiatsii arabistov* may be consulted in this connection. Yakubovski's paper in the first session gives the social and economic structure of the Abbasside Caliphate. Historians seemed at this point questioning themselves on the origins of Islam. Not much work followed, however. In 1938, E.A. Belaiyev offered a view in his *Islam i arabskiy halifat VII-IX vekov* in *Istoricheskiy jurnal*. Six years later, B.N. Zahoder offered another explanation.

Interest was again shifting towards the modern period. H.I. Kilberg published *Vostaniye Arabi Pashi f Egipte* and A. Iskenderov wrote on *Mustafa Kamil*. The Second World War interrupted normal work and thinned the rank of the Arabists. Pigulevskaya's two (in 1946 and 1951) monographs were devoted to some aspects of the social and economic history of the Middle East. M. Mashkin wrote on the Algerian Commune of 1870 and T.V. Yeremeyeva on the Egyptian crisis of 1833. S.R. Smirnov published a book on the Mahdi uprising in Sudan and H.I. Kilberg produced one on modern Egyptian history.

It is natural that lately more people concentrated on contemporary problems, mainly the class structure of the Arab society. Some examples are: M.F. Gataullin's work on agrarian relations in Syria, A.F. Sultanov's analysis of Egyptian peasantry before the 1952 land reforms, S.N. Alitovski's book on agriculture in Iraq, F.M. Atsamba's research on the Egyptian working class and L.A. Friedman's monograph regarding capitalist development of Egypt. Today, research and publication embrace particular topics such as the state sector in an individual Arab country or the problem of agrarian over-population. There are books on Kuwait, Yemen or Libia. The Arab national liberation movement is of course well studied. L.N. Kotlov wrote on the 1920 national liberation revolt in Iraq, A.M. Goldobin on the Egyptian revolution of 1919, V.B. Lutski on Syria (1925-1927), E.A. Lebedev on Jordan's struggle for independence, V.I. Kiselev on Sudanese independence and R.G. Landa on Algerian independence.

E.A. Belyayev's *Arabi, Islam i Arabskiy Halifat* is a recent book representing years of scientific research. Of course, not all the conclusions may be convincing for many. L.I. Nadirzade, for instance, has a different interpretation in *K voprosy o rabstve f Arabii VII v.* regarding the Arab social system at the birth of Islam. M.V. Churakov and N.A. Ivanov wrote on North Africa, L.A. Semyonova and S.B. Pevzner published on Medieval Egypt.

Translations of important Arab sources have also continued. *Muhammed el-Hamavi, et-Tarih el-Mansuri; Ftaraya zapiska Aby Dulafa Arabskiy anonim XI v.* and *Arabskiye istochniki VII-X vv.* are examples. For a new catalogue of Arabic manuscripts, one may see: *Katalog arabskih rukopisey Instituta narodov Azii AN SSSR.*

V. Iranian Studies

A. Iranian Philology :

Russia was interested in Iranian studies not only because that country was a southern neighbour, but also from Iran emanated invaluable sources for the study of history of peoples inhabiting Russia (and the Soviet Union). Iranian-speaking peoples had lived in Central Asia and, parts of the Caucasus, contributing to the cultural fund of these regions. Not only the Persians and the Afghanis, but the Tadjiks, Ossetians, Talyshes and Tats speak Iranian. In the museums and libraries, there are rich collection of Iranian manuscripts.

Persian began to be taught in Moscow University in 1811 (A.V. Boldyrev), later at Kazan (A.K. Kazım Bek, I.N. Berezin), in Kharkov (B.A. Dorn) and in the Richelieu Lyceum in Odessa. St. Petersburg later became the center of Iranian studies. Petersburg University, the Asiatic Department of the Foreign Ministry, the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences, the eastern branch of the Russian Archaeological Society (founded in 1851), the Public Library (now *imeni M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina*) all were interested in Iranology. Several tongues and dialects in the same language family were studied: Ossetic by A. Shegrin; Tati, Talish, Gilaki and Mazanderani by I.N. Berezin, B.A. Dorn, G.V. Melgunov and V.F. Miller; Pamiri by D.L. Ivanov, K.G. Salemann; Tadjik by V.V. Grigoryev; Afghani by B.A. Dorn and Kurdish by P.I. Lerkh. Russian Iranian studies already had some basis before 1917.

After the October Revolution, new centers (in Tashkent, Samarkand, Dushanbe, Leninabad, Kulab, Baku, Erevan, Tbilisi, Ordjonikidze and Takhinali) opened. Instead of individual workers, groups and departments came into existence. In the initial post-revolutionary decades, Leningrad was still the center of scientific Iranian studies. There, the older generation had brought up several students: E.E. Bertels, A.A. Freiman, A.A. Romaskevich, F.A. Rosenberg, Yu. N. Marr, and I.I. Zarubin.

In the 1920's and 1930's, two methods of study could be seen. One was represented by Freiman, who concentrated on the history of the family of Iranian languages as a whole. He seemed attached to the idea of a historical comparative grammar and an etymological dictionary that encompassed all the Iranian languages as a united system. Besides classical and modern Persian, other languages in the same family were taught: Tadjik (from 1927), Ossetic (from 1924), Pamiri (from 1937), Balochi (from 1937), Avestan and Sogdian (from 1938). This historico-philological trend was shared by many others, including V.B. Tomashevski, S.I. Klimchitski, L.A. Khetagurov, E.K. Bakhmutova and later by V.I. Abayev, A.K. Arends, O.I. Smirnova, M.N. Bogulyubov, V.A. Livshits, V.A. Kapranov, S.N. Sokolov, etc.

The second school of approach was represented by I.I. Zarubin, who regarded language to be closely connected with the life of the people, its ethnography and material culture. He applied the phonological method in studying the phonetics of dialects which even had no script. This trend was shared by many other people such as Yu. I. Bogorod, A.L. Grunberg, T.N. Pakhalina, V.S. Rastorguyeva, V.S. Sokolova and V.I. Zavyalova.

With the transfer of the Oriental Institute to Moscow Iranian studies came to be centered around the capital. All Iranian languages are being taught here. The basis of Iranian studies was laid in Central Asia in 1918. The Oriental Faculty in Tashkent is rather well-known now. There is also the Society for the Study of Tadjikistan and Iranian peoples, which has its own *Izvestiya* (since 1928). Persian, Tadjik and Kurdish are taught at the Samarkant State University. Tadjik studies are naturally developed in the Tadjikistan Center of the USSR Academy of Sciences and in the Tadjik State University. Work is done in the modern Tadjik language (M.F. Fazilov, M. Ismatullayev, B.N. Niyazmuhammedov and D.T. Tadjiyev), Tadjik dialects (A.N. Boldyrev, O.D. Djalalov, A.L. Khromov, R.L. Nemenova, B.N. Niyazmuhammedov and L.V. Uspenskaya), the history of Tadjik languages (V.A. Livshitz, I.M. Oranski, A.A. Semenov and L.P. Smirnova), Yaghnobi (M.N. Bogulyubov, L.A. Ketagurov, A.K. Pisarchik), Pamiri (D.I. Edelman), Parthian and Tohar (V.A. Livshits) and Sogdian (A.A. Freiman). In Baku Persian, in Erevan Persian and Kurdish and in Tbilisi Persian and Ossetic are studied.

Ossetic studies are mainly carried in the North Ossetian Autonomous SSR and the South Ossetian Autonomous Region of the Georgian SSR in the Caucasus. Research is mainly carried in Ordjonikidze in the *Osetinskiy Nauchno-Isslyedovatel'skiy Institut Krayevedeniya* or in the *Pedagogicheskiy Institut*, which publish *Izvestiya Severo-Osetinskava Nauchnava-Issledovatel'skava Instituta* and *Ucheniye Zapiski Severo-Osetinskava Gosudarstvenava Pedagogicheskava Instituta*. In Georgia, Ossetic studies center in Takhinvali, where *Izvestiya Yugo-Osetinskava Nauchnava-Issledovatel'skava Instituta* is published.

The study of the old Iranian languages is not only a matter of philology, but of history as well. Specialists in history also need to command those languages in order to conduct historical research. Therefore, the old Iranian languages are given importance in the Soviet Union (and earlier in Russia). Kossovich and Salemann has started the study of the Avestan language in the 1860's. In the post-revolutionary period, V.I. Abayev translated several Avestan texts into Russian, S.N. Sokolov wrote two books on that language, and Bertels translated passages from the Avesta. Freiman and Abayev have translated some Old Persian inscriptions and interpreted them. SI Bayevski has analysed Old Persian lexicology. Bogulyubov read inscriptions on the seals from Persepolis. R.F. Acharyan wrote a history of reading Old Persian cuneiform writing. G.M. Nalbantyan published a guide to Old Persian. A. Kerimov wrote on the Old Persian declension.

Freiman had been studying what is called «Middle Persian» even before the revolution. Bogolyubov, Rastorgyeva, Livshits, Oranski and Sokolov studied and taught Middle Persian. Excavations near Ashkhabad (unearthing the remains of Old and New Nica) provided material for the study of *Parthian* writing. (Nica was of course the ancient capital of the Parthian kings.) The language of these documents caused a discussion, in which I.N. Vinnikov, M.M. Dyakanov, M.E. Masson and G.A. Pugachenkov participated. Salemann had started work on *Sogdian* writing. F.A. Rosenberg continued it. The articles found near the Mug Mountain (in Zerefshan) were original Sogdian documents, which were deciphered and published by Freiman, Smirnova, Bogolyubov and Livshits. Freiman, Bogolyubov, Tolstov and Livshits worked on the available samples of *Khwarizmain* writing. Inscriptions in *Bactrian* were also found on Central Asian territory. Work on the *Saka* language was started by V.S. Vorobyev-Desyatovski and continued by L.G. Herzenberg. *Scythian-Alan* dialects are worked upon by V.F. Miller and Abayev. The last two paragraphs contain very brief notes on the situation of work done in relation to the Old and Middle Persian languages.

As to New (or Early New) Persian language, research has been done on Nizamî (Yu. N. Marr), Sa'adi (R.S. Sultanov, S. Halimov), *Tarih-i Sistan* (L.P. Smirnova), the *Ferhengs* (A.K. Arends, S.I. Bayevski, V.A. Kapranov, B. Kulieyev, Kh. Raupov) and the history of Baihaki (G.I. Kozlov). Regarding Modern Persian, the first steps in the 1920's in compiling textbooks, grammars and dictionaries were taken by Arends, A. Azerî, Bertels, R. Galunov, A.M. Kasayev, Puturidze, A.A. Romaskevich, A.G. Zarre and L.E. Zhirkov. In this period Marr mostly dealt with Persian phonetics. M.A. Gaffarov's two-volume Persian-Russian dictionary (1914, 1927) was replaced by B.V. Miller's late in 1950. Many special terminological dictionaries were printed (Arends, Byalkovski, Mavlyutov, Peisikov, Same-dov, Smirnov, Tolas). R.A. Galunov brought out the first Russian-Persian dictionary, to be followed by another by Petrov, and still another by a collective group.

Modern Tadjik language was studied independently during the Soviet period. Zarubin showed the main differences between modern Persian and modern Tadjik. The sound system of Tadjik was studied to agree on some basis for a new alphabet. Latin was suggested in 1928 and Russian in 1939. Several monographs on grammar, morphology, syntax, lexicology (by M.F. Fasilov, M.F. Ismatullayev, A.A. Kerimova, B.N. Niyazmuhammedov and D.T. Tadjiev) appeared. In the 1950's, Russian-Tadjik and Tadjik-

Russian dictionaries were published. The Tadjik dialects spoken in Chirchik, Bukhara, Gissar, Baisun, Goron, Karadagh, Samarkand, Zerefshan and Shartuz are separately studied. There is material on Tadjik dialects in Afghanistan as well.

Work on modern Afghani (or *Pashto*) will be more fully covered below under «Afghan studies». *Ossetic* studies were first centered in Leningrad on account of Freiman and Tomashevski. Freiman had finished V.F. Miller's Ossetic-Russian-German dictionary which finally appeared with a hundred signatures and consisted mainly of the *Ironi* and *Digori* dialects. Most of Abayev's scientific publications, which, according to the list issued in his sixtieth birthday (1960), consists of 135 titles, are on Ossetic studies. Others known in the same field are the Georgian G.S. Akhviediani, B.A. Alborov, G.A. Dzagurov and their pupils (Bagayev, Bigulayev, Gagkayev, Kasayev and Kulayev).

Kurdish had been studied before 1917. A. Kazaryan, I. Marogulov and A. Shamlov had suggested a Kurdish alphabet first on Armenian, later on Latin script. I.A. Orbeli started teaching Kurdish at Leningrad University in 1931. There I.I. Tsukerman defended his dissertation on the declension of nouns in Kurdish, Yu. Yu. Avaliani on pronouns and K.K. Kurdoyev on the formation of compound verbs. In the 1950's, two Kurdish-Russian and Russian-Kurdish dictionaries were published. Work is also conducted in Armenia, where S. Movsesyan and A. Khachaturyan published on grammar. There is also an Armenian-Kurdish dictionary.

Zarubin again started the study of the *Baluchi*, spoken in some parts of the Turkmenian SSR. Sokolov continued this work. *Tati* and *Talysh* were studied by Miller, R.O. Shor, Sokolov and Grünberg. There is a Talysh-Russian-French dictionary and a monograph on the Talysh language. *Gilaki* and *Mazanderani* are two little known languages on the Caspian shore. V.I. Zavyalova, T.N. Pakhalina and Sokolov studied them. Zarubin had early started work on the very little-known *Pamiri* language. He organized a course in Leningrad in 1936. His pupil Pakhalina published two monographs on the *Ishkashimi* and the *Sarykoli* languages. Andreyev compiled a table for the *Yazghulam* verbs, A.K. Pisarchik published *Rushan* texts. Young scientists of Pamir origin (Doukhudoyev, Faizov, Karamshoyev, Karamhudoyev) are now studying Pamir dialects. Andreyev and E.M. Peshchereva published on the *Yaghnobi* language on the basis of an expedition to Yaghnob. A.L. Khromov published new material on the same. There is also a Yaghnobi-Russian dictionary.

Finally, the scale of the Iranian studies in the USSR may be measured by the fact that All-Union Conferences on Iranian philology take place almost once every two years.

B. The History of Iran :

Before 1917, philology and history were not clearly differentiated. Moreover, the Iranists were interested —apart from the language— in the political, religious and at best cultural life of that country. Only Barthold, who was not a Marxist, dealt with social antagonisms to some extent. Today, there is general periodization of the history of Iran. Secondly, emphasis is laid on the policies of the European powers towards that country.

It has been shown that Iran experienced a slave-owning society in the VIth B.C., the early feudal society being formed between the IIIth and Vth centuries A.D., developed feudalism to be established in the Xth century A.D. Struve had concluded in *Problema zarojdeniya, razvitiya i razlajeniya rabovladelcheskava obshestva Drevneva Vostoka* (1934) as well as *Ocherki sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy istorii Dr. Vostoka* (1954) that ancient Iran was based on the slave-owning formation with scattered free and semi-free communities. The characteristics of that formation was also worked upon by I.M. Dyakonov, U.B. Yusupov and A.G. Perikhanyan. Struve (*Arenda podatey f gosudartsve Ahemenidov*) and M.A. Dadamayev (*Iran pri pervih Ahemenidah*) have written on the Achaemenids. Struve (*Rodina zoroastrizma*), Tolztov and Trever accepted Khwarizm as the home of Zoroastrianism. If this is true, then the Achaemenids were not Zoroastrians, another important supposition of Struve.

M.E. Masson wrote on Nicae, the ancient capital of the Parthians (*Gorodishcha Nici f selenii Bagir i ih izucheniye*) and on farming in ancient Margiana (*Drenizemledelcheskaya kultura Margiani*), both publications being based on his archeological findings. Struve wrote on a people's uprising against Darius I in the Autumn of 522 B.C. He explains this revolt by the diffusion of democratic tendencies in Zoroastrianism. Between the years 1948 and 1960, about two-thousand clay fragments were found in the ancient site of New Nicae. Concerned with the wine consumption of the royalty, they are invaluable economic documents shedding light on the class features of the Arshakids.

N.V. Pigulevskaya has written on the Sassanid Iran, concentrating mostly on the fall of the slavery system and the rise of early feudalism. One

of her monographs is published in Paris as: *Les cités iraniennes dans les temps Arsacide et Sassanide* (1963). The author of many other works in Russian, she has established that the transition to feudalism had been completed in Iran in the III-VIIth centuries. She has utilized Greek, Byzantine, Middle Persian, Arabic and Syrian (for example: *Siriyskiy zakonnik*) sources in defense of her assertions. She has analyzed the rivalry between Sassanid Iran and Byzantium in caravan trade (*Vizantiyskaya diplomatiya i targovliya shelkom f V-VII vv.*; *Vizantiya na putyah f Indiyu*). Orbeli and Trever published on the material culture of the Sassanids (*Sasanidskiy metall*) and E.A. Pakhomov on Sassanid monuments in Caucasia (*Pehleviyskiye nadpisi Derbenda*; *K istolkovaniyu pehleviyskiy nadpisey Derbenda*; *Krupneyshiye pamyatniki sasanidskava stroitelstva f Zakavkazye*).

The special characteristics of feudalism in Iran were duly studied. Bartold, who wrote *Iran-istoricheskiy abzor, Myesta prikaspiyskiy ablastey f istorii musulmanskava mira* and *K voprosy o feodalizme f Irane*, was the earliest research on that topic. His celebrated pupil A.U. Yakubovski's *Feodalnoye obshchestva Sredney Azii* is a good work on feudal exploitation with topics touching Iran as well. He takes the *metayer* system as a dominating form of exploitation and explains how the *ikta'* turned into an inherited feudal estate from an Oriental sort of beneficiary. V.N. Zakhoder (*Istoriya vastochnava srednivekovya*, pp. 70-81, 86-96, 113-123; *Harasan i abraza-vaniye gosudartsva seljukov*), A.A. Alizade (*Zemelnaya palitika ilhanov f Azerbayjane*; *K voprosy ab institute ikta f Azerbayjane pri ilhanah*; *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Azerbayjana XIII-XIV vv.*) and A.M. Belenitski (*K istorii feodalnava zemlevladieniya f Sredney Azii i Irane f timuridskuyu epohy*; *K voprosy o sotsialnih atnasheniyah f Irane f hulaguidskuyu epohy*) have studied the feudal landowning categories in Iran-held territories under Hulagu, Timur and others. Alizade made provocative suggestions regarding the *kharaj*, *tarh*, *inju* and the like. I.P. Petrushevski, in his *Hamdullah Kazvini kak istochnik po sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy istorii Vost. Zakavkasya*, asserts that the edict of the Mongol Ghazan Khan established hereditary *ikta'* in 1303 (703 H.). He also suggested that *soyurgal* (*K istorii instituta soyurgala*) was a conditional land grant, that is, a further development of *ikta'*. The *soyurgals* were connected with court immunity as well as tax immunity. Only the latter had been characteristic of *ikta'*. Consequently, feudal dependence of the peasant on the owner of *soyurgal* was strengthened and central authority weakened. *Ikta'* and later *soyurgal* were also the means by which the Turks and the Monghuls ruled in Iran. Basing his conclusions on the *Vakıfs* and the *Mukatabat-ı*

Rashidi, Petrushevski examined the economy of the feudal state and the scattered slave-owning system in feudal Iran.

There has been considerable discussion on the binding of the Iranian peasant to the land. Bartold had suggested in his *K istorii krestyanskih dvijeniy f Persii* (p. 60) early in 1923 that there had been serfdom in Iran during the Monghul rule, that is, the peasant was prohibited to go from one land-owner to another. Alizade, later, concurred in that opinion and asserted in his *K voprosy ab institute ikta'*, that serfdom had been in existence even before the Monghuls. Petrushevski, on the other hand, concluded that there had not been serfdom in Iran prior to the XIIIth century and that the Monghuls had initiated it on account of decline in rural economy. Alizade objected to his views, Petrushevski repeating his opinions in response to that challenge. Yakubovski supported Petrushevski in this debate. Petrushevski's *Zemledeliye i agrarniye atnasheniya f Irane XIII-XIV vv.* examines land-ownership, irrigation and agricultural techniques after the Monghul conquest.

Class struggle in feudal Iran is naturally being studied. It was again Barthold who for the first time reviewed the Mazdakite movement of the Vth century and class antagonism in the towns in the XIIth century in *K istorii krestyanskih dvijenii f Persii*. He expressed in later publications that *Shi'ism* was a form of people's protest. Pugilevskaya's *Mazdakitskoye dvijeniye* is devoted to the uprising in Kuzistan around 550. Zakhoder also wrote on the relationship between *Shi'ism* and the people's movements of the Xth century. Taji Kadirova investigated peasant movements in Eastern Iran and Maveraunnahr towards feudal exploitation under the guise of *Shi'ism*. Bertels examined peasant and artisan participation in the Ismailite movement in *Nasir-i Hosrov i ismailizm*. Petrushevski also wrote on the Sarbadar movement (1337-1381), the Tabriz artisan uprising (1573) and the Guilan revolt (1629). N.D. Miklukho-Maklay examined the 1535-1536 movements in Iran.

Many historians dwelt on the late feudal period (XVI-XVIIIth centuries): O.A. Efendiyev on the internal and external policies of Shah Ismail, M.R. Arunova and K.Z. Ashrafyan on the domestic policies of Nadir Shah, E.M. Shahmaliyev on Safavid diplomacy and Dj. İbrahimov on social-economic set up.

The Soviets have printed photographic reproductions of old Iranian manuscripts, with critical introductions and sometimes translations. Ras-

hidaddin's *Djami' at-Tevarih* has been published, Nizam ul-Mulk's *Siyasat-name* and Baihaki's *Tarih-i Mas'udi* have been translated. A.N. Boldyrev has published *Tarih-i Badahshan* as well as the memoirs of Zaynaddin Vasifi. Miklukho-Maklay has brought out Muhammed Kasim's *Name-i 'alamara-i Nadiri*. This is the only existing Persian manuscript on Nadir Shah's history published in full fascimile form. Miklukho-Maklay has also offered to readers Iranian geographical works. Yu. E. Borschchevski published Muhammed ibn Hadjib Bekran's *Djahan-name*. A.A. Rakhmani brought out *Tarih-i Alam aray-i Abbasî* while Petrov and Arunova presented several *firman*s. Petrushevski published several articles bringing works of Rashidaddin and Seyfi to our attention. Pturidze in Tbilisi and A.D. Papazyan in Erevan issued two collections each containing *firman*s and other official Iranian documents. There are also two more volumes (Tbilisi) pertaining to agrarian relations only.

There is much research done about Iran in the last two-hundred years. We may put aside the pioneering but older works of Gurko-Kryazhin, Pavlovich and G.V. Shitov. M.S. Ivanov has written on the Babid movement (1939) and the 1905-1911 revolution (1957). The latter book is acclaimed as successful in describing the class compositions of those who adhered to the constitution and those who were against it. The attitudes of Britain and Tsarist Russia are also well illuminated. This work is much superior to the British Edward G. Brown's version of the same topic. Basing some of his judgements on the official reports of Colonel Lyakov that he found in the archives (filed as Nos. 1022, 1025, 1031 and 1033), Ivanov asserts that Brown used faked documents. Works on Iran's foreign policy belong, among others, to P.P. Bushev (*Gerat i anglo-iranskoye vayna 1856-1857 gg.*), M.A. Igamberdiyev (*Iran i mejdunarodniye atnasheniya pervoy treti XIX b*), and M.N. Ivanova (*Germanskaya agressiya f Irane f godi I-oy mirovoy vayni*). M.S. Ivanov, N.A. Khalfin (Kurds) and V.V. Trubetskoy wrote on Iran's nationalities. Other problems of Iran are being studied by several writers: A. Agani (Marxism in Iran), Sh. M. Badi (agrarian relations), A.V. Bashkirov (working class), M.Q. Ivanov (the oil concession), A.K. Lavrentyev (US policy), L.I. Miroshnikov (British policy), O.S. Melikov (the Riza Shah period), M.N. Ivanova (the national liberation movement), etc.

VI. Afghan Studies

Before 1917, N.A. Aristov, B.A. Dorn, V.V. Grigoryev and N.V. Khanykov represented the Afghan studies in Russia. The first Soviet work was A.E. Snesev's *Afganistan* (1921). The second was another book

by the same title comprised of several articles (1923). A year later, N.I. Vavilov and D.D. Bukinich went to that country and published in 1929 *Zemdelcheskiy Afganistan*, which was on the agricultural characteristics of that neighboring country. It was reprinted in 1959 in the 5-volume edition of the selected works of Vavilov. In 1926, M.S. Andreyev went to Afganistan and published *Po etnologii Afganistana*.

Soviet researchers interested themselves in British policy for Afghanistan. *Sinyaya kniga*, published in 1918, comprised Russian reports from India shedding light on Anglo-Russian friction in that part of the world. I. Reisner's *Anglo-ruskaya konventsia 1907g. i razdel Afganistana*, published in 1925, exposes the imperialistic policies of Britain and Tsarist Russia in connection with the 1907 Convention. His two other articles, both printed in 1928, further analyze British position and the new elements in Soviet policy.

The domestic scene of later years naturally attracted the attention of the researchers. The earliest works are by A.A. Garritski and N. Dneprovski. G. Ilynski studied the newly-launched reforms and many other Soviet investigators later interpreted the fall of Amanullah Khan and the rise of the reactionary Bacha-i Sakaî. For a long list of titles on this question, one may consult *Bibliografiya Afganistana* (pp. 163-170).

As to the general descriptions of the country, the earliest is Reisner's *Nezavisimiy Afganistan* and *Afganistan*. The study of the Pashtu language also began in these years. The famous Bertels published an article on the Kandahar dialect of Pashtu and later wrote on the grammar and phonetics of Pashtu in general. Individual researchers dwelt on the specific aspects of the country. P. Alexeyenkov described land holdings, G. Ilyinsky agrarian problems in the north and I.I. Palyukaitis the economic plans. N. Lavrov's historical study took the events from 1919 to 1936.

With the end of the 1930's a new period in Afghani studies had commenced. A new generation of scientists had been trained. Pashto was now taught at the Moscow Institute of Orientology by M.G. Aslanov who published teaching aids as well as on Afghani literature and folklore. Other works on language and literature came from the pens of N.A. Dvoryankov, T.I. Eromicheva, Z.M. Kalinina, M.I. Kozlov and L.S. Yatsevich. In the 1940's, Aslanov further published articles on language problems, including Afghani borrowings from Turkish. With long years of study, he published in 1966 a large Afghan-Russian dictionary.

Freiman had been the founder of Afghan studies in Leningrad, where Bogolyubov taught Pashtu. B.Z. Khalidov and A.G. Ganiev did the same

in Tashkent University. Recently, several Afghan dialects were studied. V.A. Efimov wrote on the Yakaulang dialect. D. I. Edelman described Katihi, Waigali, Ashkoon Dameli and Prasoon, which are known as the «Kâfir» dialects. V.A. Frolova studied the Baluchi in her *Baluchiskiy yazık*. L.N. Dorofeyeva investigated the Dari language in her *Yazık, farsi=kabulî*. Sokolova wrote on Shugnan-Rushan group and A.Z. Rosenfeld on the Darvaz dialects.

Since the end of the 1940's interest in Ancient and Medieval history grew. Several *firman*s, old manuscripts such as Nadir Shah's campaign in India and memoirs of Afghanis were translated. Several dealt with the history of Timurid Herat. Bibliography on this topic may be found in Bartold's *Sochineniya* (Vol. II, Part 2). Semenov and Miklukho-Maklay wrote on the Timurid Khorasan. Aslanov described the Roshaniya movement as a progressive event, in contradiction to Western interpretation, which denies its social content. Reisner's monograph on the development of feudalism in Afghanistan is an important book explaining the formation of the state.

Research encompasses the last few hundred years as well. Yu. V. Gankovski's *Imperiya Durrani* is an account of the administrative system of the Durrani. Making use of the Russian archives, Gankovski published new material on the political and trade relations between Russia and Afghanistan in the XVIIIth Century. Likewise, many wrote on the liberation struggle of the Afghanis. L.R. Gordon-Polonskaya published several articles on that topic. M.A. Badahojayev's book entitled *Barba Afganistana za nizavisimost* center around the events of 1838-1842 while N.A. Halfin's *Proval britanskoy agressii f Afganistane* is on the events of the XIXth and the beginning of the XXth Centuries.

There has been many Soviet publications on Afghanistan in recent times. R.T. Akhramovich wrote a book (*Gosudarstvennyy stroy Afganistana*) and several articles until 1957. In 1961 he wrote another monograph on the history of Afghanistan after the Second World War. There are some publications on Soviet-Afghan relations, the most notable of which is L.B. Teplinskiy's *Savyetsko-Afganskiye atnasheniya 1919-1960 gg: kratkiy ocherk*. This book and several other publications naturally draw attention to the good relations between the two countries. I think it is rather difficult to oppose the truth of this statement. One ought to remember that Afghanistan was the first country with which Soviet Russia had established diplomatic relations (apart from Germany and others as participants in the Brest Litovsk Treaty). British oppression that had hung so heavily on Afghanistan was pushed aside and a Soviet-Afghan Treaty was signed on

February 28, 1921. Relations have been good ever since. Soviet appraisal of the domestic scene remains, however, objective though friendly. Yu. M. Golovin's *Gosudarstvenny kapitalizm f Aghanistane*, M.G. Pikulin's *Ocherki po agrarnomy voprosy f Afganistane* and N.I. Chernyahovskaya's *Razvitiye pramishlennosti i palajeniye rabocheva klassa Afganistana* are examples of this approach. N.M. Gurevich mainly wrote on the financial system of that country. A.D. Davudov discussed the development of capitalist relations in agriculture in his *Razvitiye kapitalisticheskikh atnashenii f zemledelii Afganistana*. For other sources, one may see *Bibliografiya Afganistana*, pp. 174-192.

One can find some publications concerning Soviet ethnography of Afghanistan. A.A. Guber, A.G. Gafferberg and E.L. Steinberg had published on the tribes between the Soviet Union and North-Western Afghanistan. There is some information on the Pamirs, the Tadjiks, the Pathans, the Hazaras, the Djamshids, the Nuristanees, the Uzbeks (Northern Afghanistan), the Turkmens (North-Western Afghanistan) and the Baluchis.

Sovremanny Afganistan is a general reference book giving information from natural conditions to government. *Afganistan* (1964) was a *spravochnik* for practical use. The two-volume *Istoriya Afganistana* by V.M. Masson and B.A. Romodin is a recent and detailed account.

VII. Central Asian Studies

A. Archeology :

Russian historians had visited Central Asia: V.V. Bartold in 1893-1894 and 1904, P.I. Lerkh in 1864, N.I. Veselovski in 1884-1885 and V.A. Zhukovski in 1890 and 1896. The Soviet period, however, witnessed a remarkable progress. Archeological surveys were conducted at the new construction sites. A.A. Semyenov went to Southern Turkmenia, B.P. Denike to Termez, M.E. Masson to Ferghana, Kirghizia and Southern Kazakhstan, A.Y. Yakubovski to Shahrissyabz and Sir Derya and D.D. Bukinich to the Anau sites. These people penetrated deeper and deeper into the pre-Islamic past of Central Asia. The remains at the Mug Mountain were discovered in 1932-1933 as well as the specimens near Termez. On what had been founded and evaluated so far, Struve concluded that there was a specific slave-holding formation in the Ancient East. He expressed such views in *Problema zarojdeniya, razvitiya i pazlojeniya rabovladelcheskava Drevneva Vostoka*. More excavations were carried out at Termez, Amu Derya, Ferghana, Nysa, Bukhara and Tali-Barzu. An epoch of urban civilisations were discovered. Historians immediately raised the question of the socio-economic character

of this epoch. Tolstov called it the communal-slave formation. More expeditions took place at Djanbas Kale (at Khorezm) and Teshik Tash (at Uzbekistan). Medieval Dandenakan was investigated, the middle reaches of Sir Derya was tackled. Toprak Kale and Koy Krylgan Kale were uncovered. Consequently, an archaeological map of Kazakhstan has been published. Apparently, there was a pictographic writing system in this area in the third millennium B.C. The sites of towns have been established and ancient trade routes traced. The excavations at Pendzhikent was a laboratory for investigating the early Medieval period. Many volumes on these expeditions have been published. What is missing are general monographs summarizing these findings. There are individual successful summarizing works, of course. B.G. Gafurov's *Istoriya tadjikskava naroda* is an example. Soviet archeology is a method to elucidate the character of the economy, the social relations based on it, the origin of cultures and the ethnic peculiarities of peoples. What has been done in Central Asia can better be evaluated when one considers for a moment what has been done along these lines in the neighboring countries.

B. The History of Central Asia and Kazakhstan :

Soviet studies were based on Marxist historiography investigating the political and economic history of this region. Lenin's presentation of Central Asia in the past had been as a colony of Tsarist Russian capitalism. The Turkestan Oriental Institute in Tashkent was founded in 1918 and the Turkestan State University in 1920. Thus, Tashkent became a major center of Oriental studies. In 1926, a state repository of Oriental manuscript was founded. This treasure house is now one of the richest of its kind in the world.

Summary histories of the Central Asian republics may now be found in the six-volume *Istoriya SSSR*. There are of course separate histories on Kazakhstan (M. Vyatkin), Tadjikistan (B.G. Gafurov), Uzbekistan, Kirghizistan, etc. They are also available in the local tongues, such as *Azerbeyjan Tarihi* in three volumes.

Considerable progress has been made in the study of the pre-Islamic epoch. Struve wrote on the Achaemenian empire, Tolstov on Ancient Khorezm, Trever on the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom, Masson on the Parthian empire and Yakubovski on Sogdiana. The discovery in 1933 of Sogdian documents at the Mug Mountain enabled scholars to visualize the Sogdian social system and economic life. *Sogdinskiy sbornik* of 1934 may still be consulted with profit.

Yakubovski mainly dwelt on the feudal epoch from the Arabic conquest to the onslaught of the Uzbek tribes under Sheybani Khan in the XVIth Century. The significance of *soyurgal*, or the latter-day institute of feudal dependence was already referred to above. P.P. Ivanov's history of Bukhara, Khiva and Kokand in the XVI - XIXth Centuries were first comprehensive attempts at a Marxist interpretation of Central Asia in modern times.

Local scholars have contributed many works on specific problems: history of irrigation (Ya. G. Gulyamov, O.M. Dzhumayev), agrarian relations based on *vakifnames* (R.G. Mukminova), Medieval Shahrstan (N.N. Negmatov, S.G. Khmelnitski), the rebellion of Isatay Taymanov (V.F. Shakhmatov), the formation and the disintegration of the pastoral nomadic communities in Kazakhstan (V.F. Shakhmatov), Bukharan Emirate (B.I. Iskandarov), popular movements in Tadzhikistan (I.A. Stetsenko), the land-water relations in Ferghana (A. Djivanmerdiyev), the early social system of the Kazakhs (S.Z. Zimanov), the Kirghiz under the Kokand Khanate (K. Usanbayev), land-rent and tax in former Bukhara (A.A. Semenov), etc.

An important event in the lives of the Central Asiatic peoples was of course their conquest by the Russians during the Tsarist times. Although condemning the Tsarist period as imperialistic, the Soviet historians chose to use the term «incorporation» (*korporatsiya, abyedinyeniye*), more often than «conquest» (*zaboyevaniye, pakareniye, pobyeda*). One explanation that they offer is as follows: the population in some regions were suffering so severely under the exploitation of the local khans and beys that they were passive to, or in greeting terms with the invading Tsarist troops (*zavatchiki*), expecting something better from them and not knowing what was to befall on them.

Much has been written on the last-mentioned theme: Kazakhstan (N.G. Apollova, E.B. Bekmakhanov, A. Tursunbayev), Kirghizistan (B.D. Dzhagerchinov, K. Usanbayev), Turkmenistan (A. Karryev), etc. On the general «incorporation», one may see works of Khalfin, A.M. Aminov, A. Babahodjayev and others. The economic policy of the ruling circles of the Russian Empire is also dealt with: E.N. Kusheva and M.K. Rozhkova have analyzed the economic policy of the Russian bourgeoisie and the economic ties of Russia with Central Asia. The socio-philosophical situation of those nations at that time are also commented upon: thought in various regions and the views of leading thinkers (such as Chokan Valikhanov) are examined by Z. Sh. Radzhabov, G.K. Beysembiyev, M.K. Ilyusizov and I.M. Muminov.

There are some subjects that have caused wide discussion. The nature of feudalism among nomadic nations and the characteristics of Central Asian «Jadidism» are the outstanding two. Regarding the former, discussion centered on whether the ownership of land (grazing land and water) or the ownership of cattle was decisive for the feudal order of the nomads. The debate started at the 1954 Tashkent session in connection with Potapov's and Ilyasov's reports and continued on the pages of *Voprosi Istorii* and *Istoriya SSSR*. Regarding the latter, the discussion started in 1963 and summed up by I.S. Braginski in *Istoriya SSSR* (No. 6, 1965).

Many original historical sources have been republished or examined. G.I. Savitski published his reports of Graeco-Roman writers on Central Asia. I have already referred to Kovalevski's translation of Ibn Fadlan's journey based on a manuscript found in Meshed in 1923. I.I. Umnyakov published several papers on the Turkic nations according to the geographer Ishak el-Hussein. The Historico-Archeographic Institute published the *posolski prikaz* on the economic relations of Muscovy with the Central Asian khanates. The Institute of Oriental Studies brought out materials on the history of the Karakalpaks in *Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya* (VII, 1935). The official Khivan archives and the economic records of other big feudals were discovered and published. The Institute of Oriental Studies later printed materials on the history of the Turkmens. The situation in Kokand is reflected in a manuscript found by Gulyamov.

The history of Central Asia has been aided by several cultural records. *Kashf el-Mahdjub* by Ali b. Uthman, *Siyasetname* by Nizam el-Mulk, *Jami-ut-tevarih* by Rashidaddin, *Badai el-vekdâi* by Zaynaddin Vasifî, *Ubaidullahname* by Mir Muhammed Amini Bukharî, *Baburname*, *Humâyunnname* by Gulbadan Begum, and *Tevarih-i Badakhshan* have been republished. Ibn Sina's canon of medical science, Firdousi's *Shahname* (in six vols.), Abu Reyhan Birunî's selected works, Alisher Navoi's *Khazoin ul-Maoni*, Saadî's *Gulistan*, Omar Khayyam's treatises as well as A. Fami, A. Jami and A. Donish's selected works were either translated or published in the original.

In the study of the culture of the Central Asiatic nations two names are outstanding: Sadreddin Aynî and Mukhtar Auezov. The former has been the founder of Tadjik Soviet literature. His *Kulliyat* in the Tadjik language as well as his study of the Tadjik literature for the last ten centuries have been published. Aynî has been able to bring out the folk roots of literature and express it in poetical terms not like archive objects. Hence,

Mayakovski's address to Pushkin as «ya lyublyu vas no jibova, a ni momiyu» is perhaps also appropriate for Aynî. Auezov has achieved something similar in respect to the Kazakh literature and culture. There are of course various other histories for the literature of several Central Asiatic republics. A list of works on the individual writers would be too long to cite here. The same is true of the critical writings on those men-of-letters.

VIII. Indian Studies

A. Indian Philology :

The Indian classics *Bhagavadgita* and *Chakuntala* were printed in Russian as early as the XVIIIth Century. Nevertheless, they were translations from the European languages. More serious study, which started in the next century, was connected with the following names: O. Böhlingk, R. Lenz, S.F. Oldenburg, I.P. Minayev and F.I. Stcherbatsky. A Sanskrit dictionary was published in two editions. (Its reprint as late as 1959 shows that it was a rather important work that did not become obsolete.) The study of Sanskrit and Vedic was taken up in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, Kharkov, Kiev, Odessa and Yuriev. I.P. Minayev's study of the Pali language was translated into French in 1874 and into English a year later. The study of Buddhism was another topic which was of interest to the Russians. Oldenburg had organized the study of Northern Buddhism when he founded the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* series in 1897. By the time of the Revolution, then, there were two basic trends: Sankritology and Buddhology.

In the early part of the post-revolutionary period, Stcherbatski is doubtless the most predominating name. The author of about fifty studies or translations from original texts, he was in fact one of the world's most renowned expert on Buddhism. Even in the early 1920's when Western Europe was not in recognizing terms with the new Soviet régime, his works were published there. His two-volume work on Buddhist logic, originally published in Leningrad in 1930-1932, was printed once more by Mouton and Company in 1958. His talented pupil Ye. Ye. Obermiller could do little serious work, including one connected with *Abhisamayalankara*, during his short life (1901-1935). In Moscow, R.O. Shor studied Vedic, A.M. Meervarth concentrating on classical Indian drama and B.A. Larin on Indian poetics. V.I. Kalyanov has done the full translation of *Mahabharata*. The *Arthashastra* has been rendered into Russian by a team of five and is appropriately sub-titled as *Nauka politiki*.

The study of the New Indo-Aryan languages was suggested first by Minayev. In 1921, M.I. Tubianski introduced Bengali at Petrograd. Two years later, A.P. Barannikov started teaching Urdu. Until 1936 several grammars and readers of Hindi, Urdu, Bengali and Marathi were ready. An Urdu-Russian dictionary, however, was published in 1951. (It was prepared before the war.) Interest in modern writings had started only in the 1940's. But after the 1950's, publication activity grew fast. A list of the language books would give an idea: Hindi (T.E. Katenina), Urdu (Z.M. Dimshits), Bengali (Ye. M. Bikova), Assamese (V.D. Babakayev), Marathi (T. Ye. Katenina), Gujarati (L.V. Savelieva), Punjabi (N.I. Tolstaya), Kannada (M.S. Andronov), Malayalam (Eh. Sekhar, Yu. Ya. Glazov), Tamil (M.S. Andronov), Oriya (B.M. Karpushkin), Sindhi (R.P. Yegorova) and Telugu (Z.N. Petrunicheva).

Articles on the Indian languages are necessarily diverse: for example, the category of mood in Hindi, the verb conjugation system in Bengali, the infinitive in Urdu, the noun cases in Marathi, the compound sentences in Punjabi, etc. There is at least one dictionary for every one of these languages. The considerable progress in Indian lexicography is primarily due to V.M. Beskrovni, a great authority on the New Indo-Aryan languages. There is little, however, on the Indian dialects. Andronov wrote on the Tamil dialects and Oranski on the Parya.

There is of course similar interest in writers who use these languages. Studies have been made on the Hindi (Prem Chand, J. Kumar, S. Pant, J. Prasad, Yashpal), Urdu (K. Chandar, M. Iqbal, S.H. Manto), Bengali (R. Tagore, Sh. Chattopadhyay), Tamil (S. Bharati), Telugu (Shri Shri) and Malayalam (Vallathol) writers.

Interest in the classical Indian literature is also continuing. Translation of the following narrative literature have been made: *Pancatantra*, *Vikramacarita*, *Chukasaptati*, *Jatakamala*, *Vetalapancavimchatika*. Interest in Ancient Indian culture seems to have been revived in the 1950's by V.S. Vorobiov-Desiatovski, who was apparently a very talented person. But early death (29) cut short the good work he had started. He was working on unique Sanskrit manuscripts from the VII-IXth Centuries as well as on Brahmin manuscripts. He only had time to publish a part of the *Kachyapaparivarta*. Bongard-Levin and Volkova translated the *Achokavadanamala* manuscript, Pankratov and Tiomkin published a part of *Bhavanakrama*. Sirkin translated and analyzed *Atmabodha*, *Kamasutra* and *Upanishads*. *Dhammapada*'s translation by Toporov is acclaimed as «a big event» in Indology.

One must add that the modern computing techniques have opened up new horizons in the study of Indian philology. In 1964, a group of philologists under Yu. V. Knorozov cooperated with the Institute of Scientific and Technical Information of the Academy of Sciences to analyze some Proto-Indian texts by the use of machines. The first results were published in 1965 as *Predvaritelnoye saabshcheniye ab isslyedovanii protoindiyskih tekstov*.

B. The History, Economy and Culture of the Indian Sub-continent :

The earliest works are the treatise of Russian ambassadors and merchants who described their impressions of India. There can also be found notes of sympathy for the peoples of this sub-continent in the enlightened Russian writers such as Novikov, Radischev, Chernishevski, Dobrolyubov and Belinski. As well-known, Marx and Engels had devoted a special attention to the colonial problem in India. In Lenin's works, there are frequent references to the Indian national liberation movement.

The Russian translations of the most important Indian documents enabled the Soviet generation of researchers to carry on deeper analysis. The large amount of material that accumulated throughout the years enabled the Indologists to formulate their own scientific conceptions about the historical process in India from the Ancient Times to the present in four volumes: *Noveyshaya Istoriya Indii*, *Novaya Istoriya Indii*, *Drevnyaya Istoriya Indii* and *Srednevekovaya Istoriya Indii*.

An important problem in the study of Ancient India was the predominating socio-economic system. A majority of the immediate post-revolutionary Indologists agreed that the Asiatic mode of production existed for some time during the ancient period. Later, it was asserted that slave-ownership and feudalism co-existed for the most of the time. The latter opinion was formulated in the 1930's and 1940's. But even then it was noted that the structure of the society was different from the Ancient Greek and Roman. G.F. Ilyin, who argued that slavery in India flourished during the latter 500 B.C., described the characteristics of exploitation. Bongard-Levin, who studied the Mohenjo-Daro and Harrapa inscriptions, concluded that the internal reasons were the cause of Harrapa's decline and not necessarily the «Aryan conquest» of India.

Regarding the Middle Ages, it was again asserted in the 1920's and the early 1930's that the Asiatic mode of production was prevalent in India.

Reisner, however, supported in 1932 the opinion that Medieval India was feudal. Likewise, A.M. Osipov, in his *Kratkii ocherk istorii Indii do X veka*, concluded that early feudal relations were predominant in the early class society in India. He also noted that slavery was ever-present. Modern Soviet Indologists date the beginning of feudal relations from the Vth century and assert that it was more or less firmly established in the VIIth century. Osipov, Antonova and Medvedev generally concur with this opinion.

Ownership of land is of primary importance for an understanding of this problem. For some time, Soviet scholarship assumed that state ownership was universal in India during the Middle Ages. Reisner showed in *Novaya istoriya kolonialnikh i zavisimikh stran* that private ownership started to become prevalent with the XVIIIth century. E.N. Komarov's and N.I. Semyenova's investigation of the same problem regarding Bengal and the Punjab respectively confirmed Reisner's views. Not only the ownership of land, but also the forms of exploitation on private and state property changed. Popular movements on the part of the peasantry have also been studied. Reisner's *Narodniye dvizheniya f Indii f XVII-XVIII v.* sums up the role of popular movements in the pre-colonial period.

Modern times is of course studied in diversity. The colonial régime and the national liberation movement was first outlined again by Reisner in his *Ocherki klassovoy barby f Indii*. Two different opinions came to the fore as to the level of development at the time of British colonization. One school asserted that state ownership and the caste system had retarded development and prevented accumulation necessary for capitalist development. K.A. Antonova's *Ocherki abshchestvennykh atnasheniy i politicheskaya stroya Mogolskoy vremeni Akbara* (1952) and *Angliyskoye zavoyevaniye Indii f XVII vv.* (1958) express this opinion. The second school, however, believes that the traditional production methods were fast disintegrating and early capitalist formation were starting to appear. Hence, colonization retarded India's development. This is, for instance the opinion of V.I. Pavlov in *Formirovaniye Indiy skoy burjuvazi*. Indian crafts were, thus, undermined with the import of English material. This view, then, refutes the opinion (of Antonova and others) that British colonization actually led to the decay of Indian feudalism and the flourishing of capitalist relations. It seems more correct that rudiments of capitalism were destroyed by colonialism, some «offshoots» to be «replanted» towards the end of the XIXth century and only in close ties with the metropolis. A.I. Chicherov's *Ekonomicheskoye razvitiye indii*, which is actually a history of crafts and trade in the XVI - XVIIIth centuries, may be read in this connection.

The Soviet Indologists have also studied the national liberation movement. The events of 1857-1859 stand out as important in Indian history. Was the uprising a reactionary feudal mutiny, as most English sources seem to review it? *Narodnoye vostaniye f Indii*, a collective work published in 1957, on the 100th Anniversary of the uprising, sheds fresh light on various aspects of the question, including the motive force behind the «Sepoy» rebellion. Further, Osipov's *Velikoye bosstaniye f Indii 1857-1959 gg.* analyzes the social composition of the participants. The study of India's struggle for freedom necessarily needs a deep analysis of that society, the attitude of different classes and their role in politics.

The condition of the Indian working class is of course looked into. L.A. Gordon's *Iz istorii rabocheva klassa Indii* is a comparatively recent book on the workers of Bombay. V.V. Balabushevitch's numerous articles between 1926 and 1954 give a general outline of the Indian working class movement. I. Hakimov and L. Shapashnikova's *K istorii rabocheva dvijeniya f Indii* is a compact single study. A.M. Dyakov's *Natsionalno-osvoboditel'naya barba narodov Indii i rabochiye dvijeniye na pervom etape obsheva krizisa kapitalizma* is a combination of the national liberation and the working class movements. Soviet research shows a close connection between the movement against colonial oppression and the struggle for workers' rights.

The agrarian-peasant problem occupied a large portion in Indological bibliography. The early writings of Reisner, B. Seigel and R.A. Ulyanovski asserted that feudalism was being continually undermined by developing capitalism. Beginning with the latter 1940's, however, a contrary opinion was suggested. This time it was asserted that the traditional Indian village was not collapsing but strengthening on account of the survival of the feudal shell. Nevertheless, not too many people adhered to this point of view. G.G. Kotovski in *Agrarniye reformy f Indii* dealt with the development of capitalism in Indian agriculture. Various agrarian factors that support—or hinder—this development are the topics of V.G. Rastyannikov and M.A. Maksimov's *Razvitiye kapitalizma f selskom hazyaystve sovremennoy Indii*.

The history, ideology, role and the leaders of the national bourgeoisie is seriously studied. It was the national bourgeoisie after all which had been the leading force in the national liberation movement. Many have written on this subject: Reisner, Seigel, Ulyanovski, Dyakov, Balabushevitch, Ehicherov, Pavlov and Komarov, whom I have already referred to. Pav-

lov's book on the formation of the Indian capitalist class, Reisner and G.K. Shiroskov's *Sovremennaya indiiskaya bourzhuaziya* as well as Dyakov's *Natsionalniy vopros i angliiskiy imperializm f Indii* and *Natsionalniy vopros f sovremennoy Indii* may especially be noted.

The leading economic problems are the economic independence of India, the relationship between the state and private sectors, small and large scale industrial production and the role of foreign capital. A.I. Levkovski's *Asobennosti razvitiya kapitalizma f Indii* exposes the aims of British capital in colonial times and explains the reasons for the crisis during colonial rule, thereby necessitating a state sector. Pavlov devoted two books to US economic expansion in that area. S.M. Melman's work is about the foreign monopolistic capital in the economy of India and Reisner's book on the struggle between the national and foreign capital.

Work on Indian ideology and culture is still continuing. *Kultura sovremennoy Indii* (by eleven authors) summarizes the ideological life of independent India. Some materials on the history of Indian philosophy was published by A.M. Pyatigorski in 1962. Three years later, N.P. Anikeyev brought out a study showing the struggle between materialistic and idealistic thought. The heritage of Roy, Ghosh, Ehatopadhaya, Vivekananda, Gandhi and others is studied individually or collectively.

Studies on *Pakistan* is naturally a new phenomena. The state itself was non-existent before 1947. Hence, it was taken up as a part of undivided India. It was in 1957 that the Pakistan Section was established in the Institute of Oriental Studies. Prior to 1957, however, there had been monographs or brochures on Pakistan. *Bibliografiya Indii* has a number of titles covering the movement for the creation of Pakistan. After 1957, works on Moslem nationalism appeared. There were publications on Syed Ahmed Khan, Muhammed Iqbal, the Jamaat-i Islamî Party, etc. For example, M.T. Stepanyants' *Filosofiya i Sotsiologiya f Pakistane* is an attempt to understand and explain the Pakistan phenomenon through the Moslem philosophical writings. Gankovski's *Narodî Pakistana* is devoted to the ethnological history of the Pakistanis, and *Natsionalniye dvijeniya f Pakistane* analyzes the national movement. There is a book by V.A. Romodin on the Pathans and an essay on the Baluchi by M.G. Pikulin. L.P. Gordon-Polonskaya's *Musulmanskiye techeniya f abshestvennoy jizni Indii i Pakistana* explains the religious movements.

B.G. Rastyannikov and S.A. Kuzmin tried to examine Pakistan's economy in a general setting in three books (1958-1960). The same two

authors and Gordon-Polonskaya dwelt on agrarian relations in three books and two essays. Gankovski and Polonskaya together published *Istoriya Pakistana*. Books on government, political parties, Indo-Pakistan relations and the people of the country were written by the younger generation of researchers. For instance, T. Ruziyev's *Rabochiy klass Pakistana* was on the working class (1966). In the same year, the first large *Spravochnik* on Pakistan was published.

There are six books on *Nepal* and two on *Ceylon*. The ones on Nepal cover the history, government, economy, population, and trade of that country. The first book on Ceylon is a collection of essays while the second is on Buddhism in Ancient and Medieval Ceylon.

IX. South-East Asian Studies

A. Philology :

The study of the South-east Asian languages started towards the end of the 1950's. The first all-union conference on that topic was held at the Leningrad State University in 1964. These studies embrace Vietnamese, Thai, Laotian, Burmese, Khmer, some Malaya-Polynesian languages (such as Indonesian, Javanese, Tagal), the Thai and Tibeto-Burmese dialects spoken in China and Vietnam (Tibetan, Chuang, etc.).

There had been of course some work on Vietnamese as early as 1934. But later works —of M.V. Gordina, for instance— were of dissertation calibre. Previously, Gordina as well had devoted several papers to Vietnamese phonetics. N.K. Duong wrote a dissertation on the system of tones and vowels of that languages. In the general field of phonology again, there have been various publications on Burmese since 1958. The Burmese tonal system was analyzed by N.D. Andreyev, Gordina and O.A. Timofeyeva. In 1966, V.G. Zlatoverkhova brought out a book on the phonetics of Burmese.

As to morphology and syntax, a description of Vietnamese grammar may be found in *Vyetnamskiy yazık*. In several articles, I.S. Bystrov investigated verbs expressing directed motion. Yu. K. Lekomtsev's paper is a general examination of Vietnamese verbs. The adjective has been the subject of N.V. Stankevich's several papers. I.E. Alyoshina wrote on the sentence structures. Several dealt with other morphological problems. *Birmanski yazık* is on the grammatical structure of the Burmese. V.P. Sadovnikov

wrote on the category of the predicative. D.I. Yelkovkov's papers are mostly on word formation. N.V. Omelianovich's dissertation deals with the questions of Burmese syntax. Yu. A. Gorgoniyev's *Himerskiy yazık* is the most important publication on the Khmer language. D.I. Yelovkov and others have written on the same subject. L.N. Morev's *Osnovi sintaksisa tayskava yazıka* is on the Thai language. So are several writings of Yu. M. Osipov, U.L. Blagonravova, V.K. Vasilieva and others. The first two have dissertations on some aspect of Thai.

There is a host of publications as comparative studies, showing the general system or classification. Examples are: Vietnamese and Chinese (V.M. Solntsev); Chinese and Thai (Yu. A. Gorgoniyev); Burmese, Tamil and Khmer (D.I. Yelovkov); Vietnamese, Laotian and Thai (I.G. Zisman), etc. The problem of the classification of the South-East Asian languages is not yet settled. The boundaries of Austronesian group, its ties with the Tibeto-Chinese and the Malayo-Polynesian languages and the origin of Vietnamese still pose controversial questions. There are also Russian dictionaries for Vietnamese, Burmese, Thai and Khmer.

I have noted above that the Austronesian languages were attracting the attention of some Soviet scholars. E.D. Polivanov had turned towards this group of languages while studying Japanese. He postulated that some of them had Japanese roots. N.A. Nevski studied Tsu, one of the tongues spoken on Taiwan. L.A. Mervart started teaching Bahasa Indonesian at the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies. The first important publication on that was by N.D. Andreyev. A.S. Teselkin and N.F. Aliyeva brought out their *Indoneziskiy yazık*. Teselkin also wrote on Javanese and Ancient Javanese-Kavi. V.A. Makarenko's dissertation is on Tagal, which is treated by others as well. A.P. Pavlenko wrote on the Sundanese language. V.D. Arakin and L.A. Kartashava have studied Malagasy.

It can be seen that some beginning has been made in many of the fields within the general framework of the South-East Asian languages. However, considering what needs to be done, Soviet scholarship is still in its infancy.

B. The History and Economy of South-East Asia :

In contrast to the pre-Revolutionary interest in Turkey, the Arab world, Iran, India and China, there is practically no material on the history and the economy of the countries of South-East Asia. This is an exception to the general rule. It is true that the Russian naturalists have made expeditions to the Malay Archipelago. The ethnographer and anthropologist

Miklukho-Maklai, V.M. Arnoldi and A.N. Krasnov have written on the islands of the Far East. P.I. Pashino, I.P. Minayev and others did the same for Burma. The Russian Consul at Djakarta wrote *Tropicheskaya Gollandiya* summarizing his five-year residence on Java. In other words, they were mostly travel notes.

The post-Revolutionary period naturally emphasized the policies of the Great Powers in that area, the national liberation movements as well as social and economic problems. But interest was at first in general terms. It was A.A. Guber, who first dealt with the individual countries. He published two books on Indonesia in 1932 and two on the Philippines in 1937. In *Indoneziya : Sotsialno-ekonomicheskiye ocherki*, he relates Indonesia's social system before the advent of the Dutch, the consequences of foreign exploitation, the agrarian characteristics, the state of capitalist development and the native bourgeoisie. He naturally summarizes the national liberation movement as it existed at that time and even attempts to explain the situation of the workers and peasants. In *Hoze Rizal*, he (with O.K. Rukovskaya) relates the role of this man's ideas in the awakening of the Filipino's national consciousness. The authors have also dwelt on the limitations of Rizal's philosophical and political ideas. His study entitled *K istorii pronikoveniya gollandtsev f Indoneziyu* embraces Dutch conquest and the role of the East India Company.

Around the 1940's, there appeared more interest in the individual countries. B.M. Dantsig published his *Indokitaya*. The war, of course, attracted attention to Japanese expansion in the south seas. In 1938 the Pacific Institute was established. Leaving aside a number of articles and essays until 1945, considerable progress could be seen after the war. Guber and others wrote on the foundation of the Indonesian Republic. V.Y. Vasilieva published a monograph on Indo-China. The foundation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the war of resistance of that country naturally led to numerous pamphlets and articles even at the beginning of the events. Studies on Malaya (G.L. Bondarevski, A.I. Levkovski and V.S. Rudnev), Burma (V.F. Vasiliev and A.N. Uzianov) and the Philippines (O.I. Zabozyayeva and G.I. Levinson) appeared. Most of them were on the national liberation movement and the crisis of the colonial system. While the publications of the 1930's were on the Japanese policies in this area, more attention is now paid to the policies of the Western Powers.

In 1956, the Institute of Oriental Studies established a department of South-East Asia with sections on the history, economy and the contem-

porary problems of these countries. The Institute of World Economy and International Relations, the Institute of Ethnography, the Moscow Institute of International Relations, the Chair of History of the Countries of the Far East and South-East Asia at the Moscow University and the Leningrad University also deal with this area either as a special field of interest or as a part of their general studies. College and university textbooks now include chapters on the history of South-East Asia.

Soviet scholarship at present draws on the original sources. Previously, (even during the Soviet times) French, English, German, Dutch and Japanese material was used, though critically. Now, there are historians, economists and sociologists who read the original documents in the languages, even dialects of South-East Asia. Many Vietnamese, Burmese or Indonesian documents have been translated and published in Russian. There are also publications from the old Russian foreign policy archives. The two documentary releases, namely *Palitika yevropeyskih derjav f yugo-Vostochnoy Azii* and *Palitika kapitalisticheskikh derjav i natsionalno-osvoboditelnoye dvizheniye f Yugo-Vostochnoy Azii : 1891-1917*, are important. There were also reports by Russian diplomats on Indonesia, the Philippines and Burma. These were published in 1962.

The interest to study the Ancient and Medieval history of this area was aroused after the 1950's. Certainly, there was some information about these periods in the earlier works. But they were only generalizations. D.V. Deopik and A.I. Mukhlinov, for instance, devoted their works to the social system in Ancient and Medieval Vietnam. Such works are representative of the younger generation. I.V. Mojheiko's researches on primitive Burma or L.A. Sedov's work on Angkor Cambodia are of the same type. These and other publications led to the revision of many previous conceptions especially concerning the feudal periods in the histories of these countries.

Soviet historians are now going deeply into the study of the national liberation struggle in this area. A.B. Belenky's *Natsionalnoye probujdeniye Indonezii* (1965) is an important Marxist study about the struggle of the Indonesians against the Dutch colonizers. N.V. Rebrikova did the same for Thailand, V.A. Tiurin for Malaya, Y.O. Levtonova for the Philippines and U.P. Dementiev for Indo-China. There are of course books on the particular aspects of the anti-colonial struggle. I.A. Ognetrov's *Vosstaniye Tey-shonov vo Vyetname* is about the Tay-son rebellion in Vietnam in 1771-1802. M.G. Kozlova's book on Burma describes the circumstances on the eve of the British conquest. Certainly, attention has been devoted to the

history of Vietnam. V.F. Mordvinov's *Natsionalno-osvoboditelnoye dvijeni-vo Vyetname* is one. A.G. Budanov, A.G. Mazayev, S.A. Mkhitaryan and I.M. Schedrov's works are all on Vietnam. Books by A.S. Kaufman, A.F. Malov, A.P. Uzianov and V.F. Vasilieva are on the history, economics, the state system and independence movement of Burma. V.A. Zharov's monograph is on recent Indonesian history. G.I. Levinson's book is a study of the Philippines from 1941 to 1957. V.S. Rudnev's *Malayya* is a history of independent Malaya. The same author's *Ocherki noveyshey istorii Malayi* is a compilation of essays devoted to the political history of Malaya between 1918 and 1957. N.V. Reprikova's serious study entitled *Tailand* was the first broad historical survey of Siam. Laotian history has been studied by V.V. Pavlovski, G.P. Popov, V.A. Kozhevnikov and R.A. Popovkina. G.A. Levinson's book on the Philippines treats the inter-war period. V.F. Vasiliyev's *Ocherki istorii Birmi* is a collection of essays on Burmese history from 1885 to 1947. There are several monographs on the consequences of Japanese occupation of South-East Asia.

The working class movement in this area is well covered. Kaufman wrote on the working class movement in Burma, Mkhitaryan in Vietnam, Levinson in the Philippines and A.I. Ionova in Indonesia. S.N. Rostovski's book is on the same topic in three South-East Asian countries - Burma, Malaya and Indonesia. There are also a host of articles dealing with the place of the working class movement in the anti-imperialist struggle.

There are also publications on the admittedly-complex nationalities question. N.A. Simoniya's *Nasileniye kitayskoy natsionalnosti f stranah Yugo-Vostochnoy Azii* has been translated in the United States. There are other works by V.I. Iskoldski, L.M. Dyomin, A.G. Mazaiyev and Y.V. Maretin.

In recent times many publications centered around neo-colonialism. R.A. Ulianovski's book, published in 1963, was a general monograph in which the author analyses US policy in Asia and its attitude towards the industrialization of the developing countries. Several others (N.V. Rebrikova, A.K. Lavrentiev and A.S. Sheen) make the same analysis in respect to certain individual countries.

The economy of these countries after independence is also studied. The main questions for analysis were the consequences of nationalizations, the role of the state and private sectors, the position of foreign capital, the effect of independence on the social structure and the like. G.A. Martushe-

va's *Yugo-Vostochnaya Aziya posli Ftoroy Miravoy Vayni* is a general analysis of the economy of these countries after the Second World War.

There have been many publications on the specific situation in Indonesia. M.A. Andreyev's *Likvidatsiya ekonomicheskikh pazitsii gollandskava imperializma f Indonezii* is on the economic retreat of the Dutch, V. Ya. Arkhipov's *Indoneziya f barbe za ekonomicheskuyu samastayatelnost* on the struggle for economic independence, L.P. Pakhomova's *Natsionalny kapital f ekonomike Indonezii* on the role of national capital and Arkhipov and O.N. Kulikov's *Finansi i banki Indonezii* on the financial system in Indonesia. Similarly, I.V. Vasiliev wrote on state capitalism in contemporary Burma and I.P. Azovski on the state sector in Burmese economy. O.G. Barushnikova's book is devoted to the national bourgeoisie of the Philippines in the struggle for independent foreign trade.

Some important South-East Asian source material had been translated into Russian. The writings of Ho Chi Min, Sukarno, Aung San and Ne Vin must be cited here. Several books on Indonesia, Vietnam and Burma by local authors have also been rendered into Russian and published for the Soviet readers. Moreover, the British historian D.G.E. Hall's *History of South-East Asia* and the French historian J.Chesneaux's book on the history of the Vietnamese people have also been translated.

As it can be seen from the summary above, Soviet scholarship has attained at least a modest start in the study of South-East Asian society.

X. Mongolic Studies

A. *The History of Mongolia* :

The study of Mongolian history has been started earlier than the study of other disciplines. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to start with history. In the pre-Revolutionary period, there had been travel notes, dictionaries and grammars. The post-Revolutionary studies were of course carried out from a Marxist point of view. Interest in that country specially grew on account of the Mongolian Revolution of 1921. I.M. Maisky's book on Mongolia, published in 1921, was the first Marxist study. It gave a political, economic and social picture of Outer Mongolia in the pre-Revolutionary years when the feudal system was pregnant with contradictions and a social upheaval. It is an important evaluation of events and has been re-published in 1959 as *Mongoliya nakanune revalyutsiy*.

A.D. Kallinikov's *Revalyutsiyonnaya Mongoliya* was the second work, which, however, contained errors. The author posed a «pasture theory» to explain the downfall of the nomadic empires of Asia. According to him, the nomads moved from one pasture to another, capturing these lands. He interprets mass migrations from the Oğuz Turks to the Manchus in the XVIIth Century—including the vast Mongolian Empire—by the same theory. The author pushed aside the class character of the nomads, the absence of many vital productions in a nomadic society and the need of plunder of the ruling aristocracy. Nevertheless, he was the first to present popular movements in his other book *Natsionalno-revalyutsionnoye dvijeniye f Mongolii* (1926).

G.E. Grumm-Grzhimailo was the third important writer who published in 1926 a huge (893 pp.) compendium on the history of the Mongols: *Zapadnaya Mongoliya i Uryanhayskiy kray*. The author has collected all the available data. His footnotes is almost a complete bibliography on the history of that country from the earliest times. But the author makes an idealistic interpretation of events. His periodization of Mongolian history, exaltation of the individual's role and several other concepts are open to discussion. He divides the span of time by dynasties. Another words, history becomes, in his pen, mere isolated facts. He exaggerates the role of certain leaders such as Djenghis Khan. He even harbors unscientific views on the innate qualities of certain races or nationalities.

1934 saw the appearance of B. Ya. Vladimirtsov's (1884-1931) *Obshchestvennyy stroy mongolov* on the social system of the Mongols. The same author's much earlier work *Chingiz-Han* suffers from some idealization, but reveals a very good knowledge of sources. His study on the Mongolian social system is a much better publication, explaining the disintegration of the tribal community and the formation of the feudal society. He traced two group of Mongols - the forest and steppe tribes. They differed from each other by the mode of their economic life. The life of the forest tribes, which were at a lower level of development compared to the other type, was based on cattle-breeding and hunting. Trying to determine the extent of the economic activity in the steppes, Vladimirtsov established the sequence of migrations, the composition of the herds and similar characteristics shedding light on the productive forces. He established the *ayil* or the family method of migration practices by the rich nomads and the *kuren* or the group migration more in vogue during the pre-class nomadic life.

Chapter One of Vladimirtsov's book (pp. 33-121) shows how change of economical methods led to the emergence of the feudal khans, altering

the general social system. Chapter II (pp. 123-187) deals with feudalism in its flourishing period, during which smaller vassals became dependent on feudal seniors. The establishment of the hierarchy in the Mongolian feudal society falls into the XVth-XVIIth centuries. The last chapter takes the analysis to the XIXth century. *Obshchestvennyy stroy mongolov* is regarded as a contribution not only to Mongolian history, but also to the history of nomadic tribes.

Just a little before the Second World War the publication of Mongolian chronicles started. *Letopisi barguzinskih buryat* was offered to the readers in 1935. Other publications of the same Buryat chronicles group followed. In 1941 appeared the so-called «Secret History», a chronicle from the XIIIth century. Experts assert that S.A. Kozin's translation of this manuscript contains numerous errors. Ts. Djamtsarano published five Mongolian manuscripts, also translated into English. In 1957 the manuscripts and the xylographs of the Oriental Institute were described in a special publication. L.S. Puchkovski published an XVIIIth Century chronicle by T. Gombojab. The translation of a XVIIth Century chronicle by L. Danzan also appeared. In 1965 *Halha Diirum*, an XVIIIth Century feudal code appeared. Some old Russian archive material was selected and published by V.L. Kotwits. Russian translations of some Chinese sources on the Mongols have also been published.

Lately, great deal has been done in terms of studying Mongolian history. After Vladimirtsov's important book, B.D. Grekov and A. Yu. Yakubovski's *Zolotaya orda* is the most outstanding work on the «Golden Horde.» The third edition, which came out in 1950, as *Zolotaya orda i yeyo padehiye* is a much revised version with emphasis on its downfall. It is regarded as a successful presentation of the *Ulus* of Juchi. A.N. Nasonov's *Mongoli i Rus* examines the manifestations of the Mongol yoke on the Russians. The history of the Mongolian People's Republic, on the other hand, is a condensed survey, which was used as a textbook in the Soviet schools for many years. Sh. Natsogdorji's book on the popular liberation movement reveals a rich use of Mongolian archives to illuminate anti-feudal struggle during the Manchu rule, especially the one led by Ayushi in 1912. I. Ya. Zlatkin's *Istoriya Djungarskava hanstva* is also based on the archive material regarding the Jungar Khanate. He explains the interesting phenomenon of a live-stock breeding community developing into a feudal one.

Archeological research shed light on the characteristics of the old Mongol cities. Excavations showed that, at first, small towns with craftsmen

and traders came into existence around the palaces of the aristocrats. Later, big cities like the capital Karakurum appeared around the khan's camp and military administration. The results of the series of expeditions were summed up in *Drevnemongolskiye goroda* by five authors (1965).

After the war, many studies appeared on the Mongolian revolution and the contemporary history of the régime. The first important one was Zlatkin's *Mongolskaya narodnaya respublika*, translated into German and Chinese. Another publication with the same title, that appeared in 1961, is a *sbornik statey*. S.K. Roshchin's book is on the economy of Mongolia.

B. Language and Literature :

In the first fifteen years of research and publication, Vladimirtsov's name is connected with the language and the literature of the Mongols. Between 1920 and 1929, he published an outline of Mongolian literature and some literary texts, mostly epics. G.D. Sanzeyev published a Mongol epic poem on Khan Karangui. Kozin made some translations from the Jangar epic. G.I. Mihailov's *Ocherk istorii sovremennoy mongolskoy literaturi* is on the modern fiction and poetry of socialist Mongolia. L.K. Gerasimovich's book of later print brings the topic to the present.

In language studies as well, Vladimirtsov again is the first important name. Among his studies of grammar, only his phonetics was published. His pupils studied the Mongolian dialects. G.D. Sanzheyev wrote on the Darkhat, and later, on the mutual influences of Mongolian and Machu. Sanzheyev's comparative grammar that appeared after the war is regarded as a considerable achievement. Volume II of the same work is on the verb system of the Mongolian languages. Sanzheyev proposes the division of Mongolian into central (Mongolian, Buriat, Kalmuk) and peripheral dialects.

XI. Chinese Studies

A. Language and Literature :

Chinese studies had, likewise, started during the pre-Revolutionary period. For instance, N.Y. Bichurin published his *Kitayskaya grammatika* in 1835. V.P. Vasiliyev wrote on several aspects of Chinese grammar from 1856 to 1898. A.O. Ivanovski was also a name in the XIXth Century. S. Georgievski, P.S. Popov and P.P. Schmidt were the three leading Sinologists before 1917.

The outstanding problem of the period immediately after the Revolution was the task of creating alphabets for languages with no writing system. In China as well, there was a trend to reform the Chinese characters. Some Chinese scholars and Soviet Sinologists prepared a new Latin alphabet around 1931. A.A. Dragunov, as head of the committee to devise a new alphabet for the Dzungars of Central Asia, wrote on the problems of Latinization. E.D. Polivanov, V.M. Alekseyev and V.S. Kolokolov wrote on the phonetics of the language. Perhaps Polivanov, at that time, influenced Sinology more than his co-workers, with his *Kratkaya foneticheskaya karakteristika kitayskava yazika* (1927). Dragunov continued to work on the phonetical system of the XIIth - XVIth Century Chinese. Kolokolov had already brought out a Chinese-Russian dictionary (1935).

After 1940, individual problems were tackled in the form of monographs. Several textbooks on grammar and new dictionaries appeared. It was in this period that the first Russian-Chinese dictionary was printed. Also, the Soviet readers became acquainted with the studies of the Chinese scholars. Russian translation of certain fundamental Chinese books appeared. Recently, comparative studies and work on individual Chinese dialects have begun.

As to Soviet publications on Chinese literature, the amount is second only to China itself (and perhaps Japan). V.P. Vasiliyev had written in 1880 an outline history of Chinese literature. Alekseyev brought out another survey on the same topic in 1920, and two years later he published, in two volumes, the translations from Pu Sung-ling. Y.K. Shutski worked out an anthology of Chinese lyrics. Some of Alekseyev's works were published in the European languages. For example: *La Literature Chinoise* (Paris, 1937).

However, it was the victory of the Chinese Communists in 1949 that activated more Soviet interest in Chinese literature. N.T. Federenko brought out three books in three years. L.Z. Eidlin discussed some of the heroes in Chinese literature. A four-volume anthology came out. The magazine *Sovyetskaya sinologiya* printed articles on various themes. Several new outlines of Chinese literature appeared.

Soviet Sinology seems to have thoroughly studied the ancient poetry of China (to the IIIrd Century A.D.), the poetry of the Tang Dynasty (VIIIth-IXth Century) and contemporary poetry (XXth Century). In 1882, Vasiliyev rendered *Shih-Ching* into Russian. Much later, in 1957, a second full translation was made by A.A. Shtukin. Alekseyev, for the first time,

studied the Ch'ü Yüan poetry. L.Z. Aidlin translated from Li Sao. L.E. Cherkasski evaluated the humanistic views of Tsao Chin-also showing the limitations of circumstances. Alekseyev did translations of *fu* (or Han dynasty odes).

As to the poetry of the Tang dynasty, Alekseyev, Shutski and Vasiliev's works acquainted the Soviet readers with the life and works of prominent Chinese writers such as Li Po, Tu Fu, Po Chü-i, M. Hao-jan and Wang Wei. Several academic dissertations were submitted on the leading Tang writers. O.L. Fishman's later publication on the life and work of Li Po showed the Tao tendency of reclusion as a form of protest against injustices. E.A. Serebriyakov's work on Tu Fu is also a social and political evaluation of China at that time. The author explained the feudal order to relate Tu Fu's protest against it.

There are also publications on the poets of the Sung Dynasty (following the Tang Dynasty). Alekseyev translated Wen Tien-siang, Serebriakov studied Lu Yü and M. Basmanov rendered into Russian the poems of Hsin Ch'i-chi.

Contemporary Chinese poetry is rich and expectedly dealt with in Soviet sources. The first important name at the turn of the XXth Century is perhaps Huang Tsun-hsien, on whom N. Petrov wrote a dissertation. V.T. Sukhorukov published many articles on the poetry of Wen Yi-to. N.F. Matkov has written a book about Yin Fu. S.D. Markova analyzed Chinese folk poetry during the war of national liberation. She shows the closeness of this poetry to the people, the role of poetry in the struggle for liberation and the emergence of new poetic forms. Much Chinese verse has been translated into Russian from the contemporary writers of that country.

As to Chinese prose: L.D. Pozdneyeva wrote a number of articles, among them one on the Chinese sources concerning ancient philosophical treatises. In 1963, the *hsiao-shuo* of the Six Dynasties has been published. The first translations from the Tang period short stories appeared in the early 1930's. I.I. Sokolova's dissertation was on the Tang *Hsiao-shuo*. Alekseyev rendered the *ku wen* of Han Yü, Li Hua and Liu Chung-yuan. A.N. Zhelokovtsev's dissertation is on the *Hua-pen* as a literary genre. Among the XVIIth Century Chinese writers, P'u Sung-ling is the best known in the Soviet Union. Wu Ching-tzu's satirical novel about the «scholars» was the subject of D.N. Voskresenski's dissertation. In 1966, Fishman analyzed the Chinese satirical novel of the age of enlightenment. V.I.

Semanov has written a book on the Chinese novel of the last two centuries. M.E. Shchneyder specialized on Ch'u Ch'iu-pai, one of the early Marxist literary critics in China. Mao Tun, Lao Sheh and Pa Chin are the most frequently translated Chinese novelists.

S.V. Obraztsov's book on Chinese theatre acquaints the reader with the Chinese methods of stage production, comparing them with the European and the Stanislavski systems. Among the plays, the most deeply studied are the Yuan dramas.

B. The History of China :

Chinese history has been a subject of study in Russia for the last 150 years. The previously-referred Bichurin published four books pertaining to China. N.M. Spafariy described this country for the first time. S.M. Guergievski wrote on ancient Chinese history. The universities at St. Petersburg, Kazan and Vladivostok had Sinological departments. A younger generation of Sinologists, who reached their prime after 1917, had started its own activities. There was, then, prior to 1917, a basis on which further study of China could be built.

Right from the beginning Lenin had attached tremendous importance to that country. The Civil War and the Foreign Intervention, however, brought almost to a halt the activities at St. Petersburg and Vladivostok. But in Moscow V.S. Kolokolov, A.I. Ivanov and I.M. Oshanin continued teaching. Soon, the All-Union Scientific Association of Orientology, created in 1921, opened up a branch in the Far East, where B.K. Pashkov, N.V. Kuner and A.V. Rudakov started to work. In the early 1920's, the Soviet writers (S. Dalin, N. Kostarev) devoted books to the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927 and to its leader Sun Yat-sen. A. Khain, A. Popov and U. Khayama focused on the Chinese working class during the revolutionary upheaval. There were also few, but large works on general history. K.A. Kharnski, for instance, tried to telescope all Chinese history, from the ancient times to 1926. N.V. Kuner wrote on the political life of China. The last-mentioned author also published his essays on the Chinese financial crisis in book form. In 1926, P. Tashkarov compiled Lenin's writings on China.

Beginning with the late twenties, scientific work in respect to China was stepped up. In 1929 a journal to study specifically the problems of that country began to be issued. The publications of that time naturally con-

centrated on Japanese imperialism and the struggle of the Chinese against it. Hence, essays on guerilla war, the Kantong Commune and various aspect of the Chinese Revolution were printed. Some writers like Skorpilev went back to the T'ai p'ings revolution, others like Kuchumov brought to the fore the 1911 events. Again in the 1930's, M.I. Kasanin wrote on the economic geography of China, while A.Y. Kantorovich dwelt on foreign capital and U.S. interest in that country.

It was during this time that a great methodological controversy developed among the Soviet scholars as to the agrarian relations in contemporary China. It reached the climax with the discussion on the problem of the «Asian mode of production». Debates continued on the celebrated book about the agrarian structure of Ancient China (1930). Further writings of E.S. Iolk, L.I. Madyar and M.P. Zhakov added much heat to the controversy. There was much intolerance and biased accusations in these debates. But it undoubtedly helped the Soviet Sinologists to mature methodologically.

The people's movements continued to attract the attention of the researchers. Z.I. Gorbacheva wrote on the insurrection of the redbrow (1935), L.V. Simonocskaya on the Li Tsu-ch'eng uprising (1936), L.I. Dooman on the Duncan insurrection and D.I. Tikhonov on the Eastern Turkestan uprising of 1864 (1944). Large monographs during the same period were as follows: V.Y. Avarin on imperialism in Manchuria, V. Kuchumov on the history of the Chinese Revolution, L.I. Dooman on the agrarian policy in Sinkiang towards the end of the XVIIth Century.

It was again in this period that a number of Chinese documents, including the ancient Buddhist manuscripts of the Institute of Oriental Studies, were published. Chinese philosophy was also studied, although at first along the traditional lines. In 1932, a bibliography of China was compiled by P.E. Skachkov. K.K. Floog brought out two more bibliographies on two different topics. This period also saw an acute debate whether which approach to the Chinese problems was a Marxist one. *Problemi Kitaya* contains some of the controversial articles. The conclusions reached were in a way summarized in a large book on China which appeared in 1940. The war, however, took away at least six leading Soviet Sinologists.

Interest in the new China was certainly revived after the war. Not only a world socialist system came into existence, but power in China passed into the hands of the Communists. Although about a hundred books had been published on China between 1917 and 1949, the number reached 447

in the next seven years, another 557 being added in the subsequent seven years.

The history of the Chinese working class, revolutionary wars, agrarian relations and several community problems continued to attract the attention of the Soviet researcher. These fundamental topics were tackled through the historical perspective. The structure of the Chou and In societies were thoroughly studied. The role of slavery, state, family and agrarian relations have been the leading topics examined. V.A. Rubin investigated the popular meetings in the Chou China. Regarding the Middle Ages, many monographs published on the taxation terms, class struggle and the anti-feudal insurrections.

Soviet historiography considers «modern Chinese history» as embracing the XVII-XXth Centuries. Many have taken up the land question (A.I. Chekhootov, A.N. Khokhlov), the genesis of capitalism (O.E. Nepomnin), shop organization (E.P. Stoozhina), the U.S. policy of Open Door (A.A. Fursenko, R.M. Brodski), foreign policy of China (G.V. Efimov) and the like. Contemporary history is naturally dealt with in much greater detail. There are new contemporary histories of China, new textbooks and monographs on the particular phases of recent history. There are still new works on the history of the working class. Several memoirs are published.

Chinese philosophy still fascinates the Sinologists. Y.B. Radool-Zatulovski's book on Confucianism denounces this creed as a reactionary teaching. Sün-tsi was translated into Russian. Petrov wrote an essay on Wang Ch'ung and Konrad on Sun-tsi. The XIXth Century Chinese philosophers were also translated for the first time. The selected works of the progressive Chinese thinkers (1840-1898) have also appeared.

The study of Chinese economics is also of late origin. A.E. Khodorov, L. Madyar, V. Gamberg and M.P. Hua Lee's books are now obsolete. There had been a radical change in the study of China's economy with the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic. V.A. Maslennikov and G.A. Ganshin's books are general surveys. Nepomnin's monograph is on agriculture, Ganshin's book on industrialization, M.I. Sladkovski's work on China's external economic relations, S.L. Shiryayev's study on the transport system, A.I. Chekhutov's evaluation on the tax system and A.E. Afanasyevski's survey on the economic geography of Sichuang.

The Soviet libraries seem to be rich in Chinese publications. The *Fundamentalnaya Biblioteka* has 50,000 books and 50,000 magazines.

Biblioteka Lenina has over 200,000. The Leningrad branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies owns 100,000. The Tunguang fund of the same institute has 12,000 storage units, the Tangkut fund some 8,000.

XII. Korean Studies

A. *The History of Korea :*

Russia was interested in Korea not only as a neighbour, but also because that country was a buffer between herself and Japan. During Tsarist times, however, Korea was studied in general terms. Apart from errors committed on account of hasty generalizations, not much was produced in special branches. On the other hand, almost immediately after the October Revolution, V.D. Vilenski-Sibiriyakov published a book on the struggle of the Korean people (1919). There were two more books in 1927 and 1929, with scattered articles in the journals. The first important monograph was N. Kim's *Pod gnyotom yaponskava imperializma*.

Substantial progress was made only after the Second World War. The war in Korea itself naturally stimulated interest in that country. Within a matter of a few years, fundamental publications were made: I. Kravtsov, *Agressiya amerikanskava imperializma f Koreye*; V.T. Zaychikov, *Koreya*; E.A. Pigulevskaya, *Koreyskiy narod f barbe za nizavisimost i demokratiyu*; F.I. Shabshina, *Narodnoye vosstaniye 1919 g. f Koreye*; *Koreyskaya Narodno-Demokraticeskaya Respublika*. The last mentioned is a *sbornik*. There are close to 50 books and a few scientific articles on Korea. About 40 dissertation have been submitted dealing with some aspects of that country. Hence, research has been divided into special branches.

The first important study on Korea's Ancient and Medieval history belongs to the Moscow University Professor M.N. Pak. He also translated *Samguk sagu*, the oldest (1145) of the Korean records. (*San-kuo chih* goes back to the IIIrd Century A.D., but is actually a Chinese source on the Korean tribes.) M.V. Vorobyov's book is on Ancient Korea. Y.V. Vanin wrote on feudal Korea and its resistance towards the invading Mongols. V.V. Serov's work deals with the popular movements in the XIIth Century Korea.

Modern and contemporary histories are better studied. Great Power interest in Korea, Japanese rule, Korea's fight against the aggressors and the popular movements within the country have been the four basic topics analyzed by the Soviet scholars. Between 1948 and 1952, it was Pak again

who published several articles on modern Korean history. Now, the leading authority on the subject seems to be G.D. Tyagai who wrote *Krestjanskoye vosstaniye f Koreye 1893-1895 gg.* Popular movements in the XIXth and the XXth Centuries continue to attract attention: G.D. Tyagai, *Narodnoye dvijenije f Koreye vo btoroy polovine XIX v.*; M. Han, *Osvoboditelnaya barba koreyskava naroda f godi yaponskava protektorata*; G.D. Tyagai, *Ocherk novoy istorii Korei vo ftoroy polovine XIX v.*

Some thought was given to Japanese rule in Korea. The military, political, economic and ideological means to subjugate the people, the modification of the methods used in the process of history and the position of the various classes towards colonialism have been treated, principally by V.I. Shipayev in *Kolonialnoye zakabalenije Korei yaponskim imperializmom* and *Koreyskaya burjuaziya f natsionalno-osvoboditelnom dvijenii.*

Y.V. Vanin's work is so far the only one on Korea's economy during the XVIIth and the XVIIIth Centuries. There is yet no analysis for the XIXth Century.

Contemporary history of the Korean land encompasses the two Koreas. Among numerous publications, the problem of the reconstruction of the Korean People's Democratic Republic is in the foreground. G.F. Kim and F.I. Shabshchina (Kulikova) are the two leading experts. In *Rabochiy klass novoy Korei* and *Rabochiy klass Korei*, Prof. Kim elaborated on the working class movement. Shabshchina wrote a survey of Korean history and an analysis of socialist Korea. G.V. Gryaznov examined the economy of the K.P.D.R. in *Sotsialisticheskaya industrializatsiya KNDR.*

There have been some work on South Korea. V.M. Mazurov tried to examine the political life of that country in *Sozdaniye antinarodnava rejima f Yujnoy Koreye.* B.V. Sinitsin analyzed the state of the industry and the working class in *Promishlennest i palajeniye rabocheva klassa Yujnoy Korei.* I.S. Kazakevich dealt with the agrarian question *Agrarniy vopros f Yujnoy Koreye.* M. Hun examined the ideological life of the South Koreans.

B. The Language and Literature of Korea :

The study of the Korean language and literature began after 1945. A.A. Kholodovich produced the first Korean-Russian dictionary in 1951. D.M. Usatov, Y.N. Mazur and V.M. Mozdukov published a Russian-Korean dictionary in the same year. Kholodovich's Korean grammar appeared in 1954. This book is even today the basic reference work in the Soviet

Union as well as in some other foreign countries. It was after 1960 that monographs on grammar began to be published. Mazur analyzed declensions, L.B. Nikolski treated the link words and E.K. Guseva several aspects of modern Korean. G.E. Rachkov is working on the tenses and moods, A.G. Vasilyev on the predicative forms and V. Dmirtiyeva on the system of voices.

Several dissertations were devoted to Korean literature. M.I. Nikitina wrote on the Medieval Korean poets, A.F. Trotsevich on the narrative prose in Medieval literature and A.N. Chon on contemporary Korean literature. Research on the rise of proletarian literature has just started. E.M. Choy's dissertation is about the war-time changes in the Korean village as reflected in G. Yong Lee's novels.

There has been just a start in way of translations. Apart from two novels from the last century, an anthology of poetry, Medieval narratives, G. Yong Lee's novel *The Earth* and some other minor works have been rendered into Russian. What has been done so far seems to be just the first steps.

XIII. Japanese Studies

A. *The Language and Literature of Japan :*

Japanese language studies had started in 1705. Instruction was systematized in 1898 when Japan emerged as a Great Power. Chairs were created in St. Petersburg University and in Vladivostok.

After 1917, research and instruction adhered to Marxist methods. In addition to such changes, Japanese was introduced as a subject in Irkutsk University. Y.D. Polivanov (1891-1937) was the first to study Japanese based on Marxist linguistic principles. He was also the first in Russia to develop the suggestion that there was an affinity between Japanese and the Malay-Polynesian group of languages. Y.M. Kolpakchi (1902-1952) wrote a thesis on the ancient Japanese literary language according to the manuscripts of the Nara Period. N.I. Konrad has made important contributions to Japanese linguistics. He examined that language in its relationship with the other Far Eastern languages. In his essay on Japanese, N.I. Feldman found phenomena that related Japanese to Korean, Mongolian and the Turkic languages. N.A. Siromiatnikov prepared monographs on the formation of the modern Japanese language.

In the past few years, new trends in machine translation have appeared. Among the reports to the First Soviet Conference on Machine Translation (May 15-21, 1958) may be found A.A. Babintsev and M.B. Yefimov's papers pertaining to translations from Japanese. S.M. Shevenko's dissertation and three brochures are on that topic. She describes how hieroglyphs are automatically divided and recognized by correlation, how the Japanese alphabets Katakana and Hiragana are recognized and how the Kiev electronic computer works. Especially technical texts are now translated with success.

There are twenty-four Japanese-Russian and Russian-Japanese dictionaries published in the USSR. Feldman has published several works on lexicology. A.A. Pashkovski's dissertation on the word formation in modern Japanese is an important work of lexicology. O.P. Petrova wrote a number of articles on Japanese naval terminology. There are many publications on Japanese grammar. Kolpakchi, Polivanov, Konrad Pashkovski and others made significant contributions. The same have also worked on the history of writing and several Japanese dialects.

In respect to Japanese literature, the first translations appeared in several magazines dating from the middle of the XIXth Century. They were all narrations or adaptations through German or English. V. Zotov's article on Japanese literature was likewise based on Western sources. Interest mounted during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. Translations now included some popular authors (Bakin, Kyoka, Roka) and some famous works (*Hagoromo*, a No play; *Chushingura*, a popular folk tradition; *Taketorimonogatari*, a IXth Century classic). V. Mendrin translated from English W.G. Aston's *Japanese Literature*. This book (*Istoriya yaponskoy literaturi*) was used by Japanese students for a long time. Mendrin also translated Japanese folk tales from the original. The center at Vladivostok, under Prof. G. Spalvin, was thus taking modest but important steps. In 1921, Konrad published his translation of a XIIIth Century classic by K. Chomei, pertaining to notes from a monastic cell. Three years later, O.V. Pletner published a part of a IXth Century classic - *Taketori-monogatari*. In 1934, Konrad wrote an article on modern Japanese literature for a general book on Japan. Three novels (by Junichiro, Toson and Soseki) and a book of stories (by Ryunoske) appeared in the meantime. Later came out the principal works of Takiji, Sunao, Kan, Wakizo, Inoske and Katsuo.

After 1945, dissertations were presented on the various aspects of Japanese literature. E.M. Pinus analysed the early works of T. Roka. I.L.

Ioffe described the art of H. Ichiyo, XIXth Century authoress. B.V. Pospelov studied critical realism. Studies were devoted to the progressive Japanese writers. G.D. Ivanova wrote on Kotoku Denjiro. A.E. Gluskina published essays on the history of contemporary democratic literature. There was more work on Wakizo and Takiji, two proletarian writers. V.S. Grivnin prepared three bio-bibliographical studies on Soseki, Toson and Ryunoske. G.N. Maximova produced an article on N. Hitoshi, a well-known democratic writer of our time.

Translations were also stepped up after 1950. More novels and stories of Takiji, Sunao, Yuriko and Teru appeared. Plays of K. Junji were done into Russian. The short novels of H. Yoshio were printed in Tashkent. The short stories of I. Saikaku, the great Japanese writer of the Medieval period, were published in the late 1950's. In 1954, a book on Japanese poetry appeared; three years later, another one on I. Takuboku, the founder of democratic Japanese poetry, came out. More translations were done after the 1960's: a book on Japanese short stories; a selected volume of S. Ineko, the progressive authoress; a novel by N. Yaeko; novels by I. Tatsuzo and G. Junpei; stories by the progressive H. Fumiko; a novel by H. Yoshio; novels by N. Takako; a novel by N. Inoske, etc.

B. The History of Japan :

There were some histories of Japan during the pre-Revolutionary days written by Russian travellers, university professors or diplomats. For instance: V. Ya. Kostilyev, *Ocherk istorii Yaponii* (1888); A.A. Nikolayev, *Ocherk po istorii yaponskava naroda* (1905); D. Pozdneyev, *Materiali po istorii Severnoy Yaponii i yeyo atnasheniy k materiku Azii i Rossii* (1909). There was a book even on the working class of Japan: A. Petrov, *Rabochiy vopros f Yaponii* (1912).

Research during the early years after 1917 concentrated on Japanese imperialism, contradictions among the imperialist powers, the political and economic situation in Japan and the position of its working class. K.A. Kharnski from the University of the Far East (Vladivostok) published *Yaponya f proshlom i nastayashchem* in 1926. He explained for the first time the domination of the monopolies, showing their influence over government policies. His book, however, remains weak in connection with the treatment of the pre-capitalist period. Likewise, O.V. Pletner's *Agrarniy vopros f Yaponii* (1928) was the first important Marxist study on the agrarian problem. It is regarded significant even at the present day. In the early 1930's

Japanese fascism had also to be dealt with: Tanin (Tarhanov) and Ye. Iyogan, *Voyenno-fashistskoye dvijeniye f Yaponii* (1933). The long, fundamental article in the early editions of the *Balshaya Sovyetskaya Entsiklopediya* is important, too.

Soviet Japanology developed in the latter part of the 1930's. Interest grew in Ancient and Medieval Japanese history. Konrad, in his *Lektsii po drevney i sredney istorii*, summarized Soviet historiography on that subject. In the article entitled «Nadelnaya sistema Yaponii», he maintained that transition to feudalism in Japan occurred immediately after the primitive-communal system, that society having by-passed slavery. Hence, according to him, slavery was never an economical form of production in Japan. However, late feudalism was included in the modern history of that country (1640-1868). (This inclusion of late feudalism in the modern history of Japan as the stage preparing for capitalism was first stated in the 1950's, in accordance with the periodical division of the authors who wrote *Vsemirnaya istoriya*.)

Again in the late 1930's, several works on the contemporary Japanese history appeared. Hayama (H.T. Eydus) analysed the workers' movement in *Rabocheye dvijeniye f Yaponii* (1937) and M.I. Lukyanova the methods of workers' struggle in *Kak baryutsa yaponskiye rabochiye* (1935). E.M. Zhukov, too, in his *Istoriya Yaponii* (1939), maintained that the primitive-communal system existed in Japan until the VIIth Century A.D., feudalism being established there immediately. Zhukov stated that feudalism remained dominant up to the 1868 bourgeois revolution.

The war interrupted the work on Japan. However, the Pacific Ocean Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences was organized in Moscow one year after the fascist attack on the Soviet Union. Eydus' book entitled *Yaponiya ot pervoy do ftoroy mirovoy vayni* was an account of the political history of that country between the two world wars. V.J. Avarin's *Barba za Tihiy okean* examined the contradictions between the United States and Japan in the Far East and in South-East Asia. Latishev's *Vnutrenniya politika yaponskava imperializma nakanune vayni na Tihom akeane* was on the domestic situation in Japan on the eve of the war. The author evaluates the attitudes of various classes towards the policy of preparation for war and explains the dissolution of the unions. In *Rol SSHA i Yaponii f pagotovke i razvyazivaniu vayni na Tihom okeane*, B.V. Rodov brought out the contradictions in the imperialistic policies in the Pacific Ocean, and B.I. Marushkin analysed aggression to China in his *Amerikanskaya politika*

nevmeshatelstva f yaponskaya agressiya f Kitaye. However, *Mezhdunarodniye atnasheniya na Dalnem Vostoke*, written collectively and edited by Zhukov, became an important conclusive work on the foreign policy of Japan before and after the Second World War. Some of the other works on the post-war situation in Japan, however, were deficient in the sense that they painted everything black, underestimating the democratic tendencies.

The first history of contemporary Japan is by Eydus, who summarized the political life in that country, with its new state structure. P.A. Kraynov's monographs are on the American policy towards Japan. P.P. Topeha wrote on the Japanese socialist parties. The books of several Anglo-American experts (Grade, Norman and others) were translated into Russian.

Soviet Japanology was most productive after 1955. Interest in Ancient History of Japan was revived in this period. M.V. Vorobyev dwelt on the ancient past of the Japanese people in *Drevniya Yaponiya*. A.A. Iskenderov analyzed the feudal city in *Feodalny gorod XVI stoletiya*. He described the origins of the «castle cities», the position of the handicrafts and guilds as well as municipal government at that time. Seven authors published in 1958 a modern history of Japan, which covered the years 1640-1917. They fix the growth of capitalist relations at the beginning of the XVIIth Century. Although this is a new opinion, they take the year of 1894 as the initial stage of monopoly capitalism. Volumes VI and VII of the *Vsemirnaya istoriya* contain summaries of modern Japanese history.

There have been some new works on Russo-Japanese relations. E.J. Feinberg's monograph covers 1697-1875. V.M. Konstantinov's work is a translation and an evaluation of *Oroshakoku Suimudan*, originally written by Japanese visitors to Russia in the XVIIIth Century. L.N. Kutakov's book is on the Portsmouth Treaty. D.V. Petrov's study deals with American penetration into Japan in the XIXth Century.

Ocherki noveyshey istorii Yaponii is a collective work which treats the 1917-1956 period. In volumes VIII-IX of *Vsemirnaya istoriya* the same period is summarized. L.N. Kutakov's big study is on the Soviet-Japanese relations during the same years. Petrov's work deals with Japanese foreign policy up to 1964. Eydus devoted his study, published in 1964, to the recent period of Soviet-Japanese relations. D.I. Goldberg's monographs cover Japanese policy between 1939 and 1941.

There is growing and more tolerable interest in Japan's internal situation. J.A. Pevzner wrote on the present characteristics of Japanese state

monopoly capital. V.N. Khlinov analyzed the condition of the working class while Petrov's *Rabochiye i demokraticeskoye dvijeniya f Yaponii* is basically on the working class struggle. Topekha's book, published in 1964, deals with the trade union movement. V. A. Popov's two monographs are on the agrarian question and the postwar Japanese peasant. Latishev minutely analyzed the 1947 Constitution. Several new works appeared on the development of social ideas before and after the war. Lastly, the two volumes of *Bibliografiya Yaponii* ought to be mentioned. Published in 1960 and 1965, they contain a list of books, articles and documents on Japan from 1734 to 1958.

* * *

It is evident that this bibliographical summary does not pretend to have presented a comprehensive list pertaining to Soviet publications on the Orient. Nor is it a full evaluation of the cited sources. What had been intended was to touch upon main trends and the leading works. It is even possible that some important studies might have been omitted or have escaped attention. A complete list, however, regarding each Oriental country may be found in the printed bibliographies, which contain thousands of titles. Hence, hundreds of books and articles had to be left out on account of space limitations.

What has been included may, nevertheless, give a general idea of Soviet Orientology. It is typical of all Soviet studies to struggle against European ethnocentrism. Many Western works on the Eastern countries and peoples reflect this tendency, in overt or various covert forms. Research emanating from the Soviet Union, generally, opposes such an inclination.

The present-day expansion of Soviet Orientology is due to work done after the 1950's. The foundation stones have, of course, been laid down by the pre-Revolutionary Orientalists, some of whom have been difficult to equal. Nevertheless, more and varied activity was the outcome of the post-revolutionary period, during which Marxist interpretations were made. New fields of research are being opened, new countries studied, new problems tackled by numerous scientific workers. Hence, some areas are in their initial stage of development; some others decline, relatively; still others are deeper studied.