

ORIENTAL NOTES AND STUDIES
PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL ORIENTAL SOCIETY
No. 5

LANGUAGE REFORM
IN MODERN TURKEY

BY
URIEL HEYD

494.35
H 511 L

JERUSALEM
1954

ORIENTAL NOTES AND STUDIES
PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL ORIENTAL SOCIETY
No. 5

LANGUAGE REFORM
IN MODERN TURKEY

BY
URIEL HEYD

JERUSALEM
1954

73

ORIENTAL NOTES AND STUDIES

published by

THE ISRAEL ORIENTAL SOCIETY

P.O.B. 7001, JERUSALEM

EDITORIAL BOARD

S. D. Goitein, L. A. Mayer, H. J. Polotsky:

U. Ben-Horin, *Secretary*.

Copyright 1954, by the Israel Oriental Society



Library

IIAS, Shimla

494.35 H 511 L



00010773

PRINTED IN ISRAEL

HADASSAH APPRENTICE SCHOOL OF PRINTING JERUSALEM

To Dr. and Mrs. George S. Wise
in gratitude

PREFACE

LANGUAGE reform is one of the most widely and, at times, most heatedly discussed cultural problems in modern Turkey. Outside the country, however, it has so far received relatively little attention. Many linguists are inclined to take a rather critical attitude towards a drastic interference in the development of any language. They hold that "every people is generally satisfied with the language it has inherited" and that "the solidarity with the past keeps in check the freedom of choice" (F. de Saussure). This general observation, however, is hardly valid in the case of the modern Turks, who during the last few generations have, to a large extent, turned away from their cultural heritage.

The reform of modern Turkish is not only an interesting attempt to change the Turkish language deliberately and methodically; it is also an integral part and an important manifestation of the social and cultural transformation which has taken place in Turkey. The linguistic changes can only be understood in correlation with the simultaneous development of Turkish society.

Owing to this dual aspect, Turkish language reform may be of interest not only to the Turkologist, but also to the historian and sociologist. I have therefore attempted to make the first part of this study, which deals with the 'external history' of the language, intelligible even to those who do not know Turkish. In the later chapters I have tried to explain some of the linguistic problems of modern Turkish by comparison with European languages but have not treated them exhaustively.

Turkish language reform began—as set out very briefly in the Introduction—in the middle of the last century. Its contemporary phase opened with the introduction of the Latin

PREFACE

script in 1928. Though this development has not yet reached its close, recent events have brought the reform movement to an at least temporary halt, allowing the observer to take stock of its results to date.

In this study no attempt is made to pass judgment on the aims and methods of this movement. Linguistic reform of this kind is primarily not a scientific undertaking. As pointed out by contemporary Turkish writers, "language problems often have an emotional rather than a scientific character; language is, like religion, a matter of belief and attachment". In a controversial matter such as this it is not for the non-Turkish observer to take sides. He can hardly do more than state the facts as fairly as possible, elucidate the problems involved and interpret the views held by various schools of thought in Turkey. Whatever attitude is adopted, however, it is a fact that as a result of modern reform the Turkish vocabulary has changed considerably.

These changes in the vocabulary of written Turkish are the main subject of this study. Problems of grammar and syntax are merely touched upon, seeing that no fundamental changes have taken place in these fields since the beginning of the recent reform movement.

An inquiry into the lexical changes of modern Turkish is hampered by the lack of preliminary studies. The history of Ottoman Turkish has yet to be written. There is as yet no historical dictionary of that language, indicating at what time a given word was first used and when and how it changed in meaning, pronunciation or spelling. In particular, the history of Arabic, Persian and European loan-words in Turkish has not yet been fully studied.

I take this opportunity to express sincere gratitude to all my friends in Turkey who have given me valuable information and discussed with me the different aspects of language reform.

PREFACE

I wish, in particular, to thank the Turkish Linguistic Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*) in Ankara for kindly permitting me to work in its library, and the members of the Istanbul Teachers' Association (*Muallimler Birliği*) who were good enough to place various publications at my disposal. I am also much indebted to the Rockefeller Foundation, which generously granted me, in 1951/2, a fellowship for studies in England and Turkey. To Professors G. Weil and H. J. Polotsky of the Hebrew University I am grateful for their encouragement and comments.

U. H.

*The Hebrew University,
Jerusalem, May 1954*

NOTE ON SPELLING AND TRANSLITERATION

WORDS of whatever origin used in Ottoman and modern Turkish are spelt, as a rule, according to the *İmlâ Kılavuzu* (Istanbul, 1948). Consequently, no diacritic marks are used for most Arabic and Persian terms. In a few instances, however, a more etymological spelling is preferred or hyphens are inserted for clarity's sake. Some inconsistencies could not be avoided in the spelling of proper names (*Mehmed*—*Mehmet*, etc.). In special cases, long vowels in Arabic, Persian and Hebrew words are indicated (*â, û*, etc.).

Titles of Turkish books published before 1929 (in the Arabic script) are, for technical reasons, quoted in modern spelling, i.e. in Latin characters. The name 'Istanbul' is generally spelt without a dot on the capital letter.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

AN OUTLINE OF EARLY TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM	9
---	---

CHAPTER I

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM SINCE 1928	
Kemalism and Language Reform . .	19
The New Script	22
The Foundation of the Linguistic Society . .	25
The High Tide of Purism . .	29
The First Retreat	31
Renewed Purification Efforts	36
A New Dictionary and a New Version of the Constitution	40
Growing Opposition to the Linguistic Society . .	44
A Turn to Moderation	48
How the New Vocabulary Was Propagated . .	52

CHAPTER II

SOME PROBLEMS OF MODERN TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM	
Arabic and Persian Words in Popular Use . .	57
Foreign Learned Words	62
Arabic and Persian Synonyms of Turkish Words . .	71
European Loan-Words	76
Technical Terms . .	80

CONTENTS

Turkish Substitutes for Foreign Words ..	88
Phraseology and Syntax ..	94

CHAPTER III

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE TURKISH VOCABULARY

Turkish and Non-Turkish Words in Present-Day Use ..	97
Accepted and Rejected Neologisms ..	103

CONCLUSION	108
------------	-----

APPENDIX	111
----------	-----

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ..	112
--------------------------	-----

INDEX	114
-------	-----

INTRODUCTION

AN OUTLINE OF EARLY TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM

OTTOMAN Turkish was a composite language of a rather unusual type. In its native stock it belonged to the South-Western group of the large family of Turkic languages. From its very beginnings as a literary language in the thirteenth century, it contained a great number of words borrowed from Arabic and Persian, the languages of Muslim religion and culture and (in Anatolia and other countries of Turkish settlement) of government. Owing to the high prestige of those languages and as a result of the many translations from them, borrowing did not remain limited to religious and cultural terms. In the literary language of the Ottoman Turks a considerable part of the native vocabulary, including many common words, was replaced with Arabic and Persian loans, which were regarded as more elegant or refined. Together with them many grammatical rules and certain syntactical features were also borrowed. A reaction to this trend, the *Türkî-i basit* movement of the late fifteenth century,¹ failed to stem the tide of foreign words and expressions. By the following century, when Ottoman might reached its zenith and Istanbul became the political and cultural centre of the Western Muslim world, the Turkish element in the literary language had been reduced to a very small proportion.

This language was as unintelligible to the Turkish peasant and illiterate townsman as medieval Latin was to the layman in Europe. Just as in seventeenth century England one had, in the words of Sir Thomas Browne, to "learn Latin to understand

¹ See Köprülüade Mehmet Fuat, *Millî Edebiyat Cereyanının İlk Mübeşşirleri ve Divan-ı Türkî-i Basit* (Ist., 1928).

English",² nobody could write correct Ottoman Turkish without a sound knowledge of Arabic and Persian. The study of these languages and their literature formed the central part of the curriculum in the religious colleges (*medrese*) and the Palace school (*Enderun mektebi*), the graduates of which were the intellectual leaders of the country. On the other hand, the vernacular of the common people and the language of popular literature preserved a more genuine Turkish character, but were despised by the educated as a barbarous and uncouth jargon (*kaba Türkçe*).

The impact of European civilization in the nineteenth century brought about fundamental changes. The reforms (*tanzimat*) of the administrative, legal and educational system of the Ottoman Empire opened a new era. In the large towns a secular and Westernized middle class rose to a dominant position in society. The new cultural outlook and budding nationalism of this class led to the demand for a change of the Ottoman language, which was found unsuitable as an instrument of popular education and incapable of expressing modern ideas. For the first time, language reform became a national problem, to be solved by conscious and protracted efforts.

Ziya Paşa, in his famous article *Şiir ve İnşa* (1868),³ repudiated the classical Ottoman literature and its artificial and un-Turkish language, drawing attention to the more genuine popular literature. At the same time he called for a simplification of the administrative and legal language, so that even the uneducated might be able to understand it and to defend their rights against Sultan Abdul Aziz's oppressive bureaucracy. His

² Mario Pei, *The Story of English* (Philadelphia and New York, 1952), p. 62.

³ Quoted in full in Agâh Sırrı Levend, *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Safhaları* (Ankara, 1949), pp. 134-140. To this work of the present Secretary General of the Turkish Linguistic Society I am indebted for much of the source-material used in this chapter.

close collaborator Namık Kemal (1840-88), the greatest writer of the time, condemned the excessive use of uncommon foreign words. "Why", he asked, "should it be regarded as an achievement to compel everybody to consult a hundred times the *Kamus* (Arabic dictionary) or the *Burhan* (Persian dictionary) when reading a two-page article?"⁴ It became the established view that unlimited and unnecessary borrowing from Arabic and Persian ought to cease.

This profound change of attitude is reflected in the lexicographic work of that period. Until then dictionaries of Arabic and Persian words had been almost the only ones in use; the genuine Turkish vocabulary was considered well known to the public or not worthy of serious study. Now the first dictionaries including native words were published by Turks. Moreover, in Ahmet Vefik Paşa's *Lehçe-i Osmanî* and in later works⁵ rare Arabic and Persian words, not used in contemporary literature, were omitted. Current words of Arabic and Persian origin were no longer listed in their original meaning, but only in the sense they had acquired in Ottoman Turkish. Thoroughly assimilated Arabic and Persian words were modified even in their spelling.

This meant a break with the classical tradition which considered almost any alteration of Arabic (and Persian) words a mistake or vulgarism. Now, many *galatat-ı meşhure*, i.e. solecisms consecrated by usage, were sanctioned, though not without much controversy, as shown by the many books on this subject published in those days.⁶ Slowly, and against much opposition, Ottoman Turkish became, as far as its Arabic and

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵ Such as Ch. Samy-Bey Frascbery's (Şemseddin Sami's) *Dictionnaire Turc-Français* (1885), Mehmet Salâhi's *Kamus-ı Osmanî* (1313), Muallim Naci's *Lûgat-i Naci* (1317), and Şemseddin Sami's *Kamus-ı Türkî* (1317/8).

⁶ E.g., Sırrı Paşa, *Galatat* (Ist., 1301); Mustafa İzzet, *Tashih-ul-galatat ve-l-muharrefat fi-l-esma ve-l-lûgât* (Ist., 1302); Ali Seydi, *Defter-i Galatat* (Ist., 1324).

Persian loan-words were concerned, independent of the Arabic and Persian lexicon. Correctness of Ottoman usage was no longer measured by the yardstick of other languages.

Another step towards the emancipation of Ottoman Turkish from the domination of Arabic and Persian was made in the field of prosody. In Ottoman poetry the rhyme had been for the eye; only words ending in the same letters in the Arabic script could rhyme with each other. In the nineties of the last century Rezaizade Ekrem claimed that the rhyme should be mainly for the ear. Thus, he permitted the rhyming of (Arabic) words like *عبث* and *مقتبس*, which only in Turkish pronunciation had identical final syllables (*abes*—*muktebes*).⁷

This innovation was a symptom of a new attitude towards language in general. In the past, the only languages thoroughly studied in schools and colleges had been Arabic and Persian, which, like Latin and Greek in Europe, were taught as dead languages. As in Western countries until the eighteenth century, this had "led to the almost exclusive occupation with letters instead of sounds. The fact that . . . the real life of language is in the mouth and ear and not in the pen and eye was overlooked".⁸ The growing appreciation of the spoken word was bound to open the gates of the literary language to popular terms and expressions.

At the same time some Turkish scholars began to show serious interest in the Turkish part of the Ottoman vocabulary. Until then it had been held that Ottoman Turkish was composed of three independent languages—Arabic, Persian, and Turkish⁹—the first two of which were thought to be of superior

⁷ See Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, *Edebî Hatıralar* (Ist., 1935), p. 72; Hikmet İlaydın, *Türk Edebiyatında Nazım* (Ist., 1951), pp. 67-68.

⁸ O. Jespersen, *Language, Its Nature, Devel. & Origin* (London, 1947), p. 23.

⁹ See Mehmet Fuat—Ahmet Cevdet, *Kavaid-i Osmaniye* (Ist., 1281-1864/5), p. 5.—Cf. also the titles of early European dictionaries of Ottoman Turkish: Fr. M. Meninski, *Lexicon Arabico-Persico-Turcicum* (Vienna, 1780); A. Handjéri, *Dictionnaire Français-Arabe-Persan et Turc* (Moscou, 1840-41); etc.

rank. Now it was claimed that Turkish should be the core of the language. Süleyman Paşa, author of a grammar significantly entitled *Sarf-ı Türki* (1874), and others suggested changing even the name of the language from 'Ottoman' to 'Turkish'. The latter should no longer be a derogatory designation for the language of illiterate peasants but the name of a great *Kultursprache*, which was much older than the Ottoman Empire.

The pioneer of this nationalist school of linguists was Şemseddin Sami, the leading lexicographer of the time, who hailed from Albania. In an interesting article published in 1881¹⁰ he pointed out that Ottoman Turkish was essentially not different from other Turkic languages, especially from 'Eastern Turkish'. The latter had preserved much more native speech-material and therefore was, in spite of its harsher pronunciation, a more perfect language. In view of the need to reform and broaden Ottoman Turkish, new words should be borrowed from Eastern Turkish rather than from Arabic. Many Eastern Turkish words were found in old Ottoman literature and were still used in Anatolian dialects. Moreover, since the Arabic and Persian words had remained foreign elements and had not been fully integrated into Ottoman Turkish, many of them might well be replaced with genuine Turkish words, particularly in the everyday language. A reform of this kind would not only make the language richer and more beautiful, but also help to fuse the Turks in the Ottoman Empire and their brethren in Russia and Central Asia into one great nation. Similar ideas were put forward by Necib Âsım,¹¹ whose amplified and annotated translation of parts of Léon Cahun's *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie* inspired early Turkish nationalism.¹²

Such far-reaching suggestions did not yet draw much re-

¹⁰ '*Lisan-ı Türki (Osmani)*' published in his weekly *Hafta*, no. 12 (Ist., 1881).

¹¹ See Levend, pp. 262-63.

¹² See Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Ankara, 1339-1923), pp. 9, 12; Count Léon Ostrorog, *The Angora Reform* (London, 1927), pp. 57-64.

sponse from the Ottoman intelligentsia. As so many reforms of the Tanzimat period, language reform was carried out hesitantly and to a limited extent only. With the exception of a few popular writers, such as Ahmet Midhat, the advocates of a simpler and purer Turkish did not live up to their own demands. However, the influence of French romantic and, after 1850, naturalistic literature resulted in a certain simplification of style and diction. Particularly in the newspapers, novels and plays—all innovations of this period—literary Ottoman Turkish drew nearer to the spoken language of the middle class. On the other hand, the rapid spread of education led to a change in the opposite direction. Under the influence of the written language many Arabic, Persian and European words replaced Turkish elements in the colloquial of the literate.¹³ The foreign vocabulary also increased considerably owing to the urgent need for new technical terms, which were borrowed from Arabic, coined from Arabic roots, or adopted from Western languages.

Only a few radical purists like Fuat Köse Raif and other contributors to the Istanbul newspaper *İkdam* tried to replace common Arabic and Persian loan-words with genuine Turkish equivalents taken from the old literature, dialects and other Turkic languages or newly coined from Turkish roots. However, this movement (*tasfiyecilik*) failed completely.¹⁴ The time had not yet come for such drastic changes.

In the last few years of the nineteenth century a new literary trend, known as the *Servet-i Fünun* school, launched the last great counter-attack against the simplification and turkicization of the Ottoman language. It was the time when the autocratic

¹³ See Ch. Samy-Bey Frascbery, *Dictionnaire Turc-Français*, p. VI.—A similar development took place in modern Persian (W. St. Clair-Tisdall, *Modern Persian Conversation-Grammar*, London-Heidelberg, 1923, p. 129).

¹⁴ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, pp. 9-10, 114-15.

regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II stifled the free expression of any progressive idea on national or social issues. The ensuing feeling of frustration and the turning away from realities among Turkish writers was further strengthened by contemporary developments in French literature, their main source of inspiration. In the eighties French naturalism had been superseded by symbolism and similar trends which placed aesthetic refinement before everything else ('l'art pour l'art'), "defined the beautiful as the rare and the singular" and were "proud of having cut off contact with the (wider) public".¹⁵

In this period Turkish poets, like Tevfik Fikret and Cenab Şahabeddin, and writers, like Halid Ziya and Süleyman Nazif, attached paramount importance to melodious and exquisite form rather than to easy intelligibility and appeal to the people. Writing for the *élite*, the small upper class of the intelligentsia (*bavas*) only, they disdained plain language and words "worn out in the mouth of the common people (*avam*)".¹⁶ Such language might possibly be fit for dealing with commonplace subjects and technical matters, but not for a literature which "wished to convey subtle feelings and sublime thoughts".¹⁷ Like Mallarmé and other French poets of that time they stressed the difference between practical and artistic language. Devoting their full efforts and remarkable gifts to the creation of the latter, they introduced many rare Arabic and Persian words and coined a large number of new Persian compound nouns and adjectives, which for them had "a beauty in sound not found in Turkish words".¹⁸ Thus literary Ottoman Turkish again moved away from the spoken language, and Arabic and Persian words and constructions gained a new predominance.

¹⁵ Gustave Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 20th ed. (Paris), p. 1169.

¹⁶ Ahmet Rasim in 1898 (see Levend, p. 225).

¹⁷ Faik Reşat in 1897 (see Levend, p. 225).

¹⁸ Müstecabizade İsmet in 1896 (see Levend, p. 208).

This attempt to put the clock of linguistic development back was short-lived. Already in 1897, under the impression of the Turco-Greek war, Mehmet Emin published his first patriotic poems (later collected under the name *Türkçe Şiirler*) in simple Turkish and the native metre. Addressing himself to all classes of the people, he refrained as much as possible from using Arabic and Persian words and constructions. Mehmet Emin was not a great artist, and his poems, though warmly welcomed by European Orientalists,¹⁹ could not break the supremacy of the *Servet-i Fünun* school in Istanbul. In the great provincial centres, however, especially in Izmir and Salonika, the movement for language reform was more successful. Here the press was less gagged by official censorship and the Turkish population, living in midst of or in close proximity to other communities, was inclined to develop strong nationalist feeling.

The first phase of Turkish language reform had come in the wake of the political, social and cultural changes of the Tanzimat; the Young Turk revolution of 1908/9 ushered in its second phase. The new rulers of the Empire wished to arouse political consciousness in the masses and to create a national movement, first of an Ottoman and later of a Turkish or even pan-Turkish (Turanian) character. In these efforts the press was called upon to play a major role. Its language had to be intelligible, as pointed out in 1909,²⁰ even to the uneducated, especially the soldiers, and to the non-Turkish minorities or, as demanded in 1911²¹ with a significant change of emphasis, to all Turks as far as Manchuria and to Muslims everywhere. In fact, the newspaper language was considerably simplified in those years.

¹⁹ E.g., E. J. W. Gibb, *A Hist. of Ott. Poetry*, I (London, 1900), p. 134, n. 1.

²⁰ *Türk Derneği* (Ist.), I, no. 2, p. 47; *Servet-i Fünun* (Ist.) of 21st May, 1325 (3rd June, 1909), pp. 35 sq.

²¹ *Servet-i Fünun* of 9th May, 1327 (22nd May, 1911), p. 51.

In this period of almost continuous war, disintegration of the decaying Empire and a desperate fight for national survival Turkish nationalism triumphed over all rival ideologies. It awakened a growing interest in the history and civilization of the Turkish peoples; their pre-Islamic culture and folklore in particular became a fashionable subject of study. The important part Turkish emigrants from Russia played in the intellectual life of Istanbul at that time also contributed to this trend. However, the strong hold religion still had on the people and the conception of the Ottoman State as the foremost Muslim power headed by the Sultan-Caliph prevented a definite break with Islamic civilization. These different tendencies found expression in the linguistic development of that turbulent period.

The first to formulate a new programme for language reform and to translate it into action were a group of young writers who in 1911 gathered round the Salonika periodical *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens). Its leading members were the short-story writer Ömer Seyfeddin and the sociologist Ziya Gökalp. After some initial hesitation they demanded the suppression of Arabic and Persian grammatical rules used in Ottoman Turkish and the elimination of those superfluous Arabic and Persian words for which exact Turkish synonyms were current in the spoken language. On the other hand, they rejected the purists' demand for the elimination of common words of Arabic and Persian origin. They also objected to the revival of archaic Turkish words, the borrowing of words and formative elements from other Turkic languages, and the artificial coinage of new words from Turkish roots. Technical terms should, as hitherto, be coined from Arabic roots (though not in compound form) or, in certain cases, be taken from European languages, if no Turkish equivalents were available.²²

²² For Gökalp's ideas on language reform in the framework of his general ideology see my *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism, The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London, 1950), pp. 115-121.

The aim of these reformers was to create a 'new language' (*yeni lisan*). Unlike the artificial language of the *Servet-i Fünun* school, the future literary language was to be based on the vernacular of the people of Istanbul, especially the language of the women, which was less overlaid with foreign elements. In practice, however, these writers did not use the vocabulary of the common people but that of the educated, which was strongly influenced by the old literary language.²³

These ideas were not new. They had been advanced, and in some respects even more radically, by Ahmet Midhat²⁴ and Şemseddin Sami²⁵ many years before. But now general conditions were ripe for such changes. The Young Turk leaders and authorities supported the new movement to a certain extent. Addresses of Parliament to the Sultan were drawn up in simple Turkish; the War Ministry replaced Arabic and Persian words with Turkish ones in its forms;²⁶ official organs of the Committee for Union and Progress used the 'new language'.²⁷ A simultaneous change in prosody also strengthened this movement. The traditional Arabic-Persian quantitative metres, into which Turkish words could be fitted only with difficulty, were now increasingly replaced with the syllable-counting metres of ancient and popular Turkish poetry.

In the teeth of bitter opposition from conservative writers the 'new language' asserted itself, and by the end of the first World War its victory was secured. The old Ottoman language with its colourful but difficult grammar vanished with the multi-national and multi-lingual Ottoman Empire.

²³ T. D. K., 6. *T. D. Kurultayı* (Ankara, 1950), pp. 5-6.

²⁴ In the periodical *Dağarcık*, no. 1 (1871) (see Levend, pp. 142-47).

²⁵ In the Istanbul newspaper *Sabah* (1898) (see Levend, pp. 235-36).

²⁶ *Türk Derneği*, I, no. 5, pp. 128, 137.

²⁷ P. Risal, 'Les Turcs à la recherche d'une âme nationale' in *Mercure de France* of 16th August, 1912, p. 699.

CHAPTER I

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM SINCE 1928

KEMALISM AND LANGUAGE REFORM

ATATÜRK'S aim, as summed up in the famous six principles of Kemalism, was to create a nationalist, secular, populist, revolutionary and etatist republic. His efforts to achieve this goal are fully reflected in the contemporary movement for the reform of the Turkish language.

Nationalism, the central pillar of Kemalist ideology, found its expression in a strong demand for the purification of the Ottoman language by replacing its foreign elements with genuine Turkish words, old or new. The flooding of Ottoman Turkish by innumerable Arabic and Persian words was now regarded as a national disgrace and, in the words of the Gazi, "the Turkish nation which knew how to defend its country and noble independence must also liberate its language from the yoke of foreign languages".¹ The romantic, almost mystical, desire to rediscover the national genius of the Turkish people and to base the new culture on the ancient, partly pre-Islamic, traditions of the nation also played its part.²

Many Turkish nationalists could not agree with the opinion of previous generations that the Turkish language was incapable of serving, without large-scale borrowing from others, as a *Kultursprache*. Their pride in its harmony, logical structure and morphological richness was a further incentive to rid it of foreign elements. Simplification of the language, the slogan of

¹ In his foreword to Sadri Maksudi's book *Türk Dili için* (Ist., 1930).

² See Tekin Alp, *Le Kemalisme* (Paris, 1937), p. 135.

the Young Turk language reformers, was now superseded by the desire for the creation of a pure or genuine Turkish (*öz Türkçe*).

This tendency found additional support in Atatürk's cultural orientation, which was based on a complete break with the Islamic past and the adoption of the secular values of modern Western civilization. The new outlook led, *inter alia*, to the introduction of the Latin script and an urgent demand for the creation of a language capable of fully expressing the thoughts and feelings common to Occidental culture.

At the same time far-reaching social reforms set in. *Halkçılık* 'populism', the Kemalist form of democracy, aimed at breaking down the political and cultural barriers which for centuries had separated the common people (*halk*) from the educated and privileged classes. Accordingly, the language reformers demanded that an end be put to the existence of two different languages, the simple Turkish spoken by the people and the written language which had been overlaid with foreign words and expressions. The latter, the so-called 'Ottoman',³ was—according to the dictum of a former Turkish Minister of Education⁴—not a national but a class language, used exclusively by the upper classes. The new literary language had to be brought as close as possible to the spoken languages of the people, so that it might be understood even by the masses and serve as an efficient medium of instruction in schools. Only thus could the fight against illiteracy have a chance of speedy success.

Atatürk did not conceive of the creation of the new language as a slow, evolutionary process, but tried to achieve it by drastic measures within a short time. Modern language reform was a

³ I.e. the literary language used until the days of the Young Turks. For this, rather disparaging, use by the modern language reformers of the term 'Ottoman' (*Osmanlıca*) in contrast to 'Turkish' (*Türkçe*) see A. S. Levend in *Dil Dâvası* (published by T. D. K., Ankara, 1952), pp. 61-69.

⁴ Tahsin Banguoğlu in a speech opening the Sixth Language Congress in December, 1949 (T. D. K., 6. T. D. Kurultayı, Ankara, 1950, p. 4).

typical *tour de force*, an expression of what A. J. Toynbee⁵ calls the 'futurism' of the Kemalist revolution. In creating the new language, the needs of days to come, and not historical continuity or the taste or convenience of the old generation, had to be the determining factor.

The linguistic reform reflected to a certain extent only the change in the cultural outlook of Turkish society; essentially it served as a means of creating such a change. The fervent belief in the omnipotence of the human will and in the creative élan of the revolution gave rise to the conviction that language, like any other social institution, could be reshaped according to a preconceived plan.⁶ This attitude reminds us of the ideas of some leaders of the French Revolution like Barère who said: "We have revolutionized the government, the laws, the habits, the customs, commerce, and thought; let us also revolutionize the language which is their daily instrument".^{6a}

Lastly, just as the economic reconstruction of Turkey was carried out—according to the principle of etatism—almost exclusively by the State, so the language reform was not left to writers and poets (as it had been in the time of the Young Turks) and not even to an independent academy. Atatürk created a national association, the Turkish Linguistic Society, which was entrusted with the systematic reform of the Turkish language, in close co-operation with the Ministry of Education, the Republican People's Party and the latter's cultural organs, the People's Houses (*Halkevleri*). The activities of the Society were to form an integral part of the general reform programme,

⁵ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, VI (London, 1940), pp. 102-3. 'Futurism' rather than 'archaism' is the characteristic quality of this movement.

⁶ See statements by Ali Canib and Hasan Âli at the First Language Congress in 1932 (T. D. K., 1. *T. D. Kurultayı*, Ist., 1933, pp. 289, 279-84).

^{6a} C. J. H. Hayes, *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (New York, 1951), p. 64. Cf. also Grégoire's demand for a revolutionary change of the French language in 1794 (F. Brunot, *Hist. de la langue franç.*, X, 2nd part (Paris, 1943), pp. 623-29).

initiated and directed by Atatürk. Consequently, the course of the modern linguistic movement has been closely connected with the cultural and religious development of contemporary Turkey.

Like other revolutionary changes in Kemalist Turkey, language reform was prompted both by irrational and rational motives, by ardent nationalism and by practical considerations. These different and, to some extent, contradictory factors may be responsible for some of the inconsistencies in this movement.

THE NEW SCRIPT

The year 1928 is generally regarded in Turkey as the beginning of Atatürk's 'language revolution' (*dil inkılâbı* or, in more modern terminology, *dil devrimi*). In April of that year the Turkish National Assembly decided to amend article 2 of the Constitution, which said: "The religion of the State of Turkey is Islam, its official language is Turkish . . .", by deleting all reference to religion. Continuing this policy of secularization and Westernization, Parliament in the following month introduced the Western instead of the Arabic numerals. In June, 1928 a committee of the Theological Faculty of the University of Istanbul, headed by Professor Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat (Fuat Köprülü), published its programme for the reform of Muslim worship, suggesting, *inter alia*, the replacement of Arabic with Turkish as the language of religious services.⁷ About the same time a committee was charged with the preparation of a new script, composed of Latin characters, and early in November the new Turkish alphabet was adopted by Parliament.

While the committee which had drawn up the new alphabet believed that its introduction would take considerable time (in

⁷ See L. Levonian, *The Turkish Press 1925-1932* (Athens, 1932), pp. 123-26; G. Jäschke, *Der Islam in der neuen Türkei* (*Die Welt des Islams*, N.S., I, no. 1-2, 1951), pp. 66-68.

schools at least five years), the Gazi decreed that the change was to be effected within a few months.⁸

The lengthy discussions on the subject of a new script had aroused wide public interest in linguistic problems generally; its adoption prepared the people psychologically for fundamental changes in the language itself. Such changes now seemed both natural and imperative. The Roman script graphically demonstrated the heterogeneous character of Ottoman Turkish. In the old Arabic script, the native Turkish words had almost looked like intruders into the language of a common Islamic, i.e. Arabic-Persian, civilization. Their orthography was difficult, inadequate and subject to frequent changes. On the other hand, the thousands of Arabic and Persian words had—owing to the religious and cultural prestige of their languages of origin—generally preserved their established spelling. Now the position was reversed. Designed to render the sounds of the genuine Turkish speech material as correctly as possible, and based on the principle of a strictly phonetic spelling, the new alphabet turned the Arabic and Persian words which had not been completely turkicized into distinctly foreign elements. Their lack of conformity with the law of vowel harmony prevailing in genuine Turkish words became strikingly apparent.⁹ Furthermore, in Latin garb, their etymology, structure and inflexion became almost unintelligible, especially to the younger generation, who from September, 1929 onwards no longer learnt Arabic and Persian in school.

In the new script, the same Latin letter stands for different Arabic characters.¹⁰ Some Arabic letters,¹¹ long vowels, and the

⁸ See H. W. Duda in *O.L.Z.* (1929), pp. 443 sq.; F. R. Atay in *T.D., A.D.*, no. 23, p. 719.

⁹ On the other hand, the new alphabet to some extent concealed their foreign origin by no longer reserving certain letters (such as ح, ظ, ع etc. in the old script) for them and by indicating short vowels in all words (and not only in genuine Turkish ones).

¹⁰ z for ظ, ض, ز, ذ; s for ص, س, ث etc.

¹¹ *hamza* and *'ain*.

reduplication of a consonant at the end of the syllable are mostly not indicated at all. Thus, in the new script, *bal* can mean 'situation' (Arabic, *ḥál*), 'solution' (Arabic, *ḥall*), or 'covered market-place' (French, *halle*). Certain grammatical rules for Arabic and Persian words¹² have become incomprehensible in the Roman script. Derivatives of Arabic and Persian words are no longer self-explanatory. Arabic words like *dua* 'prayer', *davet* 'invitation', *tedai* 'calling one another, association of ideas', *iddia* 'claim', *müddei* 'prosecutor' now look completely different; the fact that they are derived from one root is no longer recognizable.

Most suggestions made before and after the adoption of the new alphabet for the introduction of a few special letters (e.g., *q*, *kh*, *gh*) and signs (apostrophe, hyphen, etc.) for foreign words were categorically rejected, except in certain cases involving danger of misunderstanding and in scholarly editions of old Ottoman texts.¹³ The fundamental rule was laid down by Mustafa Kemal, who is quoted as saying: "I certainly do not think it proper to add letters to the Turkish alphabet for the sake of foreign words which have infiltrated into our language and the elimination of which is (merely) a question of time".¹⁴

The new spelling dictionary (*İmlâ Lûgati*), published in 1928, foreshadowed future developments by excluding "unnecessary (Arabic and Persian) words not adopted by the common people" and, on the other hand, listing many Turkish ar-

¹² E.g., the pronoun termination *-i* (and not *-si*) in Arabic words ending in *hamza* or 'ain, such as *mebde*, *mevzi*, etc. The Persian *izafet* *-i* and the Persian *u* meaning 'and', which are joined to the preceding noun, now look like a Turkish possessive pronoun. A further difficulty in recognizing a foreign root is caused by the official rule—though not applied by all Turkish writers—to transliterate the letters ب, ج, د, ذ, *ğ* at the end of a syllable in most Arabic and Persian words by *p*, *ç*, *t*, *k* (e.g., *kitap*, *içtima*, *etkik*, *renk*).

¹³ *T.D.*, II, no. 9-10, pp. 63-65; Dil Encümeni, *İmlâ Lûgati* (Ist., 1928), pp. XI-XIII; T. D. K., *İmlâ Kılavuzu* (Ist., 1948), pp. XXXIII-XXXVIII; H. W. Duda in *O.L.Z.* (1930), pp. 399-413.

¹⁴ Sadri Maksudi, *Türk Dili için* (Ist., 1930), p. 275.

chaic and dialect words.¹⁵ No effective measures for language reform were, however, taken by the enlarged Language Committee established early in 1929. Work was begun on a comprehensive Turkish dictionary and scientific terminology, but not much headway was made. When in 1931 Parliament cut off all allocations for its budget the Committee dissolved.¹⁶

THE FOUNDATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY

The next year saw the beginning of the new language movement. While the introduction of the Roman script had formed part of the secular reforms of 1924-28, the linguistic movement, though a continuation of those reforms, was closely related to the new approach to Turkish history. In 1931 Mustafa Kemal had founded the Society for the Study of Turkish History, the principal aim of which was to promote interest and research in the national history of the Turks as distinct from merely Ottoman history. Particular attention was to be paid to the pre-Islamic period of Turkish history, as Ziya Gökalp and his followers had been demanding for the last twenty years. The first Turkish Historical Congress was held in Ankara in July, 1932. On the day of its closing the Gazi invited some of its prominent members and suggested to them the establishment of a similar society for the study of the Turkish language, with a programme prepared by him in broad outline. On the following day (12th July, 1932) the Turkish Linguistic Society (today called *Türk Dil Kurumu*) was officially founded.¹⁷ According to article 2 of its statutes the aim of the Society was "to bring out the genuine beauty and richness of the Turkish language and to elevate it to the high rank it deserves among world lan-

¹⁵ *İmlâ Lûgati*, p. VI.

¹⁶ See H. W. Duda in *O.L.Z.* (1929), pp. 450-51; *T.D., A.D.*, no. 4, pp. 36-37.

¹⁷ Its original name, *Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti*, was changed in 1934 to *Türk Dili Araştırma Kurumu* and in 1936 to *Türk Dil Kurumu*. For details on the foundation of the Society and the preparations for its First Congress see Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın, *Hâtıralar* (Ankara, 1943).

guages".¹⁸ To attain this objective, special committees were set up for research in linguistics and philology, etymology, grammar and syntax, vocabulary and terminology, the collection of words, and publications.

In September, 1932 the First Turkish Language Congress (*Türk Dil Kurultayı*) convened in the former Sultan's palace of Dolmabahçe in Istanbul. The impressive setting, Mustafa Kemal's presence, and the wide publicity given to the proceedings through the press and radio made the Congress a great national event. The Congress elected the Society's Central Committee, which decided on the following main steps towards a speedy reform of the ordinary, i.e. non-technical, vocabulary:

- a) the collection and publication of the Turkish word-material present in the popular language and in old texts;
- b) the definition of the principles of word-formation in Turkish, and the creation of words from Turkish roots in conformity therewith;
- c) the suggestion and propagation of such genuine Turkish words as might replace words of foreign origin frequently used in Turkish, especially in the written language.¹⁹

In its efforts to carry out the first-mentioned task, the Society was supported by the full authority of the Government and administration. In November, 1932 the Cabinet issued a decree enjoining the administrative organs all over the country to collect Turkish words existing in the language of the people, but not recorded in the standard dictionaries or not used in the written language.²⁰ In every province a language committee was established. Headed by the governor, the committee included—

¹⁸ *T.D.*, I, no. 1, p. 4.

¹⁹ *Söz Derleme Dergisi*, I (Ist., 1939), pp. 7-8.

²⁰ For the text of this decree and of the official instructions for its execution see *ibid.*, pp. 13-16.—Earlier attempts of this kind were made in 1920 by the Ministry of Education and in 1929-30 by the Language Committee mentioned above. Part of this material was published in 1932 by Hâmid Zübeyr and İshak Refet under the title *Anadilden Derlemeler*.

in addition to members of the local branch of the Linguistic Society—the mayor, the military commander, the directors of the provincial Departments of Education and Health, the headmasters of colleges and secondary schools, and others. Similar committees of the highest local officials were formed in every district. These committees organized and supervised the 'collection centres' established in schools in every town and village. The collectors (mostly teachers) filled in a separate form for each word, indicating, *inter alia*, its exact meaning, its synonyms and antonyms, the group of people generally using it, and where, when, and from whom it had been heard. These forms, together with separate sheets containing folkloristic material (customs, proverbs, tales, etc.) collected at the same time, were forwarded to the provincial committee and by the latter to the Linguistic Society. Each consignment was checked and sifted, and duplicates were eliminated. By September, 1933, when the first stage of the work was concluded, over 125,000 forms had been received at the Society's headquarters.²¹

Though there was much enthusiasm in carrying out this work, most of the collectors lacked scientific, and especially linguistic, training. Inaccuracies and mistakes could hardly be avoided, but the large number of forms helped to rectify some of them. A serious, though inevitable, drawback from a scientific point of view was the inexact spelling of the words, as the majority of the collectors simply used the modern Turkish alphabet without indicating sounds not, or not exactly, represented in it.

In addition to collecting words from popular speech the Society began to sift the old Turkish literature written in the dialects of various countries and periods. In the first stage, about 150 books and manuscripts were systematically searched for

²¹ Collecting continued and by 1942 the total had passed 200,000 (T. D. K., 4. T. D. *Kurultayı*, Ankara, 1943, p. 73). A detailed account of the work is found in T. D., I, no. 1, pp. 49-55, 69-74, and in *Söz Derleme Dergisi*, I, pp. 7-57.

Turkish words not or no longer existent in the written language of modern Turkey. These sources included ancient inscriptions, dictionaries of different Turkic languages, translations of classical Arab and Persian works, Koran commentaries, old divans, popular and dervish poetry, historical works, etc.²²

The material collected from the spoken language of Turkey was published by the Society in 1939-51 in four volumes (*Türkîyede Halk Ağzından Söz Derleme Dergisi*). A fifth (indices) is in preparation, and a sixth, containing some of the folkloristic material collected, appeared in 1952. Notwithstanding the above-mentioned defects, these volumes constitute a most useful dictionary of the spoken language, especially of the village population. At present the Society is engaged in correcting and completing the material. Many hundreds of collectors in all parts of the country are reported to be taking part in the new campaign, which is scheduled to last for several years. This work is of particular importance at a time when the spread of education, the growing contact between village and town and the influence of the radio, the cinema and the newspapers are rapidly assimilating the local dialects to the standard language.

The sifting of the old literature has continued in preparation for the publication of two monumental works, a 'Dictionary of Turkish Dialects' and a 'Thesaurus of the Turkish Language', the latter of which is to exhibit the development of the language from its earliest use in Turkey in the thirteenth century until the present day. So far only three preparatory volumes of the 'Thesaurus' have appeared,²³ which list and explain old Turkish and turkicized words collected from 100 texts, together with quotations illustrating their use. Unfortunately, the valuable material is presented in Latin characters only and no exact references to the sources of the quotations are given.

²² *T.D.*, I, no. 4, pp. 8 sq.; no. 8-9, p. 27.

²³ *XIII. Asırdan Günümüze kadar Kitaplardan Toplanmış Tanıklariyle Tarama Sözlüğü*, I, II (A-İ) and II (K-Z) (İst., 1943 and 1945; Ankara, 1953).

THE HIGH TIDE OF PURISM

In 1933/4 these collections of words from popular speech and old texts were used as raw material in carrying out another of the Society's projects, viz. the determination of Turkish equivalents for foreign words in the Ottoman language. The first step in this direction was taken in March, 1933, when the Society launched a public inquiry. Day after day, for a period of over three months, lists of 10-20 words of Arabic or Persian origin, chosen from Şemseddin Sami's *Kamus-ı Tüirkî* were published on the front-pages of the newspapers, and the public was requested to suggest good Turkish equivalents. Altogether about 1,400 words²⁴ were published, and thanks to the active cooperation of the press, the radio, the 'People's Houses' and the Party there was a lively public response.

The result of this inquiry proved, of course, insufficient as the only basis for an authoritative list of Turkish words capable of replacing words of foreign origin. Not only was the number of foreign words intended to be eliminated much larger than 1,400, but the genuine Turkish vocabulary of the modern literary language was also much too limited to supply the necessary equivalents. It was therefore decided to tap the larger resources of the Turkish language which had just been rendered accessible. For this purpose the 125,000 forms containing words from the popular language were examined by a large number of schoolteachers with a view to finding equivalents for Ottoman words of foreign origin. This was accomplished in the surprisingly short span of five weeks—an indication of the energetic but hardly very thorough character of the linguistic work during that period. As was to be expected, it soon became evident that those forms contained many useful Turkish words for concrete objects, but were rather deficient in abstract terms. To

²⁴ A full list of these words is given in *T. D.*, I, no. 1, pp. 104-15 and no. 2, pp. 21-23.

fill the gap, ample use was made of the words collected in the course of sifting the old texts and dictionaries. On the basis of all this material a 'Collection of Turkish Equivalents of Ottoman Words' (*Osmanlıcadan Türkçeye Söz Karşılıkları Tarama Dergisi*) was published in the summer of 1934. This work contains over 7,000 words of foreign origin, for which about 30,000 Turkish words are indicated as possible substitutes.²⁵

With the publication of the *Tarama Dergisi* modern Turkish language reform reached the peak of purism. This phase coincided with a period of equally strong anti-Islamic measures. During the years 1933-1935 the Theological Faculty of the Istanbul University was transformed into an Islamic Research Institute, a ban was imposed on wearing ecclesiastical garments outside the places of worship, the traditional civilian and religious titles were abolished, the Aya Sofya (Hagia Sophia) was converted into a museum and many other mosques were closed, Sunday instead of Friday became the official day of rest and religious instruction was struck off the school curriculum.

The puristic tendency of those years was understandable in the first flush of the 'language revolution'. In 1933 students of the Galatasaray secondary school and the University of Istanbul wrote to the Linguistic Society, expressing strong opposition to any compromise with regard to the purification of the language. "Even the most uncouth Turkish word", they declared, "is to us more pleasing than the most harmonious foreign word". This attitude, which was subsequently quoted by a spokesman of the Society in support of its puristic policy at that time,²⁶ is the almost exact reverse of the outlook of Ottoman writers in pre-Tanzimat times. Until the middle of the nineteenth century "every Persian and every Arabic word was a possible Ottoman word. In thus borrowing material from the two classical languages a writer was quite unrestricted save by his own taste and

²⁵ *Tarama Dergisi*, I, p. 6; *T. D.*, I, no. 13, p. 9.

²⁶ *T. D.*, II, no. 9-10, pp. 25-26.

the limit of his knowledge".²⁷ Now any Turkish word found in the vernacular of a remote Anatolian village, in the speech of an even more remote Turkish tribe in Siberia or in the manuscript of an eleventh century Turkish-Arabic dictionary was regarded as a possible addition to the modern Turkish vocabulary. On the other hand, practically every word of Arabic or Persian origin was considered outlawed and condemned to suppression as soon as a Turkish equivalent was found.

This attitude was clearly reflected in the lists of the 'inquiry', which mainly contained Arabic and Persian words used in the everyday language, many of them even in the vernacular of the uneducated and rural population.²⁸ True, in one of its statements²⁹ the Society declared that "to seek and even to find (Turkish) equivalents for those words—some of which are widely current and used by everybody—does not mean that they will be eliminated from the language". But there can be little doubt that in those days the Society intended to do just this. Otherwise there would have been no sense in requesting the public to suggest equivalents for them.

The *Tarama Dergisi*, too, indicated Turkish equivalents for many words of foreign origin which had become part and parcel of the Turkish language, even of that spoken by the common people.³⁰

THE FIRST RETREAT

The *Tarama Dergisi* had presented a large choice of possible substitutes for foreign words. After its publication the Society again appealed to the public, asking for corrections of and additions to this collection as well as for suggestions regarding

²⁷ E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, I (London, 1900), p. 8.

²⁸ E.g., *can* 'soul', *ceza* 'punishment', *defter* 'register', *devlet* 'State', *din* 'religion', *dost* 'friend', *kaful* 'acceptance', *kanun* 'law', *zarar* 'damage'.

²⁹ Published on 10th March, 1933 and quoted in *T. D.*, I, no. 1, p. 103.

³⁰ E.g., *çerçeve* 'frame', *hizmet* 'service', *kâğıt* 'paper', *para* 'money', *ve* 'and', *yabut* 'or'.

the final selection of the best Turkish equivalents. Many thousand replies were received and checked. After the Second Language Congress in August, 1934 it was decided to take the next step, namely, choosing the best substitutes. In March-May, 1935 lists of the words selected were published in the newspapers, again giving the public one month's time to express its opinion. Eventually, in the autumn of 1935, the result of all this endeavour was published in the form of an Ottoman-Turkish Pocket Glossary (*Osmanlıcadan Türkçeye Cep Kılavuzu*) and its companion volume, a Turkish-Ottoman Pocket Glossary.

During the year which had elapsed since the publication of the *Tarama Dergisi* an important change in the Society's attitude had occurred. It had become evident that the extreme purism favoured in 1933/4 was apt to lead to linguistic anarchy and that hundreds of household words borrowed from Arabic and Persian could not be finally discarded before Turkish substitutes had been accepted by the people. A certain slowing up of the purification effort seemed therefore indicated. On the occasion of the publication of the *Kılavuz* the Society issued a statement in which it said: "The purpose of this work is to provide genuine Turkish substitutes for words which are considered foreign because they are used (only) in our written language and are not found in the spoken language of the people".³¹ Thus the main object of linguistic reform was no longer to restore the 'racial' purity of the Turkish language, but "to make the language of literature and teaching come as close as possible to the spoken language".³² As stated in the foreword to the *Kılavuz*, that work was prepared with a practical aim in mind, namely, "to guide writers in establishing a written language which every literate person can understand".

In accordance with this new attitude hundreds of Arabic and

³¹ *T.D.*, I, no. 16, p. 12.—See also the statement made in September, 1935 by the Secretary General of the Society (*T. D.*, I, no. 13, p. 8).

³² *T.D.*, I, no. 13, p. 9.

Persian words³³ and their derivatives were retained in the *Kılavuz*, though in many cases in slightly turkicized form³⁴ or with one or more genuine Turkish words added as alternatives. For instance, all the Arabic-Persian words mentioned above,³⁵ for which Turkish substitutes had been requested in the 'inquiry' lists, were now explicitly admitted into the ranks of Turkish words, without even suggesting possible equivalents of Turkish origin. Furthermore, a large number of Arabic and Persian words much used in Turkish are not mentioned at all in the *Kılavuz*, apparently because they were considered so completely absorbed that there was no need to look for substitutes.³⁶

For this new policy of moderation a theoretical reason or excuse was given. "The work of the Etymology Committee has revealed", so we read in the foreword to the *Kılavuz*, "that a number of words which are used in our language and which until now were thought to have been taken from foreign languages had originally passed from Turkish into those languages". According to a computation made by the Society, of the close upon 9,000 Turkish words suggested in the *Kılavuz* as substitutes for foreign elements, about 16 per cent are words (or derivatives of words) which "until recently had been thought to be of Arabic, Persian and other foreign origin, but which have (now) . . . been proved to be derived from Turkish roots".³⁷

Almost simultaneously with the publication of the *Kılavuz* this thesis crystallized into a new linguistic theory, known as the 'Sun-Language Theory' (*Güneş-Dil teorisi*). Its adherents claimed that just as Central Asia, the ancient homeland of the

³³ A (rather incomplete) list of such words is given in Ömer Asım Aksoy, *Karşılıklar Klavuzu Üzerine Dersler* (Gaziantep, 1935), pp. 12-20.

³⁴ E.g., *bükümet* for *bükûmet* 'government', *sayfa* for *sahife* 'page'.

³⁵ See note 28 above.

³⁶ Examples are the words mentioned in note 30 above.

³⁷ *T. D.*, I, no. 16, pp. 22-23.

Turks, was the cradle of human civilization, so Turkish was "the mother of all languages".³⁸ From November, 1935 onwards innumerable articles, pamphlets and books were published to prove this thesis and to show that a great many Arabic, Persian and European words in the Ottoman language were in fact of Turkish origin. The new discovery was regarded as so far-reaching that in the opinion of the Linguistic Society "it was no longer necessary to sacrifice any word needed in our language and familiar to the people" for the sole reason that it was thought to have come from a foreign language.³⁹ This indeed was the logical conclusion from the new thesis. If Turkish was the *Ursprache* of mankind, why should one take the trouble of purifying it from elements which had originally been derived from it?

In the opinion of many Turkish writers on modern language reform⁴⁰ Atatürk launched this theory with the object of putting an end to the excessive—and not very successful—efforts of the purists. In any case, the new theory had this effect. The eager search for Turkish substitutes for foreign words in the ordinary vocabulary and the attempts to introduce these neologisms into the press and literature slackened considerably.

As usual, Atatürk himself demonstrated the new policy. He who in November, 1934 had given the semi-official newspaper *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* its new name *Ulus* 'nation' and had used this archaic Turkish word in his speeches, from 1935 onwards re-established the (Arabic) term *millet*.⁴¹ Another sign of mod-

³⁸ *T.D.*, I, no. 16, p. 21.—For a short outline of this amazing theory see *T.D.*, I, no. 16, pp. 30-53 (in Turkish) and *ibid.*, no. 21-22, pp. 30-55 (in French).

³⁹ *T.D.*, I, no. 16, p. 22, note 1, and *T. D. K.*, 3. *T.D. Kurultayı* (Ist., 1937), p. 12.

⁴⁰ Cf. F. R. Atay in *T. D.*, *A. D.*, no. 3, pp. 4-6 and in *Dünya* (Istanbul daily) of 28th and 29th June, 1952; İsmail Habib Sevük, *Dil Da'vâsı* (Istanbul, 1949), p. 29. See also A. S. Levend in *T. D. K.*, *Dil Dâvası*, pp. 7-8, and Prof. Cemil Bilsel in *Ulus* of 19th December, 1945.

⁴¹ F. R. Atay in *Ulus* of 24th January, 1939.

eration was the fact that, compared with the *Tarama Dergisi*, relatively few words borrowed from Turkic languages spoken outside Turkey were suggested in the *Kılavuz* as substitutes for foreign elements.

The decision taken by Atatürk and his collaborators in 1935 to arrest the 'language revolution', at least for the time being and as far as the non-technical vocabulary was concerned, seems to reflect a general tendency during those years of a growing international crisis to transfer their main attention from internal reforms to foreign policy.⁴²

During the following period, which opened with the Third Language Congress (August, 1936), the Society dealt mainly with the question of technical and scientific terminology. The first aim of the Society was to establish the terms needed in primary and 'middle' schools. Already in 1933-34 lists of over 30,000 foreign terms had been drawn up and distributed to specialists and teachers with a request for suggestions for genuine Turkish equivalents.⁴³ The replies were sifted, further research was undertaken, and in 1937 temporary lists of Turkish school terms for mathematics and natural sciences were prepared by the Society and submitted to the Ministry of Education.⁴⁴ Teachers and others concerned were requested to try them and to submit corrections and additions. After the suggestions received had been checked by various commissions, a list of about 5,000 terms was finally adopted in 1939 and officially introduced in teaching and textbooks.⁴⁵

⁴² See the reminiscences of Hikmet Bayur, one of Atatürk's close collaborators in those days, in T. D. K., *Dil Dâvası*, pp. 29-30.

⁴³ *T. D.*, I, no. 8-9, pp. 29-33.

⁴⁴ These lists were published in *T. D.*, I, no. 23-26, pp. 23-376.

⁴⁵ *T. D.*, II, no. 13-15, p. 111.—In 1941/2 lists of grammatical and geographical terms were also published (*T. D.*, II, no. 11-12, pp. 128-56; no. 13-15, pp. 113-60). All these terms, except the grammatical terms, were alphabetically listed in the *Türkçe Terimler Cep Kılavuzu* published by the Ministry of Education in 1941.

Atatürk's death (November, 1938) appears to have further weakened the momentum of the 'language revolution'. The press, including the semi-official *Ulus*,⁴⁶ published a number of articles opposing too drastic reforms of modern Turkish. On 1st January, 1939 the Istanbul newspaper *Vakit* (Arabic loan-word for 'time') resumed its old name, which in November, 1934 had been changed to (Turkish) *Kurun*. A short time later the Ministry of Education replaced its new name *Kültür Bakanlığı* with the previous (Arabic) one, *Maarif Vekâleti*, and the Ministry of the Interior reintroduced *vilâyet* 'province' and *kaza* 'district' in place of the Turkish terms *il* and *ilçe*. When, at its 1939 Congress, the Republican People's Party adopted its new programme and statutes, many Arabic terms previously eliminated were reinstated.⁴⁷

The Linguistic Society likewise maintained its moderate attitude regarding purism, though the Sun-Language Theory gradually faded out. In September, 1940 the Secretary General of the Society re-affirmed that those foreign words which by constant use had penetrated into popular speech might, on certain conditions, be regarded as naturalized citizens of the Turkish language.⁴⁸

RENEWED PURIFICATION EFFORTS

Just when the linguistic reform movement seemed to have lost all its former impetus, a new puristic drive was launched by Atatürk's successor. İsmet İnönü had always taken an active interest in language reform. Already in February, 1929, when he was Prime Minister, he had convened and addressed a meeting of scholars and pedagogues to discuss the preparation of an

⁴⁶ E.g., articles by F. R. Atay on 17th and 24th January, 1939 and by Yaşar Nabi on 12th February, 1939.

⁴⁷ H. W. Duda in *Der Islam*, XXVI (1942), pp. 96-99; G. Jäschke, *Die Türkei in den Jahren 1935-1941* (Leipzig, 1943), pp. 82, 76.

⁴⁸ *T. D.*, II, no. 5-6, p. 20.

authoritative dictionary of modern Turkish based on the ideal of a simpler and purer language.⁴⁹ On the occasion of the Ninth Language Festival (September, 1941) İnönü, now President of the Republic, issued a declaration urging the Turkish intelligentsia to continue the work inaugurated by the late Atatürk for the purification of the language from foreign elements and the creation of a truly national language. About a month later İnönü gave an example of this purer Turkish in his speech at the opening ceremony of the new session of Parliament.⁵⁰

İnönü's demand that every Turkish writer and public speaker should do his share in eliminating foreign words became the slogan for the Society's renewed efforts to realize the ideal of 'genuine Turkish'. Following the President's line *Ulus* published in the winter of 1941/2 a series of articles on the problems of language reform.⁵¹ Representatives of the Press Association and the official newsagency also participated in the new efforts to turkicize the language of the newspapers and the radio. This campaign was directed not so much towards finding or creating new Turkish substitutes for Ottoman words of foreign origin as towards inducing the public to use those Turkish words previously suggested by the Society.

The new drive for linguistic changes started at the time when the Turkish Government also adopted stronger measures to enforce Atatürk's secular reforms. On 2nd June, 1941 Parliament passed amendments to the Criminal Law (§ 526) which increased the penalties for non-observance of the laws of 1925 and 1928 banning the Oriental headgear and the Arabic alphabet. Pronouncing the call to prayer (*ezan* and *kamet*) in Arabic was also made an offence punishable with imprisonment for up to three months. The traditional Arabic version had been offi-

⁴⁹ H. W. Duda in *O. L. Z.* (1929), p. 451; *T. D.*, *A. D.*, no. 4, pp. 36-37.

⁵⁰ *T. D.*, II, no. 11-12, pp. 1-19.

⁵¹ Reprinted in *T. D.*, II, no. 13-15, pp. 11-55.

cially replaced by its Turkish translation in 1932, shortly after the First Language Congress.⁵²

This new attempt at promoting a purer Turkish found a striking expression in the list of philosophical, pedagogical, sociological, and grammatical terms published by the Society in March, 1942.⁵³ The strongly puristic character of this work created a sensation. In the list of school terms adopted in 1939 the Society had followed a relatively moderate course, accepting a number of international terms. But now, in connection with the much more difficult task of creating a terminology for academic teaching, more radical tendencies became predominant. In the new list foreign terms commonly used in Turkish were replaced by neologisms, many of which were—unlike the school terms—formed from roots unknown in the modern Turkish of Turkey. The extreme purism of these suggestions was especially conspicuous, and exposed to criticism, because many of the terms proposed to be abolished formed part of the ordinary vocabulary of the educated person, whereas the school terms in the main concerned the natural sciences only.

Here the Linguistic Society met for the first time with strong opposition. Public criticism was voiced in newspapers and periodicals. More serious was the Society's clash with the academic institutions. Especially the professors of the University of Istanbul refused to recognize the Linguistic Society as the supreme authority for the creation of scientific terms. For some years the various faculties of Istanbul University and other academic institutions had been working on a new terminology. Now a central committee, established in 1941 at the University to coordinate this work, laid down its general principles, which were rejected by the Linguistic Society.⁵⁴ While the University fa-

⁵²G. Jäschke, *Der Islam in der neuen Türkei*, pp. 74 sq.; *O. M.* (1935), p. 47.

⁵³T. D. K., *Felsefe ve Gramer Terimleri* (Ist., 1942).

⁵⁴See Ragıp Özdem, *Terimler Meselesi Münasebetile Dilimizin Islahı üzerine Muhtıra*, Istanbul Üniversitesi (Edebiyat Fakültesi) Yayınlarından No. 138 (Ist., 1941); *T. D.*, II, no. 9-10, pp. 22-52.

voured the immediate acceptance of many terms common to the "advanced nations of the world",⁵⁵ the Society aimed at gradually finding or creating genuine Turkish equivalents for the majority of scientific terms.

In the opinion of many university teachers, the adoption of international terms would help the Turkish student in the use of Western scientific literature and would strengthen the ties between scientific work in Turkey and research done abroad. The creation of an artificial Turkish terminology, they claimed, was not only unnecessary, but might also endanger the exactness and clarity of scientific terms.⁵⁶

This attitude was rejected by leading members of the Linguistic Society, such as Professor İsmail (İsmayıl) Hakkı Baltacıoğlu. He referred to the example of the Germans, and especially to that of the Japanese, Finns and Hungarians, who had created a largely national terminology. Greco-Latin terms may be proper for nations who speak an Indo-European language and whose cultural traditions are based on those classical languages, but not for a people like the Turks.⁵⁷ Nurullah Ataç, too, though a fervent advocate of intellectual Westernization, is opposed to the acceptance of Greek and Latin terms, as long as those languages are not taught in Turkish secondary schools. In the past the Turkish student, who knew some Arabic and Persian, understood the literal meaning of terms like *müvellid-ül-humuza* 'oxygen'. But the term *oksijen* used today means nothing to the student.⁵⁸

Another argument advanced by academic teachers was that

⁵⁵ T. D. K., 4. T. D. Kurultayı, p. 84.

⁵⁶ See Ragıp Özdem's report to the Fourth Language Congress (4. T. D. Kurultayı, pp. 344-45), and the discussions in the Terms Committee of the Fourth and Fifth Language Congresses (*ibid.*, pp. 224-40; T. D. K., 5. T. D. Kurultayı, Ist., 1946, pp. 241-67).

⁵⁷ 4. T. D. Kurultayı, pp. 97-99; 5. T. D. Kurultayı, pp. 123-28, 244 sq.

⁵⁸ See Ataç's articles in *Ulus* (Ankara) of 9th and 23rd February and 2nd March, 1951.

universities and colleges could not postpone teaching and the publication of textbooks until the new Turkish terms had been decided upon. On the other hand, the Linguistic Society was obviously unable to solve the extremely difficult problems of the creation of new terms within a short period. The task was formidable also in quantitative respect. For instance, during the years 1938-1949 over 300 scientists were engaged in finding Turkish equivalents for more than 125,000 terms taken from a German lexicon of the technical sciences.⁵⁹ Though no final agreement was reached with the universities, the Linguistic Society continued its work, and in 1948-49 published lists of legal, biological, botanic, literary, technical, linguistic, and agricultural terms.⁶⁰

A NEW DICTIONARY AND A NEW VERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION

The new puristic attitude adopted since 1941 was also reflected in the lexicographical work which the Linguistic Society prepared in this period. In 1939 it had been decided to codify the new Turkish literary vocabulary which had come into being as a result of the 'language revolution'. After many years of research a *Türkçe Sözlük* (Turkish-Turkish Dictionary) was published by the Society.

This work, which in several respects is a marked advance over similar dictionaries previously published in Turkey, contains—apart from technical terms of whatever descent—"those Turkish words that are used today or are expected to be used in future" and the foreign words used in present-day ordinary written and spoken language. The general tendency of the Dictionary to establish the 'language of tomorrow' manifests itself

⁵⁹ T. D. K., 6. T. D. Kurultayı, p. 174.

⁶⁰ *Türe Terimleri, Dirilbilim (Biyoloji) Terimleri, Bitkibilim Terimleri (Botanik), Edebiyat ve Söz Sanatı Terimleri Sözlüğü* (İst., 1948); *Teknik Terimler I, Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Ankara, 1949); *Tarım Terimleri I* (İst., 1949).

above all in the very large number of neologisms included. With regard to non-Turkish elements the Society had, after lengthy deliberations, decided to exclude all foreign words no longer found in modern Turkish, even if used in the literature of the Tanzimat and more recent periods.

As to the foreign words which are included in the *Sözlük*, it is made quite clear in the foreword that "the Society did not intend to grant (them) a living right in the language . . . It considers it its duty to seek Turkish substitutes for all those foreign words for which substitutes have not yet been found, and it hopes that in future editions of this Dictionary it will be fortunate to replace many more foreign words by genuine Turkish equivalents". The *Sözlük* was arranged in accordance with this puristic aim. In most cases where a suitable Turkish equivalent had been found or created, the Ottoman word of foreign origin is simply 'translated' by it, and all definitions and examples, which are an important part of the Dictionary, are given after the Turkish word only. In this way the editors wished to express their conviction that the foreign word "was not expected to live on".⁶¹

The most drastic expression of the renewed puristic tendencies was the 'translation' of the Turkish Constitution into purer Turkish. To a certain extent the vocabulary of the Constitution forms part of the legal terminology and its reform is related to that of the technical and scientific terms, which will be discussed later on. However, as a political document of prime importance the text of the Constitution includes many words used in ordinary language and is intended to be understood not only by the jurist but also by the common man. It strongly influences, of course, the language of the press, the radio and the authorities.

The work on the new text took about three years. The Faculties of Law of the universities of Istanbul and Ankara and a group of members of Parliament interested in legal and linguistics

⁶¹ *Türkçe Sözlük*, pp. V-VI.

tic problems prepared a draft. The Linguistic Society, however, regarded its language as not sufficiently turkicized and drew up a text of its own.⁶² Other drafts, prepared by various people,⁶³ were also considered. After passing several commissions, a final draft was submitted to Parliament and adopted in January, 1945. In its new form the *Anayasa* 'Constitution' is an exact 'translation' of the *Teşkilâtı Esasiye Kanunu* of 1924, without any change in substance. A few months later, in April, 1945, the *Dahilî Nizamname* 'Standing Orders' of Parliament was also adopted in its new turkicized version, now called *İçtüzük*.

To illustrate the far-reaching linguistic changes made in the text of the Constitution, article 26 may serve as a good example.⁶⁴ In the 1924 text this article contained 66 words of Arabic descent and only 7 originally Turkish words. In the 1945 version, which is two words shorter, the number of Turkish words has risen to 37, one word is French, and only 33 Arabic words have remained. If words appearing more than once in the article are counted only once, the number of words of Arabic origin is reduced from about 50 to 15.

In the 105 articles of the new version of the Constitution there are only about 140 different words borrowed from Arabic or Persian (not counting separately words derived from them by means of various Turkish suffixes) and less than 10 European words. Many hundreds of Arabic and Persian words were replaced with Turkish ones and those retained were given as Turkish a form as possible.⁶⁵ The main puristic fervour was

⁶² T. D.K., *Anayasa, Gereçekler-Taslak-Sözlük* (Ankara, 1942).

⁶³ E.g., a joint draft by Falih Rifkî Atay, Reşat Nuri and Necmeddin Sadak (see the leading article in *Akşam*, Istanbul daily, of 9th February, 1951).

⁶⁴ The text of this article in the old and the new version, together with its translation, are given in the Appendix.—The article by M. Colombe, "Le nouveau texte de la Constitution Turque" in *Cahiers de l'Orient Contemporain*, IV (Paris, 1946) was not available to me.

⁶⁵ E.g., *temsilci* for *mümessil* 'representative', *kayıtlamak* for *takyit etmek* 'to restrict'.

directed against foreign legal and other technical terms, Arabic-Persian compounds, and derivatives formed by foreign grammatical rules. Not touched were foreign words which had acquired a certain halo during the early history of the Turkish Republic,⁶⁶ Arabic and Persian words which through religious or national tradition had become very popular,⁶⁷ some abstract words of foreign origin used even by the common people,⁶⁸ and finally non-Turkish words which could not be replaced with unequivocal Turkish substitutes.⁶⁹ In explaining the reasons for retaining such words, the spokesman of the Society added that the suppression of these remnants—except the first group—was only a question of time.⁷⁰

The new version of the Constitution was evidently the result of a compromise between divergent opinions. Consequently, there is some lack of consistency. Arabic or Persian words like *vilâyet* 'province' and *kaza* 'district' were eliminated, but *belediye* 'municipality', *kasaba* 'small town' and *şehir* 'town' were retained. While the *hâkim* 'judge' became *yargıç*, his tribunal, the *mahkeme*, was not renamed. War is still expressed by a foreign word (*harb*), but peace has found its Turkish term (*barış*). *Malî* 'financial' was translated by *akçalı*, while *maliye* 'finance' stayed on. Arabic and Turkish words listed in the *Kılavuz* and the *Sözlük* as synonyms⁷¹ are both found in the new Constitution, but they, or at least some of them, may carry separate shades of meaning.

⁶⁶ E.g., *cumhuriyet* 'republic', *milliyet* 'nationality', *hürriyet* 'freedom', *Büyük Millet Meclisi* 'National Assembly'. According to the *Kılavuz* of 1935 all these words should be replaced with Turkish terms, as indeed should be more than one third of all foreign words used in the new version of the Constitution.

⁶⁷ E.g., *din* 'religion', *vatan* 'native country', *devlet* 'State', *mahkeme* 'court of justice'.

⁶⁸ E.g., *şekil* 'form', *teklif* 'proposition', *karar* 'decision', *kabul* 'acceptance'.

⁶⁹ E.g., *cinayet* 'crime', *harb* 'war', *seferberlik* 'mobilization'.

⁷⁰ İ. N. Dilmen in *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul daily) of 15th January, 1945.

⁷¹ Such as *idare-yönetim* 'administration', *vatan-yurt* 'native country', *vazife-görev* or *ödev* 'duty', 'function'.

GROWING OPPOSITION
TO THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY

The 'translation' of the Constitution into purer Turkish marks the high tide in the second stage of planned language reform. It coincided with the end of the long series of revolutionary changes carried out by Atatürk and İnönü under the one-party system. About the end of the same year, in November, 1945, President İnönü announced the introduction of greater political freedom and a few months later an opposition group, the Democrat Party, was officially constituted. Thus a new phase opened in the political and cultural history of modern Turkey.

For several years the puristic efforts of the Linguistic Society had been meeting with certain criticism in public opinion, but in Atatürk's lifetime and during the first years of İnönü's presidency this opposition manifested itself mainly in the form of passive resistance. With the growing democratization of Turkish life after the second World War the criticism became more vocal. A large section of the press, especially in Istanbul, took exception to the puristic policy of the Society. The University of Istanbul, as mentioned before, clashed with the Society on the problems of scientific terminology, which was heatedly discussed at the Fifth Language Congress in November, 1945. The drastic reform of the Turkish language was also strongly opposed by the Istanbul Teachers' Association (*Muallimler Birliği*), which in 1948 convened its own Language Congress and elected a Language Committee (*Dil Encümeni*), conceived as "the basis for the Language Academy of tomorrow".⁷²

Opposition was also voiced by the *Hür Fikirleri Yayma Cemiyeti* (Society for the Propagation of Free Thought), which in February, 1949 held a special congress on linguistic problems

⁷² See the Association's statement in *Ulus* of 6th March, 1951.—Note the old terms in the name of the Association and its Committee (*muallim, encümen*) instead of *öğretmen, komisyon* used by the Linguistic Society.

and adopted a resolution demanding non-interference by the authorities in the development of the Turkish language.⁷³

At the same time a growing tendency in Government circles to reconsider some of the extreme anti-religious measures of the Kemalist revolution was discernible. Religious instruction was reintroduced into elementary schools—though at first outside the normal curriculum—, special courses (later seminaries) for training Hatibs and Imams (preachers and prayer-leaders) were founded, and it was decided to establish a Theological Faculty at the University of Ankara. The slight change in the official attitude towards the twin problems of secularization and linguistic reform was also reflected in the resolution of the Congress of the Republican People's Party in December, 1947 which eliminated the following passage of its programme adopted in 1943: "The Party considers it necessary for the present and future of the Turkish nation to protect the national language and the national culture in the field of religion from foreign linguistic and cultural influences".⁷⁴

The reasons for the opposition to the work of the Linguistic Society were manifold. First, there was the inertia of a majority of the people, who were unwilling to change the vocabulary they had been used to since childhood. The introduction of new words requires a constant effort, since the natural expression is in many cases an Ottoman or foreign term, so that one must, when reading, mentally re-translate the neologism into it or, when writing, translate the old word into the new language. Many journalists and authors were not inclined to use words unknown to the public. They were aware that the normal citizen wants to peruse his newspaper for quick information and to read a book for easy enjoyment or instruction, without needing a dictionary or commentary to understand it. Novelists and poets balked also because the neologisms had not yet acquired

⁷³ See *Hür Fikirler*, I, no. 5 (Ist., March, 1949), pp. 200-206.

⁷⁴ G. Jäschke, *Der Islam in der neuen Türkei*, pp. 134 sq., 124 sq., 70.

the emotional and intellectual significance or connotations of the old words of foreign origin. Moreover, they were afraid that constant changes in the language would make their works as unintelligible to future generations as Ottoman literature had become to their own. Though the Linguistic Society had many enthusiastic followers among schoolteachers, there were others who objected to drastic language reform because they would have to teach in a language which was unfamiliar to them and still in a state of constant fluctuation. Many scholars, especially in the various branches of the humanities, did not care for new terms which had not yet been generally adopted in a definite and precise meaning.

Other reasons for the resistance to language reform were ideological. Conservative circles feared that the wholesale elimination of Arabic and Persian words and expressions would lead to a complete break with the religious and cultural traditions. Convinced liberals, who strongly objected to authoritarian rule and to the large-scale State intervention in all spheres of public life, complained that the Linguistic Society, in collaboration with the authorities, had tried to impose the new language on the nation. Creating new words in the literary language should be left to writers and poets only. Newly coined technical terms should not be introduced into the language of administration, law and education until the public had approved of them. Others held that political considerations had played a part in the linguistic reforms.

The Society was also severely criticized from a linguistic point of view. Some people disapproved of planned language reform on principle, believing that a language, as a living organism, should develop by evolution and in accordance with its innate laws. During the last few decades, they said, Turkish had been developing, without interference by any organization, towards greater simplicity, expressiveness and richness. The modern reform movement only disturbed this healthy evolu-

tion. In their opinion, the character and originality of a language are found not in its vocabulary but in its morphology and syntax.

Others claimed that the purification efforts had impoverished the language and destroyed its harmony and gracefulness. The attempt at replacing popular words of Arabic or Persian descent with unfamiliar or newly created Turkish words was regarded as absurd. Widespread criticism was directed against the neologisms suggested by the Society on the ground that they were ugly, un-Turkish, phonetically, grammatically or semantically incorrect, and difficult to understand. The practice of reviving archaic words and endings and borrowing from Turkic languages spoken outside Turkey were especially objected to. The inconsistencies and vacillations of the Society in creating new words were also censured, as were some of its members for alleged lack of linguistic qualifications.

Finally, many critics were of the opinion that the Society had defeated its own purpose. Instead of developing the existing language so that it would be understood even by the common people, the Society was said to have created a new artificial language, an official and school language very different from the language of ordinary conversation and as unfamiliar and unintelligible to the masses as the old Ottoman had been. A situation had arisen in which parents no longer understood the language of their children, nor the public the language of the authorities. Thus a new and dangerous cleavage had been created between the intelligentsia and the masses, and the gap between the written and the spoken language had widened again.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ For a concise statement of the views of the opponents of the Linguistic Society see Ahmet Emin Yalman in *T. D., A. D.*, no. 2, pp. 45-47. Cf. also Prof. Şekip Tunç's statement (*ibid.*, no. 1, pp. 49-50), Hüseyin Cahit (Yalçın)'s speech at the First Language Congress (*1. T. D. Kurultayı*, pp. 273 sq.), a declaration by Tevfik İleri, Democrat Minister of Education (*Journal d'Orient*, Istanbul daily, of 9th Febr., 1951), and İst. Muall. Birliği, *Birinci Dil Kongresi* (1949).

Even the extreme opponents of modern linguistic reform, however, do not try to revive the language of the *Divan*, *Tanzimat*, and *Servet-i Fünun* literature. They, too, agree that the break with the Ottoman language cannot be undone. But they regard the literary language, as developed until 1928, as standard Turkish and object to any drastic change. The weakness of these conservative circles is their lack of a clear-cut idea as to how they wish to see the language develop. Furthermore, they have no organization corresponding to the Linguistic Society to formulate and propagate their views.

A TURN TO MODERATION

Under the influence of all this criticism the Sixth Language Congress, which convened in December, 1949, showed a clear tendency towards moderation in linguistic reform. Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, known for his opposition to purism, was elected president of the Congress. The Committee on Terminology decided that internationally accepted scientific terms might (as demanded by the universities) be used on certain conditions. The Committee's spokesman even expressed the opinion that turkicized terms, i.e. those foreign terms which had been adopted by the common people and had lost their original form, might remain in the language.⁷⁶

This attitude was maintained by the Extraordinary Language Congress held in February, 1951. That meeting was chiefly concerned with certain changes in the statutes of the Society necessitated by the political changes which had taken place—the victory of the Democrat Party in the general elections of May, 1950. Since the foundation of opposition parties in 1946 the question of language reform had, to a certain extent, become a political issue. The Society had hitherto been closely connected with the Republican People's Party, the ruling party until 1950, and the Minister of Education had served *ex officio* as

⁷⁶ 6. T. D. *Kurultayı*, pp. 145-46, 183.

its president. Now several articles of the statutes were modified with a view to removing the Society from the political battlefield.

One of the main topics discussed at that Congress was the demand for transforming the Society into a strictly scientific association, a kind of Language Academy, membership of which would be limited to specialists. A proposal to restrict full membership in the Society to university graduates and to ensure to academic teachers a two-thirds majority in the important Scientific Committee had already been submitted to the Sixth Language Congress, but had been rejected after a long debate.⁷⁷ Restrictions of this kind would have involved a complete change in the original character of the Linguistic Society as conceived by its founder Atatürk. Unlike the Historical Society and the Law Society, the *Dil Kurumu* had not been established as an exclusively scientific institution. Atatürk had wanted to give it a distinctly popular character and to interest the public at large in its work. The course of language reform was to be decided not by a limited group of specialists, but by representatives of all classes of people who had the aims of national renaissance at heart. Accordingly, every Turk over twenty-two years of age who was actively interested in the development of the Turkish language and accepted the aim of the Society could become a member with full voting rights at the Language Congresses. The membership of the Society used to be between 500 and 700.⁷⁸

Though the Congress of February, 1951 again rejected all attempts to convert the Society into a Language Academy, a certain tendency to strengthen its scientific character could be discerned. In the past the chairmanship of many committees had been held by public figures (members of Parliament, publicists, and others) who did not possess any special qualification for linguistic work except their great interest in and enthusiasm

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-14, 119-22, 125-31.

⁷⁸ *T. D., A.D.*, no. 2, p. 28.

for the reform of the language. In the Executive Committee elected in February, 1951, however, university professors, linguists, schoolteachers and writers formed the large majority. Hakkı Tarık Us, the new president of the Society, and Ağâh Sırrı Levend, the new Secretary General, were known for their more moderate views on language reform.

The Society's new line of policy, which has been in force since, was outlined later in 1951 at a press conference and in various publications.⁷⁹ Rejecting the views of both the conservatives and the (extreme) purists, the Society stated that it was following a middle course. Its reforms were said to be based on the 'living language' as used in the home and in schools. No radical purification of the language is aimed at. "The goal is to make Turkish a reasonably homogeneous language, free from the hegemony of both Eastern and Western languages". All neologisms are to be easily understandable to the people and are not to hurt their linguistic feeling and taste. Therefore, a definite order of precedence has now been established for the various sources of new words. First comes the living Turkish of Turkey (standard and colloquial). When no suitable word or root is found in it, the Society falls back on obsolete or dialect words, then on ancient Turkish written outside Turkey, and finally on distant dialects spoken today. During the last few years the Society has refrained from suggesting any further neologisms.

This moderate attitude is reflected in a small dictionary of foreign (mostly Arabic and Persian) words with their Turkish equivalents, published by the Society in 1953. Its title, *Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu*, seems to indicate that in the present phase 'simple' (*sade*), and not 'pure' (*öz*), Turkish is the Society's slogan.

⁷⁹ T. D., A. D., no. 2, p. 54; T. D. K., *Türkiyede Dil Devrimi (Language Reform in Turkey)* (Ankara, 1951), pp. 6-7 (13); see also T. D., A. D., no. 23, p. 779.

After the 1950 elections the Linguistic Society lost its semi-official status. The new Minister of Education publicly criticized the Society for its exaggerated purism and arbitrary creation of new words, and the predominantly Democrat Parliament decided to cut off the Government subvention previously given to the Society.⁸⁰ The annual budget of the Linguistic Society in the years 1946-49 had varied between L.T.200,000 and 250,000, i.e. about £ 26,000-32,000. Before the Government began to reduce its subventions in 1946, 46 per cent of the Society's income was derived from the Government and 30 per cent from an endowment made by Atatürk.⁸¹

The opposition of the new regime to the puristic policy of the Linguistic Society found a striking expression in the cancellation of the 1945 'translation' of the Constitution. At first, it had been intended to rewrite the Constitution in the 'living language' of Turkey, retaining a number of neologisms of the 1945 version.⁸² But to avoid lengthy debates on linguistic questions Parliament decided on 24th December, 1952 by the vote of an overwhelming majority to reintroduce the old text of 1924—including, of course, later amendments—without any change in language.

It is improbable that even conservative circles regard this language, with its very many Arabic and Persian learned words, as the 'living language' or standard literary language of today. The return to the old version seems to have been based on the opinion that the time had not yet come to establish the modern language, particularly not in such an important document as the Constitution.

⁸⁰ *Journal d'Orient* of 9th February, 1951; *Ulus* of 25th February, 1st-2nd March, and 9th April, 1951.

⁸¹ T. D. K., *Yıllık 1945-1946* (Ist., 1948), p. 181; 6. T. D. *Kurultayı*, pp. 25-26.

⁸² E.g., *tasarı* for *lâyiha* 'draft law', *savcı* for *müddeiumumî* 'public prosecutor', etc. (See article by Ferid Alpiskender in *Zafer*, Ankara daily, of 10th February, 1952.)

At the same time many Arabic terms were reinstated in place of Turkish neologisms in the language of the administration.⁸³ The new Minister of Education promised to eliminate bad neologisms from school textbooks and charged a committee with the reconsideration of the philosophical and grammatical terms published by the Linguistic Society in 1942.⁸⁴

Again, as in the earlier periods, modern Turkish language reform underwent changes parallel to those made in the religious policy of the Government. Immediately after its coming to power the Democrat Party Government rescinded the ban on the call to prayer in Arabic and permitted Koran recitation over the Ankara radio.

HOW THE NEW VOCABULARY WAS PROPAGATED

From the very beginning of its work, the Linguistic Society met with the difficult question of how to induce the people to use genuine Turkish words, old or new, instead of those of foreign origin. New technical and scientific terms can be introduced into schools and universities by a decision of the Ministry of Education. Foreign words in the Constitution and other legal or administrative documents can be replaced by Turkish ones if Parliament or the Government so decree. But the change of the non-technical and non-official vocabulary is a much more difficult proposition.

In the first stage of the 'language revolution' (1934-35) newspapers were ordered by the authorities to publish every day at least two articles in the new language.⁸⁵ Glossaries explaining the new Turkish words were published at the end of the

⁸³ E.g., *vekâlet* for *bakanlık* 'ministry', *Erkânı Harbiyei Umumiye* for *Genelkurmay* 'General Staff', *reislik* for *başkanlık* 'presidency'.

⁸⁴ *T. D.*, *A. D.*, no. 10, p. 56; no. 17, p. 328; *İş* (Ist. monthly), XVIII, no. 131, pp. 91-100.

⁸⁵ See Jean Deny in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, t. 39 (Paris, 1938), p. 64; J. Deny, 'La réforme actuelle de la langue turque' in *En Terre d'Islam* (Paris, 1935), p. 243; E. Rossi in *O. M.*, 1935, p. 56.

articles. These drastic regulations, however, were not enforced for any length of time. The Linguistic Society soon realized that the adoption of new words largely depended on popular consent. "We have never intended", the Secretary General of the Society stated in 1935, "to force anybody to accept the (Turkish) equivalents suggested in the *Kılavuz*".⁸⁶ This attitude was maintained by his successor, who said in 1945: "We have no right to impose words. We make them, and the Government and the writers use them if they want to".⁸⁷

Though not imposing the new vocabulary by legal measures, the Society utilized the strong moral pressure at its disposal. Atatürk and İnönü showed great personal interest in the success of language reform, and in their speeches deliberately used many neologisms.⁸⁸ Genuine Turkish names for several new submarines were coined by Atatürk himself.⁸⁹ He is also said to have invented a number of new terms, especially in the field of arithmetic and geometry, such as *artı* 'plus', *açı* 'angle', etc. İnönü, too, is reported to have created, or at least first used, some new words, e.g., *gelenek* 'tradition' and *olağanüstü* 'extraordinary'.⁹⁰

Under the first two presidents of the Republic the Society also enjoyed the active cooperation of the ruling party and the Government. The 1935 programme of the Republican People's Party, various official documents and communications and textbooks for schools were published in the new language. Other publications of the Ministry of Education, such as the new Turkish encyclopaedia (*İnönü*, later *Türk, Ansiklopedisi*), also helped to spread many new words and terms among the people.

⁸⁶ *T. D.*, I, no. 13, p. 9.

⁸⁷ *5. T. D. Kurultayı*, p. 258.

⁸⁸ See Atatürk's speeches in Parliament of 1st November, 1934 and 3rd March, 1935, and İnönü's speech opening Parliament on 1st November, 1941 (texts and glossaries in *T. D.*, I, no. 12, pp. 1-8; II, no. 11-12, pp. 3-19).

⁸⁹ See Atatürk's letter to Prime Minister Celâl Bayar of 17th January, 1938 (original exhibited in the Marine Museum at Dolmabahçe, Istanbul).

⁹⁰ A. S. Levend in *T. D.*, *A. D.*, no. 26, p. 63; *T. D. K.*, *Yıllık 1943*, p. 28.

The official Turkish newsagency (*Anadolu Ajansı*) and the State-owned broadcasting stations in Istanbul and Ankara likewise assisted the Society in its fight against foreign words.

As in many fields of public life in Turkey, the Army played an important part also in linguistic reform. Less encumbered by religious traditions and more inclined to believe in drastic changes by order from above, army officers had taken a most active part in the modernization of Turkey since the days of Selim III. Moreover, the military authorities were particularly interested in general education and therefore favoured every effort to simplify the script and language. The unsuccessful attempt made by Enver Paşa, Minister of War under the Young Turk regime, to change the Arabic characters reflect this attitude. In 1925-28 army regulations and manuals were published in simpler Turkish, many Arabic and Persian words being replaced by their Turkish equivalents.⁹¹ In February, 1935 the Chief of the General Staff ordered the introduction of a new, Turkish military terminology and in the same year an official list of new terms, mostly of Turkish origin, was published under the name of *Rütbe ve Birliklerin Öztürkçe Karşılıkları*.⁹² This list supplemented the Society's *Kılavuz* which appeared about the same time.

On its part, the Linguistic Society published, in addition to the books already mentioned, a large number of linguistic works, original or translated, dealing, *inter alia*, with the structure, grammar and phonetics of the Turkish language, old Turkish inscriptions, and various Turkish dialects. Several medieval Turkish works (dictionaries, divans, etc.) were also edited, translated and annotated. With a view to reaching a wider public, the Society published many popular books and pamphlets and a bulletin called *Türk Dili*, which in 1951 was

⁹¹ H. E. Erkilet in *T. D., A. D.*, no. 15, pp. 136-141.

⁹² See E. Rossi in *O. M.*, 1942, p. 476; *O. M.*, 1940, pp. 350-53; H. W. Duda in *Der Islam*, XXVI (1942), pp. 88-90, where some of the terms are quoted.

replaced by a monthly literary magazine (*Türk Dili, Aylık Fikir ve Edebiyat Dergisi*).⁹³

The efforts to propagate the new vocabulary encountered many difficulties. The growing opposition to the puristic policy of the Society has been referred to before. It became particularly strong when the advocates of purism tried to introduce many neologisms at a time. A new word is more easily understood and accepted when it appears in a sentence in which all other words are familiar. If the passage contains too many neologisms the reader is inclined to revolt. A more gradual change of the ordinary vocabulary might have been more successful, though the intermixing of old and new words is not very pleasing stylistically.

The Linguistic Society in its publications, and its spokesmen in their statements and lectures, did not always live up to their own demands regarding the elimination of foreign words. The process of spreading new words was also impeded by the frequent changes in the Society's suggestions. For instance, the Arabic word *tedbir* 'measure' was replaced in the *Kılavuz* (1935) by *önlem*, in the *Sözlük* (1945) by *ölçem* or *evirgenlik*, and in the *Türe Terimleri*, the list of legal terms published by the Society in 1948, by *önge*. Similarly, *mülkiyet* 'property' successively became *özelgelik*—*iyelik*—*mallık*, and *mahkûm* 'condemned' became *kasanık*—*hüküm giymiş*—*ceza giymiş*. No wonder that in all these cases the old Arabic words are still generally used today.

So far no important work, classical or modern, has been entirely written in or translated into the 'new language'—except the Constitution, the new version of which met, however, with strong opposition. In the thirties the Koran was several times translated into Turkish,⁹⁴ but this was mainly done by people

⁹³ For a full list of the publications of the Linguistic Society see T. D. K., *Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 1932-1952* (Ankara, 1952).

⁹⁴ See G. Jäschke, *Der Islam in der neuen Türkei*, p. 80.

who held conservative views also on linguistic questions. Moreover, since an authoritative translation of the Koran into any other language is not accepted in Islam, there seems to be little likelihood that a Koran translation will ever play a similar role in the development of modern Turkish to the one played by the Authorized Version or Luther's Bible in the growth of English or German respectively.

CHAPTER II

SOME PROBLEMS OF MODERN TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM

ARABIC AND PERSIAN WORDS IN POPULAR USE

WHICH words of foreign, especially Arabic and Persian, origin should be eliminated and which retained in modern Turkish? This question has been one of the central problems facing the language reform movement in Turkey since its very inception. In the Tanzimat period attempts were made to oust rare Arabic and Persian words, which were unfamiliar even to the educated. The Young Turk reformers banned certain foreign formations and those superfluous foreign elements for which there were current Turkish synonyms. The Linguistic Society has gone much further. In fact, it has always refused to commit itself on the final limits of its purification efforts. It has never drawn a definite distinction between alien words, to be replaced with native equivalents, and naturalized words, which would most likely be retained. The Society's approach to this question has been empirical, which, as indicated before, permitted frequent changes of opinion and various forms of compromise. In the first phase of its language reform (1932-34) every word of foreign origin was expected to be eliminated as soon as possible. During the following years temporary citizenship was granted to non-Turkish words used in popular speech, provided that they conformed more or less to the Turkish phonetic and morphologic system and did not form part of foreign 'word families'.¹ This moderate attitude was, to some extent, abandoned in the years preceding and following the publication of the *Türkçe Sözlük* and the new version of the Constitution

¹ *T.D.*, II, no. 9-10, pp. 43, 47.

(1945), but has been re-adopted under pressure of public opinion since the Sixth Language Congress (1949).²

The scope of the Society's purification policy seems to have been largely determined by its ability to suggest suitable Turkish substitutes for foreign words. Theoretically, it has never renounced the right to try to oust any loan-word.³ In practice, however, it appears to acknowledge the fact that very many words of foreign origin have become part and parcel of the language and will, as far as can be foreseen, remain. Although these words have not been systematically defined or classified by the Society, certain interesting conclusions can be drawn from its glossaries and dictionaries.

The large majority of all non-European loan-words in modern Turkish are Arabic and Persian nouns and verbal nouns. Excluding technical and scientific terms, to be discussed later, historical terms (such as *Şeyhülislâm*, *Kazasker*), and literary and especially poetic words rarely used now (e.g., *kevkeb*, *necim*, *ahter*, all meaning 'star'), these loan-words can be divided into the following five main groups:

- a) exotic or untranslatable words, i.e. chiefly words denoting things or ideas which originally were peculiar to certain foreign countries or peoples, such as names of flowers, animals and articles of food or clothing: *lâle* 'tulip', *bûlbûl* 'nightingale', *karpuz* 'water-melon', *kahve* 'coffee', *kefiye* 'Arab head-dress';
- b) simple concrete words, many of them names of material objects of everyday use with which the Turks became acquainted through their contact with Islamic civilization: *çarşı* 'market', *dükân* 'shop', *hamam* 'bath', *perde* 'curtain', *sokak* 'street'; these loans are comparable to the many Latin and French concrete words borrowed by the English when they came into contact with the higher Roman and Norman civilizations;

² *T. D., A. D.*, no. 25, p. 32.

Türkiyede Dil Devrimi, p. 6 (13).

- c) popular religious, moral and legal terms which the Turks borrowed in the course of their Islamization, just as English and German, for instance, adopted a great many Latin and Greek words for ideas and things introduced with Christianity: *ahlâk* 'morals', *cami* 'mosque', *peri* 'fairy', *sadaka* 'alms', *namaz* 'ritual prayer'⁴;
- d) simple abstract terms of a general character, some of which superseded older native words or originally belonged to legal terminology: *dost* 'friend', *kabul* 'acceptance', *sabah* 'morning', *sebeP* 'cause', *zarar* 'harm';
- e) 'learned words', to be dealt with later.

The words mentioned in the first four groups are either not listed at all in the *Cep Kılavuzu* and the *Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu* among the foreign words for which the Society suggests genuine Turkish equivalents or are explicitly retained as substitutes for Arabic or Persian words with a stronger foreign flavour. In the *Türkçe Sözlük* they are not simply translated by Turkish words, but are defined and explained like words of native stock. This treatment shows that the Linguistic Society does not, at least not for the time being, intend to oust them from modern Turkish. What is the distinctive quality common to these groups which has so far protected them from the onslaught of purism?

Most of the words of these groups—with the possible exception of some listed under (a)—are 'popular words'. They are used in the everyday language of all classes of the people, at least in the vernacular of Istanbul, which served as a model for the modern literary language⁵ and as phonetic basis for the spelling in Latin characters.⁶ Many of them occur in collo-

⁴ For *dua* 'prayer' (in general) a Turkish word, *yakarış*, was suggested. This word had already been used in 1909 by Ahmed Hikmet as the name of a well-known composition in pure Turkish (*Türk Derneği*, I, no. 3, pp. 73-75).

⁵ See Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, pp. 10, 97-102, 121-22.

⁶ H. W. Duda in *O.L.Z.* (1930), p. 406.

quial expressions and idioms. As a rule, they are short words of one or two syllables and represent various phonetic patterns, including native Turkish patterns (e.g., Arabic *ders*—Turkish *ters*, *şart*—*kart*, etc.). A considerable proportion of them have been subjected to more than the regular changes in pronunciation (such as Arabic short *u* in most positions pronounced *ü*, Arabic ث and س pronounced alike, etc.). This is shown, after the adoption of the Latin alphabet, also in their orthography (e.g., *sarnıç* from Arabic صهریج 'cistern', *merdiven* from Persian زردیان 'ladder'). Quite a few had already been turkicized in the old Arabic script (e.g., سوقاق for Arabic زقاق 'street', چارک for Persian چاریک 'quarter').⁷ In particular, many of them tend to lose their *teşdid* (doubling of a consonant) (e.g., *ham(m)al* 'porter', *kas(s)ap* 'butcher') or to shorten their originally long vowels (e.g., *hayât* 'life', *lüzûm* 'need'), as indicated also by their metrical value in late Ottoman poetry.⁸ In others, the vowels have been assimilated to each other as in genuine Turkish words (e.g., *adam* 'man' unlike learned *Adem* 'Adam', *zavallı* 'miserable' from learned *zeval* 'decline'), or the *l*, which in Arabic and Persian words is generally sounded 'clear', is, in conjunction with back vowels, pronounced 'dark' (e.g., *mal(ı)* 'property', 'cattle', unlike learned *maliye* 'finance', etc.). In several of them the auxiliary vowel inserted in the non-inflected form has become fixed as part of the stem (e.g., *havuzun* 'of the pond', *cevizin* 'of the nut') (unlike *fikirin* from *fikir*).⁹

⁷ See the collections of *galatat* cited in note 6 to the Introduction.

⁸ See Hikmet İlaydın, *Türk Edebiyatında Nazım* (Ist., 1951), pp. 37, 58.

⁹ See A. Fischer, *Die Vokalharmonie der Endungen an den Fremdwörtern des Türkischen* (Leipzig, 1920), p. 18, n. 2, p. 21, n. 4. (According to him the genitive of the learned formation *havz* in the sense of 'aquarium' is pronounced *havzın*). Cf. also J. Deny, *Grammaire de la langue turque* (Paris, 1921), § 115. For other irregular phonetic changes in popular words, such as medial *g* > *ğ*, final *k* (*q*) > *ğ*, etc., and for Persian *é* > *e* (*ey*), and not *i*, see J. Németh, 'Zur Kenntnis der Mischsprachen (Das doppelte Sprachsystem des Osmanischen)' in *Acta Linguistica Acad. Scient. Hungar.*, III, 1-2 (Budapest, 1953), pp. 159-98.

Some adjectives in these groups accept, like native words, an alliterative prefix for intensification (e.g., *bembeyaz* 'extremely white', *simsiyah* 'jet black'). From others, verbs can be formed in the way usually reserved for native stems, by adding *-lemek*, *-semek*, etc. (e.g., *hazırlamak* 'to prepare', *mühimsemek* 'to consider important'). Some of the nouns are Arabic plural forms which in Turkish are used as singulars, accepting the Turkish plural ending (e.g., *evlât* 'child', *akraba* 'relative'). Many more have acquired in Turkish usage a different meaning (e.g., *fena* from Arabic فناء 'annihilation', *pazar* 'Sunday' from Persian بازار 'market'). Lastly, almost all of these words either never had an exact Turkish synonym or have long ago supplanted it (e.g., *ayna* for Turkish *gözü* 'mirror', *hasta* for *şayrı* 'ill').

For these reasons the Arabic and Persian words in these groups may be regarded as completely naturalized. As in the case of *cry*, *claim*, *state* in English or *Mauer*, *Strasse*, *Wein* in German, only the philologist knows that they are not of native stock.

This does not mean, however, that all Arabic and Persian words that have not been modified in some way or other are felt to be foreign elements in Turkish, and that all those that have undergone changes are today considered popular words fully incorporated into the language. Strictly formal criteria of this kind, as are sometimes applied in distinguishing between foreign and naturalized words in other languages,¹⁰ certainly do not hold in Turkish. As a result of large-scale borrowing, Turkish, like English,¹¹ has permanently altered its phonetic system. Hiatus, absence of vowel-harmony, reduplication of consonants and the position of certain consonants in a given word may, with some exceptions, be a phonologic indication of

¹⁰ See, for instance, Aasta Stene, *The Influence of English on Present-Day Norwegian* (London, 1938).

¹¹ See L. Bloomfield, *Language* (London, 1950), p. 447.

its non-Turkish origin,¹² but do not prove that it is felt to be alien. On the other hand, a foreign word has only been fully absorbed into the language if it is used in popular speech, denotes homely things or ideas and cannot easily be replaced with a Turkish equivalent. It is significant that the Linguistic Society has not tried to replace, for instance, foreign-sounding words such as *dükkân* 'shop', but on the other hand has suggested Turkish substitutes for Arabic and Persian words which have changed in form or meaning (e.g., *cömert* 'generous', *fırka* 'division of army', 'party').

FOREIGN LEARNED WORDS

Very different from the four groups of popular words are the Arabic and Persian 'learned words', though the borderline, particularly between them and group (d), cannot be definitely drawn.

The words of this important group are mostly abstracts and technical terms. Many of them were first adopted in the process of translating Arabic and Persian literature. Owing to the cultural prestige of those languages, such words were, until the nineteenth century, borrowed even where native equivalents existed or could easily have been created. Used mainly in writing and formal speech, these elements are, at least originally, typical book-words, similar—in English linguistic history—to those borrowed or coined since the thirteenth century and especially since the Renaissance from French, Latin and Greek. Until the nineteenth century nearly all learned words in Ottoman Turkish belonged to this group.

These words differ from those listed under (a)-(d) also in their formation. While most of the latter were borrowed as isolated, individual elements of many different patterns, the

¹² Ragıp Özdem, *Tarihsel bakımdan öztürkçe ve yabancı sözlerin fonetik ayraçları*, 1. fasikül (İst., 1937). Cf. also his article 'Über die praktische Wortphonologie im Neu-Osmanischen' in *Festschrift Friedrich Giese* (1941), pp. 129-39.

learned words constitute a large homogeneous layer, which has preserved its separate system of inflexion and derivation. They brought with them their own (Arabic or Persian) prefixes (and separate words serving in lieu of prefixes), such as *hem-*, *na-*, *gayri-* (comparable in meaning and function to *con-*, *in-*, *dis-* in English words of French or Latin origin), and suffixes, such as *-î*, *-iyet* (comparable to *-ate*, *-ation* in English); their own plural and dual forms, genitive constructions, feminine endings, compound formations, prepositions, etc.; and, in particular, the patterns of certain Arabic (and Persian) verbal forms. A large majority of the learned words in Turkish are Arabic verbal nouns (*masdar*) and participles, chiefly of the derived forms (II-VIII, X), and their derivatives. Unlike the popular words in group (a)-(d), many of the learned words are long (three syllables or more); very few of them have acquired a new meaning in Turkish or have, apart from the regular phonetic changes, been modified in pronunciation. In the Arabic script their original spelling was faithfully preserved.¹³

Many of these words form groups derived from one Arabic root, e.g., *ilim* 'science', *ulûm* 'sciences', *âlim* 'scholar', *ulema* 'Muslim learned men', *allâme* 'very learned', *malûm* 'known', *malûmat* 'information', *muallim* 'teacher', *muallem* 'trained', *talim* 'instruction', *talimat* 'regulations', *ilâm* 'judicial decree', *taallûm* 'studying', *istilâm* 'asking for information', etc., from the root 'lm (علم).

At first sight, such words seem to have in Turkish the same status as the 'semi-foreign' or 'foreign-learned' forms in English (e.g., *conceive*, *conceit*, *conceptive*, *conception*; *receive*, etc; *deceive*, etc.).¹⁴ This comparison, however, should not be carried too far. There are fundamental differences between the status of such words in Turkish and in English. An examination of some of these differences may help better to understand the

¹³ Except some general modifications of minor importance (see Deny, *Grammaire*, § § 100 sq.).

¹⁴ See Bloomfield, *Language*, pp. 153-54.

hostile attitude of the modern Turkish language reformers towards this vast section of their vocabulary.

Most French, Latin and Greek words of this class in English have at least been modified in spelling and endings, but the Arabic and Persian learned words in Turkish were borrowed almost unchanged. Whereas "actually we have two normal patterns in English (the Saxon and the French-Latin) with a good deal of overlapping",¹⁵ in Turkish the two patterns, the native Turkish and the learned Arabic-Persian, do not blend in general. Arabic and Persian grammatical rules were reserved exclusively for words borrowed from those languages—Arabic rules for Arabic words, and Persian rules for both Arabic and Persian words. Consequently, for the correct use of the learned words, and not only—as in English—for their understanding, the Turk had, and to a certain extent still has, to know their origin.

In English, French-Latin prefixes and suffixes are freely attached to Saxon root-words (*ex-king*, *interbreed*; *enlightenment*, *shortage*), whereas in Turkish, though native endings may be affixed to foreign stems, no Arabic or Persian affixes are used with Turkish words. Exceptions, such as *variyet* 'wealth', *gidişat* 'goings-on', *gün begün* 'from day to day', are much rarer even than comparable hybrid words in German (*Bäckerei*, *halbieren*, etc.) and used to be regarded as solecisms. Thus, the Arabic suffix *-î*, though added to hundreds of (Arabic) words in Turkish, has never become as integral a part of its machinery of derivation as, for instance, the French ending *-able* in English. Formations like *gümüşî* 'silvery', *kurşuni* 'leaden' are rare exceptions.

A further indication of the separate position maintained by these foreign elements in Turkish is the very large group of compound verbs formed by adding a Turkish auxiliary verb

¹⁵ R. W. Weiman, *Native and Foreign Elements in a Language, A Study in General Linguistics Applied to Modern Hebrew* (Philadelphia, 1950), p. 3.

(*etmek, eylemek, kılmak, buyurmak; olmak*) to an Arabic verbal noun or, more rarely, to an Arabic or Persian participle, noun, or adjective. Apart from relatively few cases, native Turkish words do not enter into such combinations with an auxiliary verb.

Lastly, the Arabic mode of inflexion and derivation is based on three (or four) radical consonants, which are combined with 'servile letters' and various vowels into certain patterns, while all Turkish derivatives begin with the stem, which changes very little. The difference between these systems is much greater than that between the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin-French systems in English (and that between popular and learned formations in the Romance languages).

Thus, the foreign learned words in Turkish have, like those in German, remained much more of a separate entity than their equals in English. Just as in Germany many special dictionaries of *Fremdwörter* have been published,¹⁶ Turkish lexicographers list Arabic and Persian words which have not been turkicized in a separate part¹⁷ or indicate their foreign origin.

The onslaught on Arabic and Persian learned words began in the early part of this century, when the Young Turk language reformers banned—in addition to unnecessary foreign synonyms—various Arabic and Persian modes of inflexion and word composition. The chief targets of their attack were the Persian *izafet* construction and the Arabic plural forms, which were widely used in literary but not in spoken Turkish. In these efforts the reformers had a considerable measure of success. The *izafet* construction is described by Deny¹⁸ as "un emprunt grammatical consécutif et indissolublement lié à un emprunt de vo-

¹⁶ E.g., J. Ch. A. Heyse's *Allgemeines verdeutschendes und erklärendes Fremdwörterbuch* (many editions).

¹⁷ E.g., Ahmet Vefik, *Lehçe-i Osmani* (Ist., 1306).

¹⁸ Deny, *Grammaire*, § 1129.

cabulaire". Consequently, its elimination was bound to affect the Arabic-Persian loan-words in Turkish. Indeed, many such words disappeared with the foreign construction in which they had been used (e.g., *hüsün* 'goodness', as in *hüsn-ü tesir* 'good impression'; *vusta* 'middle', as in *kurun-u vusta* 'Middle Ages', etc.).

This fight against foreign grammatical rules and modes of word composition, initiated two generations ago, was intensified and broadened by the Linguistic Society. With a view to ending all 'linguistic Capitulations', the Society wished to dislodge even those Arabic and Persian formations that its predecessors had been willing to preserve as 'clichés', such as *darülâceze* 'poor-house', *noktai nazar* 'point of view', *efkârı umumiye* 'public opinion'.

The recent reformers did not content themselves with the elimination of the special rules for foreign words. They declared open war on most of the Arabic and Persian learned words themselves. Also, unlike the advocates of the 'new language' in Young Turk times, the Linguistic Society did not limit its puristic efforts to those foreign words which had well-established Turkish synonyms. In the Society's opinion, the existence of series of words derived in the Arabic manner from one root is just another indication of the subjection of the national language to foreign grammatical rules. Together with the remnants of these rules, therefore, the Arabic word families are expected to disappear.¹⁹

A further, more practical reason was given for this attitude. Since Arabic and Persian were no longer studied in Turkish schools, the young generation was unable to understand the relationships between the members of such word families. A speaker of Turkish, an agglutinative language, tends to resolve its polysyllables into significant components beginning with the

¹⁹ See Samih Rifat's statement at the First Language Congress in 1932 (1. T. D. *Kurultayı*, pp. 316-17).

stem. Now, this cannot be done with Arabic learned words. As mentioned above, the roots and structure of their inflected and derived forms, especially in Latin script, are often not recognizable by anyone who does not know at least the elements of Arabic grammar. As in German, many of the foreign learned words "offered nothing that the unconscious mind could assimilate".²⁰

In the case of many learned words in English, too, "there are usually no associations of ideas between them and the ordinary stock of words, and no likeness in root or in the formative elements to assist the memory".²¹ This lack of transparency and of connexion with any concrete meaning, which is typical of Arabic-Persian learned words in Turkish as it is of many English abstract words, may be an advantage in scientific terms. English *oxygen*, for instance, may be superior to German *Sauerstoff*, "which perpetuates a discarded conception of the nature of oxygen".²² But there can be little doubt that a more general term, such as *Ehelosigkeit*, is more easily understood and used by the average German than *celibacy* is by an Englishman who has had no classical education. Jespersen has drawn attention to the 'undemocratic character' of such learned words, the great number of which in English is "apt to form or rather to accentuate class divisions . . . making the language more complicated than necessary and thereby hindering the spread of education among all classes of the population".²³

²⁰ E. Sapir, *Language, An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1921), pp. 208-9.—Opponents of the Linguistic Society claim, however, that a Turkish child can learn the meaning of such words without understanding their etymological relationship (see Findikoğlu Z. Fahri in *T. D., A. D.*, no. 1. pp. 44-46; Ahmet Emin Yalman, *ibid.*, no. 2, p. 46).

²¹ Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 133-34.

²² L. R. Palmer, *An Introduction to Modern Linguistics* (London, 1936), pp. 178-79. See also A. Meillet, *Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle* (Paris, 1928), p. 165.

²³ Jespersen, *Growth*, p. 134.

The same applies to Turkish. Modern linguistic reformers emphasize that it was those learned words that made literary Ottoman Turkish unintelligible to the common people. This is pointedly shown in the conversations between the two main characters of the famous Turkish shadow-plays.²⁴ Hacivad, the representative of the literate class, constantly uses Arabic and Persian learned words and expressions which the uneducated Karagöz misunderstands, just as Weller senior in Dickens's 'Pickwick Papers' is unable to handle 'big words' of foreign origin in English.

A similar observation can be made with regard to modern Turkish. Although the uneducated use many non-Turkish words (many more than some purists—wishfully—think), the percentage of learned words in their vocabulary is strikingly small. For instance, in recorded conversations between people of the lower strata,²⁵ Arabic verbal nouns and participles of the II-X forms, the largest group of foreign learned words, constitute only about 4 per cent of the total Arabic-Persian vocabulary used, while in the leading articles and news columns of a contemporary newspaper,²⁶ the corresponding figure is nearly 50 per cent. The discovery of an Anatolian schoolteacher²⁷ that his pupils did not understand Arabic loan-words in expressions like *mazhar olmak* 'to acquire' and *galip gelmek* 'to be victorious' may be typical.

The elimination of most learned words is therefore regarded as a natural and necessary operation in the general drive for the simplification of the Turkish language, which began several generations ago. The modern reformers, who wish to establish greater unity and regularity in the language, definitely reject

²⁴ See Hellmut Ritter, *Karagös, Türkische Schattenspiele*, I-III (Hannover, 1924; Leipzig, 1941; Wiesbaden, 1953).

²⁵ For this inquiry the sketches *Mahkeme Koridorlarında* ('In the Corridors of the Law-Courts'), published regularly in the Istanbul daily *Akşam* during 1952, were used. The conversations recorded seem to be more or less true to life.

²⁶ *Akşam* of February, 1951.

²⁷ I. T. D. *Kurultayı*, pp. 303-7.

the patterns of Arabic and Persian learned words as normal patterns of the future Turkish language. They particularly object to the very many compound verbs, mostly formed with Arabic verbal nouns.²⁸

The extent of the Linguistic Society's opposition to foreign learned words becomes apparent from the *Cep Kılavuzu*. Many hundreds of Arabic verbal nouns of the II, V and VI forms (*ta-* or *te-*) are listed, but only ten are suggested as possible survivors of the great purge.²⁹ They, or some of them, may have been considered naturalized words. Of about one hundred *masdars* of the X form (*isti-*) not one is approved for future use in Turkish. 'Ottoman' words with initial *mu-* or *mü-*, i.e. mostly verbal nouns of the III form and participles of the derived forms, fill about 37 (small size) pages in the *Kılavuz*, but only five such formations are retained in the list of 'Turkish' words.³⁰ Many Arabic derivatives with the prefix *ma-* or *me-* (nouns of time and place, etc.) are likewise replaced with Turkish equivalents. The same attitude is reflected in the *Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu*, published by the Society in 1953. About 40 per cent of all the foreign words for which this booklet suggests genuine Turkish substitutes are Arabic verbal nouns and participles of the II-X forms (and their derivatives).

In general, the Society has not replaced those relatively few learned words that have penetrated into popular speech in a new meaning. An interesting example is the word *merak*, explicitly retained by the *Cep Kılavuzu*. The Arabic term مراق originally meant 'soft parts' (of the belly). Serving as a loan-translation of Greek 'hypochondria', which denotes the same part of the body, it acquired the sense of 'morbid anxiety as to

²⁸ See, for instance, Suat Yakup Baydur, *Dil ve Kültür* (Ankara, 1952), pp. 20-22.

²⁹ *takvim* 'calendar', *tarih* 'date', 'history', *tavsiye* 'recommendation', *tedbir* 'measure', *teftiş* 'inspection', *tehlüke* 'danger', *tenbih* (*tembih*) *etmek* 'to warn', *tenkid* 'criticism', *teslim* 'delivery', *teşekkür* 'thanking'.

³⁰ *muhafız* 'guard', *muhtaç* 'needing', *murtat* (for *mürted*) 'renegade', *mühendis* 'engineer', *müspet* 'positive'.

one's own health', the seat of which was formerly supposed to be in the abdomen. Finally, it has become a popular word in Turkish, meaning (any) 'anxiety', 'great interest', 'curiosity'. The history of this term is similar to that of old physiological terms of Latin or Greek origin in English (such as *humour*, *complexion*, *phlegmatic*), which have been rejected from the vocabulary of strict science and have become purely popular words in a different meaning.³¹

A special group are the learned words created by the Turks in the nineteenth and early twentieth century from Arabic and Persian roots. These words do not exist in those languages, at least not in the meaning assigned to them in Turkish. Examples are *mefkûre* 'ideal', *şenî* 'real', *pederşahi* 'patriarchal', all of which are ascribed to Ziya Gökalp. The opponents of purism claim that such words prove the vitality and originality of the Turkish language and should be retained. Many modern language reformers, however, consider them linguistic counterfeits which should be among the first to be ousted.³²

A clear distinction should be made between those learned words that have suitable Turkish synonyms in popular use and those denoting abstract concepts that are outside the intellectual sphere of the uneducated. Language reformers in Turkey, as well as other countries,³³ sometimes overlook the fact that many learned words are unintelligible to the common people not because they are foreign formations, but because the people are not familiar with the concepts expressed by them.

³¹ J. B. Greenough and G. L. Kittredge, *Words and Their Ways in English Speech* (New York, 1901), pp. 30-33.

³² Cf. İsmail Habib Sevük, *Dil Dâvâsı*, p. 60; Naim Hâzım Onat in T. D. K., *Dil Dâvâsı*, pp. 47-49. (Many of the Arabic words listed are not Ottoman inventions, but are found already in Persian.)

³³ For Norway, for instance, see A. Burgun, *Le développement linguistique en Norvège depuis 1814* (Kristiania, 1917, 1921), II, p. 53.

ARABIC AND PERSIAN SYNONYMS
OF TURKISH WORDS

Most of the foreign learned words were until recently firmly entrenched in Turkish, since there were no native words that could have taken their place. Quite a number of Arabic and Persian words, however, had found their way into Turkish despite the fact that well-known native synonyms existed. Such foreign loans were generally used in the literary language only. The modern movement for a new written language based on the Turkish spoken by the people regarded the elimination of these foreign synonyms as one of its foremost tasks. Already the Young Turk language reformers had objected to the use of Arabic *mâ* and Persian *âb* by the side of Turkish *suy* 'water', of *lejl* and *şeb* by the side of *gece* 'night', etc.³⁴ The fact that writers used such synonyms indiscriminately is today deemed to indicate confusion, and not richness, in Ottoman Turkish.

One reason for the wide use of those foreign words were the requirements of the Arabic-Persian quantitative metres (*aruz*) in Ottoman poetry. Since there are, strictly speaking, no long vowels in genuine Turkish words, the poet had to use many Arabic or Persian elements to provide all the long syllables needed. The 'nationalist' school in modern Turkish literature, by replacing the *aruz* with the native syllabic metres, removed this dependence on foreign synonyms.

In many other cases, the modern purist says, such foreign words were used with a view to showing off one's education or refinement. They are to him what Talleyrand in 1791 called "ce luxe imposteur et servile" and what Dickens styled "a large superfluous establishment of words to wait upon us on great occasions".³⁵ An ordinary Turkish word like *kör* 'blind' or

³⁴ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, pp. 100 sq.

³⁵ F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, X, 2nd part (Paris, 1943), pp. 622; Jespersen, *Growth*, p. 127.

sevinmek 'to be glad', for instance, was regarded as rather vulgar and was therefore replaced in literary language with a more elegant or dignified Arabic synonym, such as *âmâ* and *mesrur olmak* respectively.³⁶ But similarly to the nineteenth century reaction to the 'big words' and stilted language in English, modern Turkish tends to plainer and more natural ways of expression. Consequently, the *Cep Kılavuzu* eliminated the Arabic words and reinstated *kör*, *sevinmek*, etc.

This attitude is strongly contested.³⁷ It is pointed out that in all civilizations the written language, and especially the language of belles-lettres, is much richer than the colloquial, not only in technical and scientific terms but also as regards the general vocabulary. Lack of synonyms causes monotony and tedious repetition. The rule of 'one word only for every notion'³⁸ would ruin all literature and particularly all poetry by denying the writer any possibility of developing his individual style, of playing with words and of meeting the needs of rhythm and rhyme. A language deficient in synonyms is unable to express subtle shades of meaning, different degrees of estimation and varieties of mood. The richness and expressiveness of English is adduced as proof of the great value of synonyms borrowed from foreign languages.

The critics of the Linguistic Society admit that Ottoman literature exaggerated in the unlimited and indiscriminate use of Arabic and Persian synonyms, but claim that modern language reform runs the risk of lapsing into the other extreme. The *Cep Kılavuzu* substitutes, for instance, *yazan* (from *yazmak* 'to write') for *müellif* 'author' and *bası* (from *basmak* 'to press') for *tabı* 'print', 'edition', thereby impoverishing the language

³⁶ Cf. Müftüoğlu Ahmed Hikmet in *Türk Derneği* (Istanbul), I, no. 1, p. 24; Deny, *Grammaire*, § 836.

³⁷ Cf., e.g., the articles published by İsmail Hami Danişmend in *Yeni Sabah* (Istanbul daily) of 25th May and 8th June, 1943.

³⁸ Advocated by Gökalp, p. 101, and before in *Türk Derneği*, I, no. 4, p. 133.

by the elimination of two special, though foreign, terms. *Çekilmek* 'to withdraw' for *istifa etmek* 'to resign from office', *boşaltmak* 'to empty' for *tabliye etmek* 'to evacuate', and *açık* 'open', 'clear' for twelve different Arabic and Persian words are cited as further instances of the overburdening of common words with additional meanings. In other cases, it is stated, purism is liable to lead to the abolition of clear distinctions between different concepts. Modern usage tends to replace Arabic *harb* 'war' with Turkish *savaş*, which means 'fight' or 'struggle' in general, and Arabic *ecnebi* 'foreigner' with Turkish *yabancı*, which means 'stranger'.³⁹

The supporters of the Linguistic Society could adduce some counter-evidence. In many cases the *Cep Kılavuzu* suggests different Turkish words for one Ottoman word of foreign origin. Arabic *kaide* is replaced by *taban* in the meaning of 'base', by *duraç* in the meaning of 'pedestal', and by *kural* in the meaning of 'rule'. Similarly, three different Turkish words are substituted for *talebe*: *öğrenci* 'pupil', *yetiştirme* 'disciple', and *irdemen* 'student'. Unfortunately—from the point of view of the richness of the language—many of the new words (e.g., *duraç*, *yetiştirme*, *irdemen*) have not been accepted by the public.

To prevent a further impoverishment of the language, some moderates wish to retain the foreign words that still live in spoken Turkish side by side with their native synonyms, such as *istimal etmek* along with *kullanmak* 'to use', *temenni* along with *dilek* 'wish', etc. In particular, they object to the elimination of Arabic and Persian words which form part of colloquial expressions and idioms. Arabic *lâzım* 'necessary', for instance, should not be definitely superseded by Turkish *gerek*, as the former is found in current sayings like *neme lâzım* 'what's that to me!' The Turkish translation of the call to prayer, introduced

³⁹ See H. C. Honay in *İş Mecmuası*, XV, no. 89 (Ist., 1949), p. 5; F. Alpiskender in *Zafer* (Ankara daily) of 10th February, 1952.

in 1932, opens with the words *Tanrı uludur* instead of *Allahü ekber*. The Turkish term *Tanrı*, however, should not wholly replace the common (Arabic) word *Allah*, which occurs in innumerable expressions, such as *Allah aşkına* 'for God's sake', *Allah göstermesin* 'God forbid!', etc.

Certain foreign synonyms, the moderates say, should be preserved for polite speech and writing: *zevç* for *koca* 'husband', *teşrif etmek* (lit., 'to honour') for *gelmek* 'to come to see someone', etc. Others might be needed to express a certain notion in formal or solemn, as opposed to everyday language. Waiting for a bus is *beklemek*, but waiting for a lost son's return may be more suitably expressed by the sonorous Arabic *intizar etmek*.⁴⁰

With a view to enriching the modern vocabulary, the moderates also demand that revived or newly created Turkish words should not automatically replace their foreign equivalents, but serve as synonyms with a slightly different meaning. F. R. Atay made a number of practical suggestions in this regard.⁴¹ While Turkish *batı* and *doğu* express the general concepts of 'west' and 'east', their Arabic synonyms *garb* and *şark* should be retained in the sense of 'Occident' and 'Orient'. The new word *durum* might be used in the sense of 'situation' (e.g., *askerî durum* 'military situation') only, leaving the old word *vaziyet* to cover the meaning of 'position' (e.g., *vaziyet almak* 'to take up a position'). He also recommends the continued use of *sefalet* by the side of its turkicized form *sefillik*, assigning a social denotation ('destitution') to the former and a moral one ('base-ness') to the latter. Another contemporary writer⁴² suggests retaining the Arabic word *mektep* in the ordinary sense of 'school'

⁴⁰ See İ. H. Danişmend in the article quoted above (8th June, 1943); Vâ-Nû (Vâlâ Nureddin) in *Akşam* of 11th and 27th March, 1952; Ragıp Özdem in 4. *T. D. Kurultayı*, pp. 353-54; Sadri Maksudi, *Türk Dili için*, pp. 276-77 (cf. *Bücherei-Bibliothek* in German).

⁴¹ See his article 'Zengin Türkçe', published in autumn, 1941 in *Ulus* and reprinted in *T. D.*, II, no. 13-15, pp. 14-19.

⁴² Vâlâ Nureddin (Vâ-Nû) in *Akşam* of 10th February, 1951.

and using the new Turkish word *okul* in the sense of a group of artists.

Common Ottoman words should also be preserved where the new Turkish word cannot be considered a correct substitute. Thus Atay thinks that *önem* should not replace the old *ehemmiyet* 'importance', but rather stand for *rüçhan* 'preference'. He would also regret it if Arabic *muvaaffakiyet* 'success' were to be superseded by the neologism *başari*, since the latter, in his opinion, expresses more exactly the concept of 'realization'.

Lastly, it is pointed out that there are new Turkish words which cover only one of the meanings of the foreign word they are intended to replace. The *Cep Kılavuzu* 'translates', for instance, *tecrübe etmek* by *denemek*. But the Turkish word renders only one sense of *tecrübe* ('test', 'experiment'); for its other meaning ('experience') the old word should be retained. Similarly, *önerge* was suggested by the *Cep Kılavuzu* as a substitute for *teklif* 'proposal'. The latter, however, will have to be preserved, as it also means 'etiquette'. The purists prefer Turkish *eğitim* to Arabic *terbiye* 'education'. But even they do not call a 'flavoured soup' *eğitimli çorba* (instead of *terbiyeli çorba*) or an 'ill-mannered man' *eğitimsiz adam* (instead of *terbiyesiz adam*).

These critical observations did not remain without effect on the Linguistic Society. The *Türkçe Sözlük*, published about ten years after the *Cep Kılavuzu*, retained, for instance, *şark* and *teklif* in the meanings not covered by their Turkish synonyms, and suggested two substitutes for *tecrübe*: *deneme* ('experiment') and *görgü* ('experience'). A. S. Levend, Secretary General of the Society since 1951, even recommended, as his personal opinion, that foreign words should be retained, together with their Turkish synonyms, wherever the former had a special sense or expressed a different shade of meaning.⁴³

⁴³ T. D., A. D., no. 12, p. 659.

There can be little doubt that the Linguistic Society has in recent years become more aware of the dangerous shrinkage of the Turkish vocabulary as a result of excessive purism and has begun to check this process. As far as the non-technical vocabulary is concerned, however, only writers and poets will give the various synonyms their definite meanings and connotations.

EUROPEAN LOAN-WORDS

Ottoman Turkish has borrowed a great many words from European languages. These loan-words can be divided into two principal groups. The older stratum are words borrowed in the period from early Turkish settlement in Anatolia to the beginning of the nineteenth century. During that period many words were adopted from the languages spoken by the non-Turkish citizens of the Ottoman Empire and neighbouring peoples. The most important sources were Greek (e.g., *anahtar* 'key', *körfez* 'gulf') and Italian (e.g., *iskele* 'landing-place', *masa* 'table'), but Hungarian (e.g., *varos* 'suburb'), Slavonic (e.g., *kiral* 'king') and several other languages were likewise drawn upon. These words were picked up by the ear, through intercourse with the non-Turkish communities and peoples mentioned. Most of them are names of concrete objects of everyday use, nautical terms and designations of well-known foreign institutions. With the exception of some of the last two groups, they were used by all classes of the people and have undergone considerable phonetic changes. Today they are a completely naturalized element, and the reformers have never tried to oust them.

The majority of European words in Turkish, however, have been borrowed since the beginning of Westernization about 150 years ago, mainly from French. At first, they were mostly words for new things and ideas introduced from the West. Later, a great many words were adopted from European languages to replace Arabic or Persian words for both traditional

and modern concepts.⁴⁴ In popular use a number of these loan-words have changed phonetically and semantically, but relatively few of these changes have so far been sanctioned by the literary language (e.g., *kangren* 'gangrene', *telgraf* 'telegraph' and 'telegram').⁴⁵ As far as such loans have penetrated into the colloquial language, their status resembles that of the Arabic and Persian popular loan-words of groups (a)-(d) mentioned above. Consequently, the Linguistic Society has never tried to replace words like (a) *buldok* 'bulldog', (b) *telefon*, (c) *pasaport*, and (d) *kontrol* with Turkish equivalents.

Generally speaking, the Society has so far shown little concern for the question of European words in Turkish. The lists of foreign words for which the public was requested in 1933 to suggest Turkish substitutes contained only words of Arabic and Persian origin. In the *Cep Kılavuzu* and the *Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu* very few Western words were included.

On the contrary, in some cases the Society deliberately increased the European vocabulary of modern Turkish. In the *Cep Kılavuzu* a number of Arabic and Persian loan-words were replaced with words taken from Western languages. Examples are *sekreter* for *kâtib*, *direktör* for *müdür*, *teori* for *nazariye*, and *sembol* for *timsal*. An authoritative explanation of this policy was given in 1935 by İ. N. Dilmen, Secretary General of the Society. He stated that words like *kâtib*, *müdür* (*müdüür*), etc. were relics of a bygone era. At a time when the Turks were adopting Occidental civilization in its entirety, the Western equivalents of such terms should be preferred.⁴⁶

This lenient attitude towards European words, which contrasts so sharply with the relentless fight against most Arabic-

⁴⁴ Lists of such words are given in *T. D.*, III, no. 14-15, pp. 2-3, and in Baydur, *Dil ve Kültür*, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁵ See Andreas Tietze, 'Die formalen Veränderungen an neueren europäischen Lehnwörtern im Türkischen' in *Oriens*, Vol. V, Nr. 2 (Leiden, 1952), pp. 230 sq.

⁴⁶ *T. D.*, I, no. 13, p. 40.

Persian loans, was not only a reflection of Atatürk's policy of Westernization. It appears also to have been due to certain linguistic reasons. To many of those who dealt with linguistic reform the European element appeared to be less dangerous to the individuality of their language. In fact, modern borrowing from the West has in certain respects been more limited than the importation of Arabic and Persian words in the past. European words which have genuine Turkish synonyms or denote objects and actions of a general character (such as *grup*, *sürpriz*) are relatively few. Loans from Western languages are almost exclusively nouns and some adjectives; adverbs, conjunctions, etc.—borrowed in former times from Arabic and Persian—have not been adopted. Compound verbs composed of a French verbal form and a Turkish auxiliary verb (e.g., *dikte etmek* 'to dictate', *adapte etmek* 'to adapt') are insignificantly few in comparison with those with Arabic verbal nouns. Further, the European loan-words have not brought with them their own inflectional system (plural endings, etc.). They do not generally form families of words derived from one root by certain foreign methods. Because of these facts, non-technical words of European origin do not, like the Arabic-Persian learned words, constitute a relatively homogeneous and separate group in the Turkish vocabulary.

The different attitude towards European loan-words and Arabic-Persian ones is not a new phenomenon. Ahmet Vefik, in his above-mentioned dictionary (*Lehçe-i Osmanî*), listed all European words together with the native (i.e. genuine Turkish and naturalized Arabic-Persian) material, while the non-assimilated Arabic and Persian words were arranged in a separate part. But in those days the extent of the European vocabulary in Turkish was still rather small.

Since then the number of such words has steadily increased. The introduction of the Latin script, the many translations from Western literature and the growing knowledge of foreign lan-

guages in wider sections of the population facilitates and accelerates this invasion. Often French words are used to display the speaker's education or because he will not try to find a Turkish word to express his idea. In many cases, however, the use of European words seems unavoidable. As pointed out by a contemporary writer,⁴⁷ there are in the great languages of Western civilization, apart from technical and scientific terms, thousands of words which have no equivalent in modern Turkish, and their number grows year after year because of the many new words coined in those languages.⁴⁸ In view of this moderate language reformers demand that the Linguistic Society direct its main attention to enriching rather than purifying the Turkish vocabulary. On the basis of a foreign standard dictionary, such as the *Petit Larousse*, lists of all necessary non-technical words missing in modern Turkish should be drawn up and then good Turkish equivalents should be suggested.⁴⁹

Though leading members of the Linguistic Society have likewise demanded quick action to halt the invasion of Western words and expressions,⁵⁰ very little has been achieved so far. In the reform of administrative and military terminology, words like *şimendifer* 'railway', *mitralyöz* 'machine gun', *projektör* 'searchlight' have been superseded by Turkish terms—*demiryolu*, *makinalı* (*makineli*) *tüfek*, *ışıldak*. Some Western loans which the *Cep Kılavuzu* had substituted for Arabic or Persian words have lately (e.g., in the *Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu*) been replaced with Turkish neologisms: *sekreter*, which had displaced *kâtib*, has now given way to *yazman*, etc. But the number of successful Turkish substitutes for European words in the

⁴⁷ See Peyami Safa's article in *Ulus* of 2nd March, 1950.

⁴⁸ According to the Secretary General of the Linguistic Society, nearly 300 French words listed in *Larousse* under the letter *A* alone had no Turkish equivalents (*Ulus* of 29th October, 1948).

⁴⁹ See an article by Necmeddin Sadak in *Akşam* of 9th February, 1951. His opinion is shared by F. R. Atay (*T. D.*, II, no. 13-15, p. 18).

⁵⁰ E.g., Besim Atalay (*5. T. D. Kurultayı*, pp. 147-48).

everyday language (such as *baltalama* for *sabotaj* 'sabotage') is still small.

Even a superficial comparison with the literary language of other Near and Middle Eastern peoples will be instructive. Not only Arabic, which is known for its strong puristic trend, but also Persian and Hebrew designate a far greater proportion of modern things and ideas by native words. To give only a few random samples: in the three other languages mentioned, commonplace terms, such as 'bicycle', 'driver', 'station', 'factory', 'newspaper', 'culture', are rendered by native equivalents (Arabic, دراجة, سائق, محطة, مصنع, جريدة, ثقافة; Persian, دوچرخه, راننده, فرهنگ; Hebrew, תחנה, נהג, אופנים, עיתון, תרבות, עתון), whereas literary Turkish uses the European terms (*bisiklet*, *şoför*, *istasyon*, *fabrika*, *gazete*, *kültür*).

Modern Turkish appears to repeat what its reformers consider an unfortunate development of the time when the Turks accepted Islamic civilization. Instead of framing words for Western objects and concepts out of its native word-material, it adopts European terms in ever-increasing numbers.

TECHNICAL TERMS

In dealing with the reform and development of their language, the Turks distinguish between two classes of words—the ordinary vocabulary (*lûgat*), and the technical or specialized terms (*istilah* or, with a newly coined word, *terim*). As regards the former, attention was—as shown above—directed mainly towards its turkicization. The elimination of foreign words was carried out gradually, as Turkish substitutes could be found. Such substitutes were, as far as possible, taken from living, obsolescent or obsolete speech-material; the creation of entirely new words was kept to a minimum.

The question of terminology was treated in a different way. In any language, the reformers point out, technical terms are not the result of an organic, unconscious development, but are

deliberately and artificially created. The chief qualities required of them are exactness and unambiguousness; they have also to be adjusted to each other so as to form a system. Being derived from the classical languages common to the various nations of the same civilization, such terms are to a large extent international.

After the Turks embraced Islam, they, like most other Muslim peoples, borrowed their technical terms almost exclusively from Arabic. When the impact of Western civilization in the nineteenth century necessitated the creation of a very large number of new scientific terms, the Ottoman Turks again had recourse to Arabic and, to a lesser extent, Persian, their classical languages. Even under the Young Turks, when the first systematic attempt was made at turkicizing the ordinary vocabulary, the coining of new terms from Arabic and Persian roots continued, though a number of European terms were also adopted.⁵¹ This process came to an end when Republican Turkey turned away from Islamic civilization, introduced the Latin script and banned the teaching of Arabic and Persian in schools.

All at once, the existing scientific terminology became obsolete, and that for two reasons. First, Arabic technical terms—even more than other words of Arabic origin—were hardly intelligible in Latin characters. For the new generation, who no longer acquired a basic knowledge of Arabic and Persian, these terms have even less literal meaning than scientific terms have for Western students ignorant of Greek and Latin. Secondly, while in the non-technical vocabulary words of Arabic or Persian origin may well exist side by side with Turkish words or neologisms, scientific terminology must needs be more homogeneous. If new terms are no longer formed from Arabic-Persian roots, the whole terminology so far borrowed from or based on those languages is doomed.

⁵¹ See the lists of terms published in those days by the *İstıslabat-ı İlmiye Encümeni*. A few examples are quoted in Levend, p. 353.

Another problem the reformer had to cope with was the incompleteness of the old terminology. A large number of terms did not exist at all in Ottoman Turkish, and with the rapid development of modern technology and science this deficiency is constantly increasing.

In the field of terminology, therefore, the Linguistic Society had to adopt a method different from that applied to the ordinary vocabulary. With regard to the latter it proceeded from the Ottoman lexicon, its main object being to replace foreign words with Turkish ones without enlarging the existing vocabulary. In its attempts at terminology reform, on the other hand, the Society first drew up lists of the terms needed in various fields of learning; they were culled from European dictionaries, mainly French, German, and English.⁵² Then the Ottoman equivalents of those terms—as far as there were any—were examined and, with relatively few exceptions, rejected. In their place the reformers chose either international, i.e. European, or Turkish terms.

Unlike Turkish substitutes for foreign words in the ordinary vocabulary, most Turkish technical and scientific terms had to be newly coined. The collection of words from the spoken language of the people had, as was to be expected, produced relatively little material that could be used to express abstract concepts. From old Turkish texts, too, rather few native terms could be gleaned, since the wholesale adoption of Arabic (and Persian) terms had prevented the development of a Turkish terminology and had seriously cramped the inherent ability of the Turkish language to form new words out of native material.

With regard to the large-scale creation of new Turkish terms the reformers faced considerable difficulties. Western languages, especially German, possess an almost unbounded capaci-

⁵² For linguistic terms, for instance, the French *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* by J. Marouzeau was taken as basis for the Society's *Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü* published in 1949.

ty for producing new terms by forming compounds or by the use of affixes. In Turkish (just as in the Semitic languages), these possibilities exist to a much more limited extent but have, in the opinion of the Linguistic Society, to be greatly enlarged.⁵³

The Linguistic Society divides technical terms into two main categories: those used in primary schools and 'middle schools' (*orta okul*), i.e. the sixth to eighth class, and those used in higher education and scientific literature. In the 'lycée' (*lise*), i.e. the ninth to eleventh class, a gradual transition from the first to the second category of terms is supposed to take place.

As to terms used in primary and 'middle' schools strict turkicization is considered axiomatic. To speed up the fight against illiteracy and to expand general education, the language of instruction is to approach as much as possible the language which the child hears at home. Therefore, all terms used in school textbooks are to be derived from Turkish words which exist in the language known to the pupil, except common international terms, such as *elektrik*, *dinamo*, *gram*, etc.⁵⁴

The lists of school terms introduced in 1939⁵⁵ had been prepared on these lines. According to the statistics published by the Linguistic Society, of over 5,000 terms included in the lists only 9 per cent had in the past been Turkish words. Now the percentage had risen to 80.⁵⁶

Many who opposed the puristic policy of the Society in general⁵⁷ welcomed the new school terms. There was wide agreement with the claim of the reformers that neologisms such as *sekizyüzlü* 'octahedron' and *eşkenar üçgen* 'equilateral triangle' (whatever the Turkologist might say against their formation)

⁵³ See below, pp. 89-90.

⁵⁴ Decision of the Third Language Congress of 1936 (*T. D.*, I, no. 23-26, p. 20); cf. also *T. D.*, I, no. 8-9, p. 29.

⁵⁵ See above, p. 35.

⁵⁶ *T. D.*, III, no. 1-3, p. 38.

⁵⁷ E.g., Necmeddin Sadak in *Akşam* of 9th February, 1951.

are to the Turkish child more easily pronounceable and intelligible than the old Arabic terms *zu-semaniyet-ül-vücut* and *müselles-i mütesavi-y-ül-adla* (or even its turkicized form *dılı-ları müsavı müselles*). The same applies to botanical and zoological terms such as *güneyönelme* (or *günedoğrulum*) replacing *teveccüh-ü ilez-ziya-iş-şems* 'heliotropism', *düzbarsaklılar* for *zat-ül-em'a-i gayri-müteş'a'ibe* 'rhabdocoela', etc.

The German model for many of the new Turkish terms is conspicuous (cf. *Achtflächner* 'octahedron', *gleichseitiges Dreieck* 'equilateral triangle', *Sonnenwende* 'heliotrope').

Regarding scientific terms for higher education the Society at first adopted, as mentioned above,⁵⁸ a strongly puristic attitude. International terms, such as *biyoloji*, *botanik*, etc., which had been used in schoolbooks, were now replaced with newly coined Turkish words (*dirilbilim*, *bitkibilim*, etc.). In the lists of terms published during the years 1942-1949 Turkish neologisms were suggested even for terms like 'impressionistic' (*izlenimci*), 'cubism' (*somculuk*), 'surrealism' (*üst gerçekçilik*), etc.⁵⁹

In recent years, however, a more moderate policy has been adopted. The Sixth Language Congress in 1949 decided that "the scientific and technical terms used in common by the advanced nations may be accepted according to a definite system".⁶⁰ The Society now regards the adoption of certain specialized terms of Greek or Latin origin, found in all Western culture-languages, as a 'historical necessity'.⁶¹

The pronunciation and spelling of such international terms in Turkish raises some difficult questions. Should these terms, as hitherto, be adopted in French pronunciation or in their original form? Is a 'faculty' (of a university), for instance, to

⁵⁸ See p. 38.

⁵⁹ *Edebiyat ve Söz Sanatı Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Ist., 1948).

⁶⁰ 6. T. D. Kurultayı, p. 146.

⁶¹ Statement by the Linguistic Society published in the Turkish press on 24th November, 1950. For the views of other Turkic-speaking peoples on the question of terminology see Th. Menzel, 'Der 1. Turkologische Kongress in Baku' in *Der Islam*, XVI (1927), pp. 171-73.

be *fakülte* as at present or *fakulta*, is 'oxygen' to be *oksijen* as usual now or *oksigen*? It is pointed out that French is not, after all, the classical language of Western civilization and that even its position as the principal foreign language in Turkey is no longer undisputed. Furthermore, from whatever source the terms be borrowed, how should they be spelt in Turkish—as in their language of origin or in accordance with the sound value of Latin characters in modern Turkish? Is the present-day phonetic spelling, as *tentürdiyot* for French 'teinture d'iode', satisfactory also for scientific terms, which in general belong to the written language only?⁶²

In 1950 the Linguistic Society defined its attitude by advocating the adoption of international terms "in conformity with the morphology and phonetics of the Turkish language".⁶³ This was to mean that such terms must be adapted (a) to the Turkish rules of stress, vowel harmony, etc., and (b) to the spelling system of modern Turkish. The point of departure was henceforth to be not the forms of the terms in French, English or German, but, as far as possible, their Greek or Latin forms.

Before finally deciding on the system of turkicizing Greek and Latin terms, the Society sent out a questionnaire⁶⁴ asking the opinion of various people as to how one should spell terms such as

- 'asphyxia': *asphyxia* or *asphyxi* or *asfüksi* or *asfiksi*?
- 'rhythm' : *rhythmos* or *rhythm* or *ritm* or *ritim*?
- '-logy' : *-logia* or *-logi* or *-loji*?

While moderate reformers⁶⁵ prefer a spelling which is close to the form used in most European languages, the Society seems

⁶² See Peyami Safa's report to UNESCO (*T. D., A. D.*, no. 4, p. 5); Dr. Kemal Cenap, *Türkçede İlmî İstılablar Meselesi* (İst., 1929). ⁶³ See note 61 above.

⁶⁴ *Yunanca ve Lâtince köklerden meydana gelen ve dilimize alınması lüzumlu görülen yabancı terimlerin türkçeleştirilmesi hakkında anket* (Ankara, 1950).

⁶⁵ E.g., Prof. Ragıp Özdem (4. *T. D. Kurultayı*, p. 344; *T. D.*, II, no. 9-10, p. 37).

in principle to favour a phonetic orthography. To ensure correct pronunciation, leading members of the Society⁶⁶ have suggested that even well-known foreign proper names should be spelt phonetically. Thus 'Shakespeare' should be written *Şekspir*, 'Temps'—*Tan*, etc., while the original spelling might be added in brackets. In recent years, however, the tendency to preserve an etymologically more correct spelling of Western terms is increasing.⁶⁷

The terminology problem is further complicated by the fact that many terms are also part of the non-technical language and even of popular speech. With regard to such terms the Turkish reformers could be expected to share the opinion of the Danish linguist O. Jespersen: "So much of science is now becoming more and more the property of everybody and influences daily life so deeply that the endeavour should rather be to have popular than learned names for whatever in science is not intended exclusively for the specialist".⁶⁸

But what are, in the case of modern Turkish, 'popular names'? Are common terms of Arabic or Persian origin to be retained or to be replaced with Turkish words and neologisms? In its lists of terms published in the forties the Linguistic Society suggested Turkish substitutes (*us, anlak, doğa*) for Arabic terms such as *akıl* 'reason', *zekâ* 'intelligence' and *tabîî* 'natural', all of which are used in the popular language. The moderates⁶⁹ object to such extreme purism, since they regard these Arabic terms as well-established naturalized words. In their view, such remnants of the old Ottoman terminology do not seriously disturb the new system of terms. Moreover, their retention would conform with the Society's own policy of basing the

⁶⁶ See Besim Atalay, *Türkçe'de kelime yapma yolları* (Ist., 1946), p. 47.

⁶⁷ See Tietze in *Oriens*, V, no. 2, p. 232.

⁶⁸ Jespersen, *Growth*, p. 129.

⁶⁹ See *T. D.*, *A. D.*, no. 1, pp. 49-52; *T. D. K.*, *Dil Dâvası*, pp. 85-86; *4. T. D. Kurultayı*, p. 341.

future terminology, as far as possible, on the spoken language and prevent the creation of new learned words from Turkish roots.

In its recent turn to moderation the Linguistic Society took note of this criticism and decided that terms used in the colloquial should be words "from the living language of the people".⁷⁰ It has not been made quite clear, however, what is meant by 'living language' and, in particular, the spoken language of which class of the population should be regarded as standard.

The final outcome of this controversy over terminology reform may perhaps be on the lines of the compromise solution suggested by the University of Istanbul. As regards medical terms, for instance, it was pointed out⁷¹ that modern medicine had two fronts—national health and international science. For the contact with the sick, the doctor needs a Turkish terminology intelligible to the layman, while for academic teaching and research international, i.e. Greek and Latin, terms should be adopted. Consequently, a committee of the Faculty of Medicine decided to distinguish between three classes of terms:

- a) terms used in the spoken language of the people: they should all be Turkish words, such as *önkol* (rather than *sâid*) 'forearm', *karın boşluğu* (rather than *cevî-i batın*) 'abdominal cavity';
- b) terms known to the educated layman: here, native (Turkish or naturalized Arabic) words and international terms—such as *karınzarı* and *periton* 'peritoneum', *mide iltihabı* and *gastrit* 'gastritis'—might be used as synonyms;
- c) terms used exclusively by medical men: they should be international terms in modern Turkish spelling, such as *iskio-rektal* 'ischioirectalis' (in the old Ottoman termi-

⁷⁰ See note 61 above.

⁷¹ 4. T. D. Kurultayı, pp. 335-39.

nology, *vereki-i mia-i müstakimî*); the orthography of such terms in their language of origin might, if necessary, be added in brackets.

TURKISH SUBSTITUTES FOR FOREIGN WORDS

The success of the efforts to eliminate foreign words depends of course on the possibilities of finding suitable Turkish equivalents. Here, too, the modern language reformers have encountered theoretical and practical problems, and the contest between different points of view is as yet undecided.

The Linguistic Society has found or created Turkish substitutes for foreign words and terms mainly in the following ways:

- a) by choosing Turkish words used in the written language of today as synonyms of foreign terms: *ölüm* (*vefat*) 'death',⁷² *yıl* (*sene*) 'year', *sunmak* (*takdim etmek*) 'to present';
- b) by collecting words from the popular vernacular and dialects of Turkey (recorded in the Society's *Derleme Dergisi*): *görkem* 'display', 'pomp', *yöntem* 'method', *denetlemek* 'to control'⁷³;
- c) by reviving obsolete 'Ottoman' words of Turkish origin (collected in the Society's *Tarama Sözlüğü*): *konuk* 'guest', *tanık* 'witness', *töre* (*törü*) 'custom';⁷⁴
- d) by gleaning words from non-Ottoman Turkish texts and borrowing from Turkic languages spoken outside Turkey: *başkan* 'president', *saylav* 'member of Parliament', *tüzük* 'regulation';⁷⁵

⁷² All the following examples are taken from the *Cep Kılavuzu*, the 1945 version of the Constitution or the *Türkçe Sözlük*.

⁷³ On the adoption of this term into the new text of the Constitution see *5. T. D. Kurultayı*, p. 123.

⁷⁴ The revival of these words had already been suggested by H. Vambéry in his *Alt-Osmanische Sprachstudien* (Leiden, 1901), pp. 27-28.

⁷⁵ For the reformers' opinion on the origin of these and similar words see İ. N. Dilmen's articles in *Cumhuriyet* of 19th, 23rd, and 27th January, 1945.

- e) by using existing Turkish words in a restricted (special) or enlarged sense: *çevirmek* 'to turn round' in the meaning of 'to translate', *ürün* 'dairy (or other agricultural) product' in the sense of 'product' (in general);
- f) by giving an abstract meaning to existing Turkish words originally referring to material objects: *alan* 'clearing in forest' in the sense of 'field', 'sphere',⁷⁶ *kaynak* 'spring of water' in the sense of 'origin';
- g) by translating foreign terms literally into Turkish (loan-translation): *bakan* (from *bak*- 'look') for *nazır* (same literal meaning in Arabic) 'minister', *bulunç* (from *bul*- 'find') for *vicdan* (from Arabic root of like meaning) 'conscience';
- h) by turkicizing foreign words phonetically: *hükümet* instead of *hükûmet* 'government', *kuvet* instead of *kuvvet* 'force', *ıspor* instead of *spor* 'sport';
or morphologically (using Turkish instead of foreign modes of derivation): *imkânlı* instead of *mümkün* (*mümkün*) 'possible', *nöbetleşme* instead of *münavebe* 'alternation', *tarafsız* instead of *bitaraf* 'neutral';
- i) by forming various types of so-called compounds: *tek el* (single hand) 'monopoly', *yüzyıl* (a hundred years) 'Century', *basımevi* (house of printing) 'printing-press'⁷⁷; some being composed of two nouns without a possessive pronoun added to the second:⁷⁸ *dilbilim* (lit., science of

⁷⁶ See *T. D.*, II, no. 9-10, p. 49.

⁷⁷ Formed on the analogy of older compounds, such as *binbaşı* 'major', *yeniçeri* 'Janissary', *kahvaltı* 'breakfast', and more recent popular formations, such as *gecekondu* 'hut erected overnight', *kaptıkaçı* 'small motor-bus'. Formations like *basımevi* are, of course, not compound nouns in the strict sense of the term (see Deny, *Grammaire*, §§ 1114-16).

⁷⁸ These formations were criticized by moderate reformers (see, for instance, Ragıp Özdem in *4. T. D. Kurultayı*, p. 347). For the defence of the Linguistic Society, which was based mainly on the existence of place-names like *Çanakkale*, *Duatepe*, etc., see *T. D.*, II, no. 9-10, pp. 51-52; *T. D. K.*, *İmlâ Kılavuzu* (Ist., 1948), p. XXIX.

- language) 'linguistics', *tümgeneral* (general of a division, *tümen*) 'major-general' (cf: also *Sümerbank*, *Eti-bank*, names of Turkish banks established in 1933-35);
- j) in particular, by forming compounds one component of which is used as a kind of prefix,⁷⁹ such as *ön* (front) 'pre-', *son* (final) 'post-', *üst* (upper) 'super-', *alt* (under) 'sub-', *eş* (mate) 'syn-': *önsöz* 'preface', *sonek* 'suffix', *üstinsan* 'superman', *altşube* 'subdivision', *eşanlamlı* 'synonymous';
- or is intended to serve in lieu of a suffix (in the meaning of an Indo-European prefix), such as *ara* (interval) 'inter-', *dış* (outside) 'a-', *önce* (time before) 'pre-', *sonra* (time after) 'post-': *milletlerarası* 'international', *ahlâkdışı* 'amoral', *okulöncesi* 'pre-school', *harbisonrası* 'post-war';
- k) by deriving new words by means of still productive derivative suffixes (*kıyasî lâbika*): *aracı* (from *ara* 'relation between persons') 'mediator', *eşsiz* (from *eş* 'mate') 'matchless', *dokunulmazlık* (from *dokun* 'touch') 'immunity';
- or by means of revived derivative suffixes (*semaî lâbika*): *anıt* (from *an-* 'remember') 'monument', *öğretmen* (from *öğret-* 'teach') 'teacher', *içsel* (from *iç* 'inside') 'internal';
- or by means of derivative suffixes borrowed from other Altaic languages: *Danıştay* (from *danış-* 'consult') 'Council of State', *söylev* (from *söyle-* 'speak') 'speech';
- l) by creating neologisms similar in sound to the European (French) or, in a few instances, the Arabic words in the same meaning ('calques phonétiques'): *okul* 'école',

⁷⁹ On the question of prefixes in Turkish see J. Deny, 'Existe-t-il des préfixes en turc?' in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 39 (Paris, 1938), pp. 51-65.—Cf. also the formation of compounds in modern Hebrew (בנאום 'internationalization', חתיהכרה 'subconscious', etc.).

terim 'terme', *belleten* 'bulletin', *diyelek* 'dialecte', *genel* 'général', *kamun* 'commune', *komutan* 'commandant', *nomal* 'normal', *örge* 'organe', *somtöz* 'synthèse'. The adjective ending *-(s)allel* (*ulusal* 'national', *dinsel* 'religious') sounds like the French endings *-al* and *-el*, and the suffix *-man/men* for the formation of agent-nouns (e.g., *seçmen* 'elector', cf. German 'Wahlmann') recalls English '-man' and German '-mann'. Some neologisms resemble the Arabic words they are designed to replace: *irde* for *irade* 'will', *üsnet* for *isnad* 'imputation', *tecimer* or, in the *Türe Terimleri* of 1948, *tecir* for *tacir* 'merchant'. Such likeness may, of course, be sometimes purely accidental. At any rate, the spokesmen of the Linguistic Society stress that all these neologisms are derived from genuine Turkish roots (*oku-* 'read', *ter-*, modern Turkish *der-*, 'collect', *belle-*, 'learn by heart', etc.) and in some cases (such as *okul*) are based on words found in Anatolian dialects.⁸⁰

It should be remembered, however, that very many of these 'calques phonétiques' were suggested at a time when the Sun-Language theory set out to prove the close relationship between European languages and Turkish. As a matter of fact these words may be compared to folk etymologies (such as *telgraf* for *télégraphe*, *eleğimsağma* for *alâmisema*), with the difference that they were not formed unconsciously but intentionally and systematically, and that their creators were not the anonymous people but intellectuals interested in planned linguistic reform.⁸¹ Incidentally, inventions of this

⁸⁰ See Dilmen's article in *Ulus* of 9th April, 1943; N. H. Onat in T.D.K., *Dil Dâvası*, pp. 49-50; and Besim Atalay, *Bir doçentin Türkçe okutuşu ve müna-kaşalarımız* (Ist., 1940), p. 40.

⁸¹ J. Deny in *En Terre d'Islam*, 1935, pp. 223-47 and in *Bull. de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris*, 1938, pp. 55-56, 64.

kind are not, as Deny believes,⁸² entirely "without precedent in the annals of linguistics". Modern Hebrew, too, tried, for a short period and without much success, to follow the same road, forming words like חִלְרָע (*hólirá*—lit., 'bad illness') for 'cholera', פְּרָטִי-כָל (*p'rátê-kol*—lit., 'details of the whole') for 'protocol', etc.

The relative importance of the different sources from which Turkish substitutes for foreign words are taken is shown in the statistics published by the Linguistic Society itself.⁸³ Of the 8,752 Turkish words suggested in the *Cep Kılavuzu* as equivalents of foreign words

- 54 per cent were found in Turkish as spoken in Turkey (including non-literary words and apparently also archaic and obsolete words, since these are not separately listed); and
- 20 per cent were derived from such words by means of affixes;
- 5 per cent were borrowed from Turkic languages spoken outside Turkey; and
- 5 per cent were derived from such words by means of affixes;
- 6 per cent were words of foreign, mainly Arabic and Persian, origin which were considered completely turkicized;⁸⁴ and
- 10 per cent were derived from such words by means of (Turkish) affixes.

In recent years the Linguistic Society has stopped borrowing words and roots from other Turkic languages, since most of

⁸² Deny, *En Terre d'Islam*, p. 246.

⁸³ *T. D.*, I, no. 16, pp. 22-23.—See also Ömer Asım Aksoy's statistics in his *Karşılıklar Klavuzu Üzerine Dersler* (Gazianteb, 1935).

⁸⁴ Or, as the Society put it in the heyday of the Sun-Language theory, "were understood to be of Turkish origin" (see above, pp. 33-34).

these loans had been rejected by the public. On the other hand, very many new words have been formed by composition and derivation. With a view to exploiting all possibilities in this field, the Society engaged in large-scale research into the various modes of word-formation in old and modern Turkish.⁸⁵ The material collected served as basis for coining new terms corresponding to existing words. The most important innovations of the Society were the systematic formation of compound words and the free use of many completely 'frozen' derivative suffixes. The latter method had been categorically rejected by Ziya Gökalp and his followers.⁸⁶

One of the main efforts of the Society in this field was to replace Arabic word families with terms derived from one Turkish root. For instance, the Turkish root *top-* was to take the place of the Arabic trilateral *cm* (جمع) in forming a 'family' of terms: *toplama* for *cemi* 'addition', *toplalık* for *müçtemi* 'collected', *toplantı* for *içtima* 'assembly', *toplaç* for *camia* '(electric) collector', *topluk* for *heyeti mecmua* 'the whole', *topluluk* or *toplum* for *cemiyet* or *cemaat* 'society', 'community', *topluluk (ismi)* for *(ism-i) cemi* 'collective (noun)', *toplumsal* for *içtimai* 'social', *toplumbilim* for *içtimaiyat* 'sociology', and, in addition, *toplumculuk* 'socialism', *toplak* 'collection', *toplumdaş* 'associate', etc.⁸⁷

In some cases the Turkish substitutes for foreign words reflect the ideological changes that have taken place in modern

⁸⁵ Of the Society's publications in this field the following may be mentioned: Besim Atalay, *Türkçemizde men-man* (Ist., 1940), *Türk dilinde ekler ve kökler üzerine bir deneme* (Ist., 1941), *Türkçe'de kelime yapma yolları* (Ist., 1946); Mehmet Ali Ağakay, *Kelime yapı yolları* (Ist., 1943); Ahmet Cevat (Emre), *Türkçede kelime teşkili hakkında bir anket*, 1-2 (Ankara, 1933), *Ekler lügatçesi*, 1 (Ist., 1934), *Türkçenin yapılışı* (Ist., 1942), *Türkçede isim temelleri* (Ist., 1943).

⁸⁶ See Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, pp. 108, 114-15; Ahmet Cevat, *Türkçe Sarf ve Nabiv* (Ist., 1926), p. 214.

⁸⁷ These terms are found in the *Türkçe Sözlük*, published by the Linguistic Society in 1945.

Turkey. Strong nationalist feeling is expressed in words like *sömürge* 'colony' from *sömürmek* 'to devour'. The new term *Anayasa* 'Constitution' reveals the tendency to revive ancient Turkish-Mongolian traditions (*yasa* 'code of laws'). The secularization of Turkish life finds expression in the replacement of Arabic *muvaffak* 'successful' and *mansur* or *muẓaffer* 'victorious', originally denoting that God has given success or victory, with Turkish *başarılı* and *yener*, which indicate man's own achievement. Certain religious terms are given a secular meaning.⁸⁸ *Şehit*, which signified 'martyr', 'one who dies in battle for the glory of Islam' is today used for a Turkish soldier killed in a national war. A Turkish newsagency recently employed the term *malûl gaziler* in reference to Yugoslav disabled soldiers, though traditionally the title *gazi* is reserved for those victorious in Muslim Holy War. In fact, the agency was criticized in the press for using this epithet, "which is peculiar to... soldiers who have shed their blood for the Turkish fatherland".⁸⁹ Lastly, the Kemalist ideal of *halkçılık* (democracy) has led to the abolition of many 'class words', such as *mahdum* 'son', *kerime* 'daughter' (in higher society).⁹⁰

PHRASEOLOGY AND SYNTAX

Bending their main efforts to the turkicization of vocabulary and grammar, modern language reformers have so far paid little attention to phraseology and syntax. While, for instance, words of Persian origin were systematically replaced with Turkish equivalents, no attempt was made to oust the many loan-translations from Persian.⁹¹ Similarly, little was done to stem

⁸⁸ For a similar development in French during the Revolution see Brunot, *Hist. de la langue franç.*, IX (Paris, 1937), pp. 625 sq.

⁸⁹ *Cumhuriyet* of 27th June, 1953.

⁹⁰ For the new 'democratic' titles *Bay* and *Bayan* see p. 107.

⁹¹ For a list of such expressions see M. Bittner, *Der Einfluss des Arabischen und Persischen auf das Türkische* (Sitzungsber. der Kais. Akademie der Wiss. in Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse, CXLII, 1900).

the tide of literal translations from European languages which have been accepted at a growing pace since the last century. The number of terms such as *kara bursa* 'black market', *hayat sahası* 'Lebensraum', and expressions like *kuyruk yapmak* after 'faire (la) queue' ('to queue up') increases daily in Turkish as in many other languages. Very few of them have been replaced with independently coined neologisms, such as *bakım* or *görüş* for *noktai nazar* 'point of view'. On the whole, the reformers seem to be satisfied if the words used in rendering such foreign expressions are, as far as possible, of Turkish origin.

This attitude has been criticized for being formalistic and 'atomistic' by those who think that a language is not simply a collection of words and terms, and that more consideration should be given to the phrase and sentence as a whole.⁹²

With regard to syntax too the Linguistic Society has shown little initiative. In 1935 the Society decided to undertake a research into the syntactical features of the spoken language, the language of proverbs, folk-songs, etc.⁹³ The material collected has not yet been published.

Some proposals for the reform of Turkish syntax were made by individuals who wished to Westernize and simplify the language and bring it closer to the colloquial. A radical programme submitted to the Fourth Language Congress suggested, *inter alia*:

- a) introducing relative (and other subordinate) clauses by means of the pronouns *kim* and *ki*, which had been found in Ottoman Turkish, but had more recently been banned;
- b) using conjunctions, such as *evvel ki* and *sonra ki* in the sense of 'before' and 'after', at the beginning of subordinate clauses;

⁹² Halide Edib in *Hür Fikirler* (Istanbul), I, no. 5, pp. 207-10; İst. Muallimler Birliği, *Birinci Dil Kongresi* (İst., 1949), p. 176.

⁹³ *T. D.*, I, no. 12, pp. 21-25.

- c) breaking the strict rule of literary Turkish which requires the verb to be placed at the end of the sentence.⁹⁴

The Congress flatly rejected these suggestions, declaring that "it was neither necessary nor possible to change the syntax of our language by any interference".⁹⁵ This conservative attitude curiously contrasts with the radical efforts to change the vocabulary.

However, some contemporary Turkish writers favouring language reform such as Nurullah Ataç use a word-order customary in conversation, often placing a subject or object after its verb and a genitive after the noun which governs it. Such modernisms have been strongly criticized.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ 4. *T. D. K.*, pp. 306-19. See also the suggestions made by Vedad and Sedad Örs in *Revue internationale de l'enseignement supérieur*, 96 (Paris, 1935), pp. 13-54 (quoted in Deny, *La réforme actuelle*, p. 238).

⁹⁵ 4. *T. D. K.*, p. 63.

⁹⁶ See, e.g., N. S. Banarlı in *Hürriyet* (Ist. daily) of 6th February, 1954 and the discussion between Ahmet Ateş and Nurullah Ataç in *T. D.*, *A. D.*, nos. 26, 28 and 29.

CHAPTER III

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE TURKISH VOCABULARY

TURKISH AND NON-TURKISH WORDS IN PRESENT-DAY USE

To what degree has recent language reform succeeded in actually changing the vocabulary of modern Turkish? A definite answer to this question cannot be given, since a standard language has not yet evolved. With regard to the respective use of foreign and Turkish words, there are marked differences between the vocabularies of the press, belles-lettres, administration and law, school textbooks, and scholarly works. Even in the same branch of literature, each writer shows personal propensities in his choice of words. Some general trends in recent vocabulary changes can, however, be discerned.

The language of the great daily newspapers, especially of their articles, provides a fair specimen of present-day Turkish as written for the average literate. By tradition and owing to the lack of periodicals, many Turkish writers and scholars contribute regularly to the daily press, which has considerable influence on the development of the modern language.

At first sight, there seems to be no general agreement as to the extent to which Arabic and Persian words should be replaced with Turkish ones. Sometimes a contemporary newspaper reads as if it had been written twenty years ago, i.e. before the beginning of recent language reform. Here is the first paragraph of a leading article of the Istanbul daily *Cumhuriyet* (13th January, 1951):

"Posta ile tevzi edilmiş matbu bir beyanname, son zamanlarda sahifelerini, matbuat hürriyetinden suiistifade ederek halkın

dine olan rabitasını istismara hasretmiş bazı mecmuaların neşriyatından bir kısım Türk halkının mustarib¹ olduğunu gösteriyor".

All the nouns and adjectives in this paragraph, with the exception of one European and one Turkish word, are Arabic or Persian. For most of them, the *Cep Kılavuzu* had suggested Turkish equivalents, several of which have in fact been widely accepted: *dağıtmak* for *tevzi etmek* 'to distribute', *basma* for *matbu* 'printed', *basın* for *matbuat* 'press', *bağ* for *rabita* 'tie', *dergi* for *mecmua* 'periodical', *yayın* for *neşriyat* 'publications', and others. *Sahife* 'page' is given in the old spelling and not in its turkicized form, *sayfa*.

The other extreme is found in articles written by militant purists,² who do their utmost to dispense with words of Arabic-Persian origin and to propagate Turkish neologisms. They use words like *erek* 'aim', *evrim* 'evolution', *deneç* 'experiment', *değgin* 'concerning', *tinsel* 'spiritual', which have been suggested by the Linguistic Society, but are hardly found in any other column of the same newspaper. It is, of course, no accident that newly-coined words of this type are mostly used in articles dealing not with politics, but with cultural subjects.

The ordinary newspaper language today steers a middle course, using old and new words side by side and almost indiscriminately. The same newsitem contains, as exact synonyms, Arabic *mühim* and Turkish *önemli* 'important', *tedrisat* and *öğretim* 'teaching', *emniyet* and *güvenlik* 'security', *ehlivukuf* and *bilirkişiler* 'experts'. One writer mentions "...adlı kitabının ismi" (lit.) 'the name (*isim*) of his book by the name (*ad*) of...', while another refers to the *pamuk mevzuu* 'subject (*mevzu*) of cotton' as *günün bir konusu* 'a subject, or issue, (*konu*) of

¹ Printing error for *muztarib*. Mistakes in spelling Arabic and Persian words are becoming more frequent as the knowledge of the old script decreases.

² See, for instance, İsmayıl Hakkı Baltacıoğlu's articles in *Ulus* of 22nd January and 19th February, 1951.

the day'. Phrases like *Şehir Meclisi . . . bir toplantı yapmış ve bu içtima . . .* 'the Municipal Council held a meeting (*toplantı*), and this meeting (*içtima*) . . .' are quite common today. This mode of avoiding repetitions is as normal in modern Turkish as the interchange of Anglo-Saxon and French-Latin synonyms is in English (cf., for instance, the passage from Dickens's "A Christmas Carol": "The phantom slowly *approached*. When it *came near* him . . .").

Typical of the simultaneous use of Arabic-Persian, European and Turkish terms are the headlines of different papers which announced, on 1st March, 1953, the signing of a pact between Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia. In 'Yeni İstanbul' the pact is called *muahede*, in 'Yeni Sabah' *pakt*, and in 'Cumhuriyet' *andlaşma*.

In present-day Turkish old and new, foreign and native words can be found together in one and the same expression, term or title. Some examples are *batı şimalinde* 'in the north-west', *teşriî dokunulmazlık* 'parliamentary immunity', *Millî Talebe Federasyonu Genel İdare Kurulu* 'General Managing Committee of the National Students' Federation'. Such 'hybrid' expressions, often criticized by purists,³ reflect the stage of transition through which the language is passing.

A small number of words of Arabic or Persian origin are retained in the newspapers because they are considered more dignified than their native synonyms. Thus, for instance, a newsitem about a queen expecting a child is headed *Kraliçe . . . hâmile* ('enceinte'), and not *gebe* ('pregnant').

Many other Arabic and Persian words and even constructions are used to produce a humorous or ironical effect. Cartoonists in particular often resort to such words and expressions in their captions. A similar use of foreign words can be observed in English and other languages.⁴

³ E.g., Nurullah Ataç, *Sözden Söze, Edebiyat Konuşmaları* (Ist., 1952), p. 72.

⁴ For English see Jespersen, *Growth*, pp. 136-37.

The percentage of Arabic and Persian words in today's newspaper language is still rather high, but varies considerably. The following statistics is the result of my test of various Turkish newspapers published in 1950-52. Leading articles by Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın in *Ulus* and Mümtaz Faik Fenik in *Zafer* contain an average 40-45 per cent of Arabic-Persian⁵ and 3-5 per cent of European⁶ words; the rest are genuine Turkish elements. Ahmet Şükrü Esmer (*Ulus*) and the late Necmeddin Sadak (*Akşam*) used just over 35 per cent of Arabic and Persian words. In Nadir Nadi's leaders in *Cumhuriyet* the percentage drops to about 30, and in M. Nermi's articles in *Yeni İstanbul* it is generally even lower. (For comparison it may be noted that in a newspaper article published in 1909 about 75 per cent are non-Turkish words.⁷)

Newsitems chosen at random from those papers show an average 30-40 per cent of Arabic-Persian and 5-10 per cent of European words. Popular short stories in the daily press, which are written in the language of everyday conversation, contain fewer words borrowed from Arabic and Persian (25-35 per cent).

Calculations of this kind⁸ have a certain value in that they show the differences in the composition of the vocabulary used in various periods, or by different writers at the same time. They cannot, however, give a fair idea of the respective significance of the 'native' and 'foreign' section of the vocabulary. For one thing, the frequency of occurrence of the different elements must also be considered. In English, for instance, the frequency rate of Anglo-Saxon (and Scandinavian) words is much higher than that of the other elements, which

⁵ Including completely turkicized words, such as *sey*, *kadar*, *ve*, and words the stem of which only is of Arabic or Persian origin, like *pahalt*, *hazırlamak*, etc.

⁶ Both old and new borrowings (see above, pp. 76 sq.). ⁷ Levend, p. 317

⁸ For their theory see G. Udny Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1944).

are a large majority in the language.⁹ But no frequency count appears to have yet been made for the modern Turkish vocabulary.¹⁰ Furthermore, the percentage of foreign elements in the different classes of words should also be examined. If, for example, only nouns and adjectives were counted, the rates of Arabic and Persian words in the newspapers tested would be about 50 per cent higher. It would also be important to find out the exact proportion of learned words among the foreign elements, which, as mentioned before,¹¹ is very large. Last, and most important, such word counts ignore the decisive fact that not all non-Turkish words are felt by the speaker or writer to be foreign elements, at least not in the same degree. Popular words of foreign origin, many of which have undergone a change of meaning or pronunciation, evidently have a different standing in the language from unassimilated learned words.

The language of the young generation is, of course, influenced by the vocabulary of school textbooks. The readers at present used in the first four classes of primary schools¹² contain a relatively small number of Arabic and Persian words. It is significant that in the primer (*Alfabe*) the Arabic conjunction *ve* 'and' is not used at all.¹³ Arabic verbal nouns and participles are also very rare. Where common native synonyms exist for non-Turkish words, only the former are used: *yıl* for *sene* 'year', *önce* for *evvel* 'before', etc. On the other hand, neologisms not yet generally accepted are avoided. In textbooks for higher

⁹ Mario Pei, *The Story of English* (Philad.-New York, 1952), pp. 97-98, 109.

¹⁰ Even limited studies such as Moshe Brill's *The Basic Word List of the Arabic Daily Newspaper* (Jerusalem, 1940) would fill a notable gap.

¹¹ See pp. 62 sq.

¹² *Alfabe; Okuma Kitabı, İkinci Sınıf; Okuma Kitabı, Üçüncü Sınıf; Türkçe Kitabı, İlkokul, Sınıf IV*; all published by the Ministry of Education (Ist., 1952).

¹³ This conjunction is rarely used in popular speech (see K. Foy, 'Der Purismus bei den Osmanen' in *M. S. O. S.*, I, 2. Abt., Berlin, 1898, pp. 22-23). Its excessive use in the literary language had already been criticized by Muallim Naci in 1887 (Levend, p. 153).

classes, however, the number of newly-coined words increases. In the history-book for the fourth class,¹⁴ for instance, *olay* 'event', *uygarlık* 'civilization', *özet* 'summary', *etki* 'influence', *ulusal* 'national' are found. Many more neologisms are used in textbooks for the sciences.

With regard to the language of modern literature, general statements can hardly be made. Here, individual writers differ considerably in their use of foreign or native words.¹⁵ All we can say is that rather few neologisms are used, while many authors try to replace Arabic-Persian words by common Turkish synonyms. The number of Arabic and Persian learned words is steadily decreasing. On the other hand, owing to the realistic trend of contemporary literature, many Turkish colloquialisms and even slang expressions are finding their way into the literary language. The many books, articles and poems on Anatolian village life published in recent years have introduced a number of dialect words.

The legal language is particularly conservative. Like the 'Law French' used in England until the eighteenth century and the old German *Kanzleisil*, the Turkish of lawyers and law-courts is still interlarded with many foreign (i.e. Arabic) terms.

The language of administration depends, of course, on the attitude of the authorities towards linguistic reform. Since the 1950 elections many Arabic terms have been reinstated. However, quite a number of Turkish neologisms are still used in the press, e.g., *bakan* 'minister', *eğitim* 'education', *ilçe* 'district', *savcı* 'public prosecutor', *başkanlık* 'presidency', *gensoru önergesi* '(parliamentary) interpellation', though official usage prefers the older, Arabic terms (*vekil*, *maarif*, *kaza*, *müddeiumumi*, *reislik*, *istizah tavriri*).

¹⁴ *Tarih*, IV. Sınıf, *İlkokul*, approved by the Ministry of Education in 1945 and reprinted for use in 1950/1 and 1951/2.

¹⁵ An examination of a few pages of Reşat Nuri Güntekin's popular novel *Çalıkuşu* (Ist., 1939), first published in 1922, shows that this writer uses only about 25 per cent of Arabic and Persian words.

In many cases Arabic and Persian root-words are still in use, but their derivatives are formed by Turkish rather than foreign methods. In the 'simplified' edition of his famous novel *Aşk-ı Memnu* published in 1939, Halid Ziya Uşaklıgil, who certainly was not in favour of drastic language reform, replaced many Arabic and Persian formations used in the 1341 (1925) edition: e.g., *lâkayd* with *kaydsız* 'indifferent', *mübbemiyet* with *mübbemlik* 'vagueness', *musırrane* with *ısrar eden* 'insistent', *mânadar* with *mânalı* 'significant', *tamamen* with *tamamiyle* 'completely', etc..

Today *izafet* constructions have become almost as uncommon and petrified as Latin genitive formations in modern German (*Christi Geburt, Johannisbeere*). Arabic sound and broken plural forms, such as *memurin, kelimat, düvel*, which fifty years ago were normal in literary Turkish, have by now been almost completely replaced with Turkish forms (*memurlar, kelimeler, devletler*), just as in everyday English *formulas, indexes, funguses* tend to supersede *formulae, indices, fungi*. Only when used as collective nouns or singulars do these Arabic plural forms still survive (*arazi* 'real property', *amele* 'worker').

ACCEPTED AND REJECTED NEOLOGISMS

In the present state of fluctuation of the Turkish language it is impossible to state definitively which neologisms (in the sense of words not used in literary Ottoman Turkish before the first World War)¹⁶ have been adopted and which have not. An attempt may, however, be made to divide the Turkish words suggested (though not necessarily coined) by the Linguistic Society as substitutes for Arabic and Persian words into four groups as far as present usage is concerned:

¹⁶ They are not listed in Ali Seydi's *Resimli Kamus-ı Osmanî* (Ist., 1330) and D. Kélékian's *Dictionnaire Turc-Français*, reprint (Ist., 1928).

1. new words generally rejected:

uray 'municipality', *özgenlik* 'freedom', *işyar* 'civil servant', *uluşal* 'official';¹⁷

2. new words struggling to assert themselves, i.e. so far used by certain writers only:

konu 'subject', *sonuç* 'result', *görev* 'duty', *olay* 'event';¹⁸

3. new words used side by side with their Arabic-Persian synonyms:

çoğunluk (ekseriyet) 'majority', *ilgi (alâka)* 'interest', *önem (ehemmiyet)* 'importance', *alan (saba)* 'field' (fig.);¹⁹

4. new words which to a certain extent have ousted foreign words:

durum (vaziyet) 'situation', *aydın (münevver)* 'enlightened', 'intellectual', *terim (istilab)* 'term', *sözlük (lûgat)* 'dictionary'.²⁰

Why have some Turkish equivalents of Arabic and Persian words been widely accepted by the public and others have not? This is an interesting but difficult question. A linguistic development of this kind does not follow fixed principles and logical lines. The following observations can therefore be only tentative.

There seems to be a good chance of acceptance for such Turkish words, old or newly-coined ones, as replace long and clumsy foreign words: *belirtmek (tebarüz ettirmek)* 'to emphasize', *başarı (muvaffakiyet)* 'success', etc. Turkish words have

¹⁷ Though these Turkish words had been suggested in the *Cep Kılavuzu* or the *Türkçe Sözlük*, their Arabic or Persian equivalents were retained even in the 1945 version of the Constitution.

¹⁸ Found in Hikmet Bayur's leader in *Kudret* of 23th July, 1952 and in Nadir Nadi's leaders in *Cumhuriyet* of 29th August, 1951 and 17th May, 1952.

¹⁹ Both the foreign and the Turkish words are used in one newspaper issue (*Akşam* of 1st February, 1951).

²⁰ The Turkish words are found even in the reports in which the İstanbul Muallimler Birliği summarized its opposition to excessive purism (*Birinci Dil Kongresi*, pp. 172-79).

particularly succeeded in superseding foreign terms composed of two or three words, such as *arzuhâl* (*dilekçe*) 'petition', *hissikablelvuku* (*önsezi*) 'presentiment', *Teşkilân Esasiye Kanunu* (*Anayasa*) 'Constitution', etc. Another example are the new Turkish names for four months of the year (*ekim* 'October', *kasım* 'November', *aralık* 'December', *ocak* 'January'), which after 1944 took the place of the older, foreign names *teşrinievvel*, *teşrinisani*, *kânunuevvel*, *kânunusani* (or *birinci teşrin*, *ilkteşrin*, etc.).²¹

Arabic words with certain un-Turkish phonetic features (double consonants, especially after a long vowel, glottal stops, etc.) also seem to be often replaced by Turkish words: e.g., *âmme* (*kamu*) 'public', *kat'î* (*kesin*) 'definite'.

On the other hand, many short, simple and easily pronounceable words of Arabic and Persian origin successfully resist their newly-coined Turkish equivalents. *Nesir* 'prose' and *nazım* 'poetry', which in the *Cep Kılavuzu* had been replaced with *serpem* (*serpin*) and *dizem* (*dizim*), were later²² reinstated by the Linguistic Society itself.

Essential conditions of the popularity of a new word seem to be a pleasant and adaptable form, a harmonious sound, a familiar morphologic and phonetic pattern, expressiveness, and intelligibility. Conspicuous among the Turkish words accepted by many writers in place of foreign ones are certain groups formed with the same derivative suffixes, such as:

- ek: *sığınak* 'shelter', *uçak* 'aeroplane', *dayanak* 'prop';
- gi: *dergi* 'periodical', *tepki* 'reaction', *yetki* 'authority';
- (i)m: *oturum* 'session', *devrim* 'revolution', *deyim* 'expression';
- î: *gösteri* 'manifestation', *kazı* 'excavation', *gezi* 'trip';
- (i)n: *yayın* 'publication', *kesin* 'definite', *basın* 'press';
- ge: *sömürge* 'colony', *bölge* 'zone', *belge* 'document';

²¹ See O. M., 1946, p. 61; Sevik, *Dil Da'vâsı*, p. 35.

²² In the *Edebiyat ve Söz Sanatı Terimleri Sözlüğü*, published in 1948.

-(i)t: *yazıt* 'inscription', *yakıt* 'fuel', *eşit* 'equal';
 -(i)nti: *söylenti* 'rumour', *alıntı* 'loan(-word)',²³ *toplantı*
 'meeting'.²⁴

The success of these words, most of which are shorter than the Arabic words they have replaced, was largely due to the fact that they are derived from well-known roots and formed on a familiar pattern. On the other hand, a neologism is not readily accepted if its termination is unusual, archaic or foreign. For many years the Linguistic Society tried in vain to introduce the very rare suffix *-(s)el* (cf. *uysal* 'compliant') to replace the common Arabic adjective ending *-î* (e.g., *tarihsel* 'historic', *cinsel* 'sexual'). Suggestions to replace this ending with other Turkish suffixes, such as *-(e,i)k*,²⁵ *-liğ*,²⁶ *-cek*,²⁷ or *-cil*²⁸ have been equally unsuccessful.

The suffix *-men*, used by the Linguistic Society to form many new agent-nouns, met at first with strong criticism, but in recent years a number of such words have become current: *öğretmen* 'teacher', *seçmen* 'voter', *teğmen* 'lieutenant', and others. It is significant that many of these words are administrative or military terms. The same applies to many other neologisms which in spite of their unfamiliar roots or endings have been adopted, at least in the language of the newspapers.

Some newly-coined words, such as *öğrenci* 'pupil', *incelemek* 'to examine' and others, have been criticized on the score of alleged faulty formation or discrepancy between the original meaning of their root and the new signification given to them.²⁹ Without examining how far this criticism is justified, we may note that these words have been more easily adopted than many

²³ This neologism is used in the Society's *Türkiyede Dil Devrimi*, p. 3.

²⁴ For older words formed with these suffixes see Deny, *Grammaire*, §§ 855 sq. Cf. also Eleanor Frankle, *Word Formation in the Turkic Languages* (Columbia Univ. Press, 1948).

²⁵ *T. D.*, I, no. 5, pp. 94-96.

²⁶ Maksudi, *Türk Dili için*, pp. 361-67.

²⁷ *4. T. D. Kurultayı*, pp. 320-28.

²⁸ Found in articles by İsmayıl Hakkı Baltacıoğlu.

²⁹ See *6. T. D. Kurultayı*, pp. 203-4; Hony in *J. R. A. S.*, 1947, pp. 218-19.

other neologisms. There is nothing surprising in this, since a host of wrongly formed or wrongly used words have been accepted in every language.

Modern language reformers have had much success with their suggestions for replacing Arabic and Persian elements with familiar Turkish words or with derivatives of such formed with 'living' suffixes (e.g., *ortaçağ* 'Middle Ages', *emekli* 'retired', *yalanlamak* 'to deny'). On the other hand, they failed signally when, infringing one of their own principles, they tried to dislodge words of foreign origin which had struck deep roots in the colloquial. This holds especially in the case of words which are neither technical terms nor part of the language of administration, law, etc. The very few attempts to replace certain old Turkish words were even more strongly resisted. Thus, the introduction in 1934 of *Bay* 'Mr.' and *Bayan* 'Mrs.', which, contrary to Turkish usage, were to be placed before the name, has not been very successful in spite of strong official support. Until this day, the old terms *Bey* and *Hanım*, put after the first name, are generally used in the spoken language, while the neologisms *Bay* and *Bayan* are regarded by many people as strange and even slightly comical.³⁰

³⁰ See Fahir İz in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, II (Ist., 1943), pp. 356-57.

CONCLUSION

MODERN Turkish language reform has certain parallels in the linguistic movements in Norway¹ and various countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia.² In particular, the puristic trends in Hungarian, a language of the Finno-Ugrian family, attracted the attention of several Turkish linguists who had studied in Budapest (Ragıp Hulûsi Özdem and others). The development of modern German, however, exerted the strongest influence on many Turkish language reformers, who time and again recommended following the German example.³ There are a number of reasons for this influence. Modern Turkish nationalism in general has much in common with the German national movement of the nineteenth century.⁴ Further, German is the only major European language and the only foreign language known to many Turkish intellectuals that faces problems somewhat similar to those encountered by Turkish with regard to foreign elements.⁵ Thus, the puristic efforts of German writers, authorities and the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein* (founded in 1885)⁶ found an echo in the Turkish linguistic movement, which, like them, met with strong opposition in academic circles and part of the upper middle class.

¹ See, e.g., A. Burgun, *Le développement linguistique en Norvège depuis 1814* (Kristiania, 1917, 1921).

² For the connection between social and linguistic changes in a Far Eastern country see John de Francis, *Nationalism and Language Reform in China* (Princeton, 1950).

³ For instance, Ragıp Özdem (*Terimler Meselesi Mün. Dilimizin Islahı üzerine Muhtıra*, Ist., 1941, p. 66), Saim Ali Dilemre (*T. D., A. D.*, no. 6, pp. 9-10), M. Sükrü Akkaya (*Dil Düzelmesi üzerine Düşünceler*, Ist., 1941, pp. 8 sq.).

⁴ See my *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism*, p. 164-70.

See above, pp. 39, 64-65, 67, 82-84.

For details see H. Dunger, *Die Deutsche Sprachbewegung und der Allgemeine Deutsche Sprachverein 1885-1910* (Berlin, 1910).

The Turkish language problem, however, is much more serious and difficult. First, unlike the German *Sprachreinigung*, language reform in Turkey was intimately connected with a renunciation of the cultural heritage of the educated class, including the traditional script and classical languages. The modern Turks—and here they differ also from their Arabic, Persian- and Hebrew-speaking neighbours—do not regard any part of their old literature as classics, which might serve as a model for their modern literary language. Secondly, most of the foreign words in Ottoman Turkish had been borrowed from languages belonging to two families completely different from Turkish and from each other, the Semitic (Arabic) and Indo-European (Persian). Their amalgamation was much more difficult than that of foreign elements in other languages, especially in view of their very great numbers. Thirdly, owing to this vast Arabic and Persian element, literary Ottoman Turkish was unintelligible to the overwhelming majority of the people, who were illiterate. The pressing need for popular education made the simplification of the language imperative and, at the same time, gave the reformers a unique, but brief opportunity to change the composition of its vocabulary before it became the property of the whole nation. Finally, the Turkish reformers not only wished to purify their language of foreign elements, but tried, simultaneously, to fill its enormous gaps. Ottoman Turkish was very deficient in technical and many other terms, and the creation of a new terminology, no more based on the Islamic languages, could not be delayed.

The reform of the Turkish vocabulary under the Republic was a continuation of the changes suggested, and in part carried out, during the Tanzimat and Young Turk periods. The three main stages of this movement were: the desistence from borrowing additional non-technical words from Arabic and Persian and the ejection of rare Arabic-Persian words and expressions (Tanzimat); the elimination of unnecessary Arabic

and Persian synonyms of familiar Turkish words (Young Turks); and the systematic replacement of most Arabic and Persian learned words, technical terms and some others with Turkish words (many of them revived or newly coined) or European equivalents (Republic). As for the Arabic and Persian words retained in the language, the reformers in the nineteenth century postulated the right to use them without regard for their original meaning and pronunciation; their successors before and during the first World War banned certain foreign grammatical rules governing them; and since 1932 the Linguistic Society has tried to eliminate their non-Turkish modes of derivation.

Whatever may have been the errors and exaggerations of modern Turkish language reform, it has unquestionably had some beneficial results. It has aroused general interest in the development of the Turkish language, prompted scholarly research into its history and structure, sharpened the linguistic feeling, done away with much outmoded conventionalism, induced writers to use simpler, clearer and more exact language, and introduced a considerable number of good and necessary new words and technical terms.

APPENDIX

ARTICLE 26 of the Turkish Constitution in the original form of 1924 (as amended in 1928) and the 1945 version:¹

The Text of 1924:

'Büyük Millet Meclisi kavaninin vaz'ı, tadili, tefsiri, fesih ve ilgası, devletlerle mukavele, muahede ve sulh akdi, harb ilânı, muvazenei umumiyei maliye ve Devletin umum hesabı katî kanunlarının tetkik ve tasdikı, meskûkât darbı, inhisar ve malî taahhüdü mutazammın mukavelât ve imtiyazatın tasdik ve feshi, umumî ve hususî af ilânı, cezaların tahfif ve tahvili, tahkikat ve mücazâtı kanuniyenin tecili, mahkemelerden sâdır olup katiyet kesbetmiş olan idam hükümlerinin infazı gibi vazaifi bizzat kendi ifa eder.'

The Version of 1945:

'Kanun koymak, kanunlarda değişiklik yapmak, kanunları yorumlamak, kanunları kaldırmak, devletlerle sözleşme, andlaşma ve barış yapmak, harb ilân etmek, devletin bütçe ve kesin hesap kanunlarını incelemek ve onamak, para basmak, tekelli ve akçalı yüklenme sözleşmelerini ve imtiyazları onamak ve bozmak, genel ve özel af ilân etmek, cezaları hafifletmek ve değiştirmek, kanun soruşturmalarını ve kanun cezalarını ertelemek, mahkemelerden çıkıp kesinleşen ölüm cezası hükümlerini yerine getirmek gibi görevleri Büyük Millet Meclisi ancak kendisi yapar.'

Translation:²

'The Grand National Assembly directly exercises such functions as enacting, modifying, interpreting and abrogating laws; concluding conventions and treaties of peace with foreign states; declaring war; examining and approving laws relative to the General Budget and the Final Accounts of the State, coining money, approving or annulling contracts and concessions involving financial obligations; proclaiming partial or general amnesty; reducing or modifying sentences, postponing legal investigations and penalties and executing definitive death sentences pronounced by the courts.'

¹ See above, pp. 41-43.—On p. 42 one Persian word in the 1945 version is inadvertently counted as Arabic.

² As given in *The Turkish Constitution (Turkey Today, No. 11)*, published by the Turkish Information Office, New York.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

Turkish books on the history and general problems of modern Turkish language reform:

- Sadri Maksudi, *Türk Dili için* (Istanbul, 1930).
Ragıp Özdem, *Terimler Meselesi Münasebetile Dilimizin Islahı üzerine Muhtıra*, İstanbul Üniversitesi (Edebiyat Fakültesi) Yayınlarından No. 138 (Istanbul, 1941).
Agâh Sırrı Levend, *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Safhaları* (Ankara, 1949).
İsmail Habib Sevük, *Dil Da'vâsı* (Istanbul, 1949).
İstanbul Muallimler Birliği, *Birinci Dil Kongresi* (Istanbul, 1949).
T. D. K. (Türk Dil Kurumu), *Türkiyede Dil Devrimi (Language Reform in Turkey)* (Ankara, 1951).
T. D. K., *Dil Dâvası* (Ankara, 1952).
Suat Yakup Baydur, *Dil ve Kültür* (Ankara, 1952).

Many articles on language problems published in the Turkish press are mentioned in the footnotes.

Periodical publications of the Turkish Linguistic Society:

- T. D.: *Türk Dili, Bülten (Belleten)* (Istanbul or Ankara, 1933-50).
T. D., A. D.: *Türk Dili, Aylık Fikir ve Edebiyat Dergisi (Aylık Dergi)* (Ankara, 1951-).
1., 3., 4., 5., 6. T. D. Kurultayı: Acts of 1st, 3rd-6th Turkish Language Congresses (published in 1933, 1937, 1943, 1946, 1950).
Yıllık: Yearbook, 1943 (Ankara), 1944 (Ankara), 1945-46 (Istanbul, 1948).

Articles by non-Turkish scholars on modern Turkish language reform:

- Jean Deny, 'La réforme actuelle de la langue turque' in *En Terre d'Islam* (Paris, 1935), pp. 223-47.
Ettore Rossi in *Oriente Moderno* (Rome), 1935, pp. 45-57; 1942, pp. 466-77; 1953, pp. 378-84.

¹ Books and articles on Ottoman and modern Turkish, other languages and general linguistics are referred to in the footnotes.

- Konrad Nielsen, 'Die türkische Sprachreform' in *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, VIII (Oslo, 1937), pp. 443-59.
- Hans Joachim Kissling, 'Die türkische Sprachreform' in *Leipziger Vierteljahrsschrift für Südosteuropa*, I, no. 3 (October, 1937), pp. 69-81.
- Herbert W. Duda, 'Die Gesundung der türkischen Sprachreform' in *Der Islam*, XXVI (1942), pp. 77-100.
- H. C. Hony, 'The New Turkish' in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London), 1947, pp. 216-21.
- H. C. Hony, 'Zavallı Türkçe' in *İş Mecmuası*, XV, no.89 (Istanbul, 1949), pp. 2-6.

Abbreviations of titles of European periodicals:

- M. S. O. S.*: Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen (Berlin).
- O. L. Z.*: Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig).
- O. M.*: Oriente Moderno (Rome).
- J. R. A. S.*: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London).

INDEX

Only the more important names and subjects are included

- administrative language, 10, 41, 46f., 52, 79, 102, 106
- agent-nouns, 91, 106
- Ahmet Hikmet, 59 note
- Ahmet Midhat, 14, 18
- Ahmet Vefik, 11, 65 note, 78
- Anadilden Derlemeler*, 26 note
- Anadolu Ajansı* (newsagency), 37, 54
- Arabic and Persian,
 - coining from roots, 14, 15, 17
 - compounds, 15, 17, 43, 63, 65f., 105
 - compound verbs, 64/5, 69
 - foreign elements, 13, 23, 57, 61/2
 - grammar, 9, 17, 64, 66, 110
 - inflection and derivation, 24, 43, 63, 65, 67, 69, 110
 - knowledge, 10, 12, 23, 39, 66/7, 81
 - learned words, 51, 62-70, 102, 109
 - literature, 109
 - literary words, 58, 71ff.
 - loans, 9, 11, 14f., 30/1, 58/9, 62, 81, 109
 - naturalized words, 11, 23, 33, 36, 42f., 48, 57, 60f., 69, 74, 78, 84, 87, 89, 92
 - participles, 63, 65, 68f., 101
 - plural & dual forms, 61, 63, 65, 103
 - popular words, 11, 17, 31, 43, 47, 57-62, 69, 70, 73, 86
 - prefixes and suffixes, 63, 64
 - script, 23f., 37, 54
 - spelling, 11, 23, 60, 63
 - synonyms of Turkish words, 17, 43, 57, 66, 70ff., 88, 98f., 101, 104, 109
 - verbal nouns, 58, 63, 65, 68f., 101
 - words changed in Turkish, 11f., 60-63, 110
 - word families, 57, 63, 66, 93
 - words for modern concepts, 80
 - words in Latin script, 23f., 60, 67
 - words in use today, 97ff.
 - words 'of Turkish origin', 33f., 92
 - words superseding Turkish words, 9, 59, 61, 62
- archaic words, 14, 17, 24f., 34, 47, 50, 88, 92
- army, 54
- Ataç, Nurullah, 39, 96
- Atatürk, 19-26, 34-37, 44, 49, 51ff., 78
- Atay, Falih Rıfkı, 74f.
- Baltacıoğlu, İsmail Hakkı, 39
- calques phonétiques, 90ff.
- Cenab Şahabeddin, 15
- Cep Kılavuzu*, 32f., 35, 43, 54, 59, 69, 72/3, 75, 77, 79, 92, 98, 105
- classes, social, 9f., 13-16, 18, 20, 24, 47, 67/8, 70, 108/9
- collection of words, 26-28, 82, 88
- compounds, 83, 89/90, 93
- conjunctions, 78, 95, 101
- Constitution, 41-43, 51f., 57, 111
- democracy, 20, 94
- Democrat Party, 44, 48, 52
- derivation, 64, 89, 93, 103, 105-7
- Derleme Dergisi*, 28, 88
- dialect words, 13f., 25-28, 31, 50, 54, 88, 91f., 102
- dictionaries, 11, 26, 37, 40f., 65
- Dilmen, İbrahim Necmi, 77
- education, 10, 14, 20, 28, 54, 83, 109
- Enderun mektebi*, 10
- English, 9/10, 56, 58f., 61-65, 67f., 70-72, 82, 85, 91, 99-103

- Enver Paşa, 54
 etatism, 19, 21
 European languages, loans, 14, 17,
 42, 76ff., 81, 100
ezan, 37f., 52, 73/4
- Finnish, 39
 folk etymology, 91
 folklore, 17, 27f., 95
 French, language and words, 58, 62-
 64, 71, 76, 78f., 82, 84f., 90/1
 literature, 14, 15
 Revolution, 21, 94 note
 Fuat Köse Raif, 14
- galatat*, 11, 64
Genç Kalemler, 17
 German, 39, 56, 59, 61, 64f., 67, 82,
 84f., 91, 102f., 108/9
 glottal stop, 105
 Government, 26, 52, 53
 Greek, 12, 39, 59, 62, 64, 69f., 76,
 81, 84f., 87
- Halid Ziya (Uşaklıgil), 15, 103
Halkevleri, see People's Houses
 Hebrew, 80, 90 note, 92, 109
 hiatus, 61
 history, Turkish, 17, 25, 49
 Hungarian, 39, 76, 108
Hür Fikirleri Yayma Cemiyeti, 44
- İkdam*, 14
İmlâ Lûgati, 24
 impoverishment of language, 47,
 72ff.
 İnönü, İsmet, 36f., 44, 53
 Islamic civilization, 9, 17, 20, 23,
 58f., 81
 Istanbul Teachers' Association, 44
 Italian, 76
izafet, 24 note, 65/6, 103
- Japanese, 39
- kaba Türkçe*, 10
 Karagöz, 68
 Kemalism, 19ff., 94
- Koran, 28, 52, 55/6
 Köprülü, Fuat, 22
- Language Committee, 22, 25, 26 note
 Latin, 9, 12, 39, 58f., 62-64, 70, 81,
 84f., 87, 103
 Latin script, 20, 22-25, 59f., 67, 78,
 81, 85
 legal language, 10, 41, 43, 46, 52,
 59, 102
 Levend, Agâh Sırrı, 10 note, 50, 75
 Linguistic Society, see Turkish L.S.
 literature, modern, 14, 41, 102
 old, 10, 26-28, 46, 48, 54, 109
 popular, 10, 28
 'living language', 50f., 87
 loan-translation, 69, 89, 94/5
- medrese*, 10
 Mehmet Emin, 16
 metre, see prosody
 Ministry of Education, 21, 26 note,
 35, 36, 51-53
 months, names of, 105
- Namık Kemal, 11
 nationalism, Turkish, 10, 13, 16f.,
 19, 22, 94, 108
 Necib Âsım, 13
 neologisms, 14, 17, 34, 38, 41, 45f.,
 50-53, 55, 73, 79, 83f., 88ff., 95,
 98ff., 101/2, 103ff.
 newspapers, 14, 16, 28, 37, 41, 52,
 97ff.
 Norwegian, 61 note, 70 note, 108
 numerals, 22
- opposition to purism, 44-48, 51, 55,
 95
 Ottoman, name of language, 13, 20
 Empire, 9f., 13, 16-18, 76
- Ömer Seyfeddin, 17
öz Türkçe, 20, 37, 50
- Pan-Turkism, 16
 Parliament, 22, 25, 37, 41f., 49, 51f.
 People's Houses, 21, 29

- Persian, see Arabic and Persian
 Arabic words in, 14 note, 70 note
 phraseology, 94/5
 prefixes, 61, 63, 83, 90, 92
 pre-Islamic, 17, 19, 25, 94
 prosody, 12, 15, 18, 60, 71
- radio, 28f., 37, 41, 52, 54
 Recaizade Ekrem, 12
 reduplication of consonants, 24, 60f., 105
 religion (Islam), 9, 17, 22, 30, 37, 45f., 52, 54, 94
 Republican People's Party, 21, 29, 36, 45, 48, 53
 Romance languages, 65
 Russia, Turks in, 13, 17, 31
- Sade Türkçe Kılavuzu*, 50, 59, 69, 77, 79,
 school language, 35, 39, 46f., 52f., 68, 83f., 101/2
 secularization, 10, 19ff., 25, 45, 94
 Semitic languages, 83
Servet-i Fünun, 14, 16, 18, 48
 simplification of language, 10, 14, 19, 54, 68, 95, 109
 Slavonic languages, 76
 spelling, 23, 59, 85-88
 spoken language, 12, 14f., 17f., 20, 26-29, 32, 47, 57, 59, 62, 65, 71, 77, 82, 86f., 95, 107
 State intervention, 21, 45f., 52f.
 suffixes, 17, 47, 61, 63f., 83, 90-93, 105-7
 Sun-Language theory, 33f., 36, 91f.
 Süleyman Nazif, 15
 Süleyman Paşa, 13
 synonyms, see Arabic and Persian,
 synonyms of Turkish words
 syntax, 9, 47, 94ff.
- Şemseddin Sami, 13, 18, 29
- Tanzimat, 10, 14, 16, 41, 48, 57, 109f.
Tarama Dergisi, 30-32, 35, 88
- Tarama Sözlüğü*, 28
 terms, historical, 58
 military, 54, 79, 106
 religious and cultural, 9, 59
 technical and scientific, 14, 17, 25, 35, 38-40, 43f., 46, 48, 52-54, 62, 67, 76, 80ff., 84/5, 109
- Tevfik Fikret, 15
 titles, 30, 107
 Turkic languages, 9, 13, 28
 loans, 13-15, 35, 47, 50, 88, 90-93
 Turkish, name of language, 13
 Turkish Language Congresses, 26, 32, 35, 44, 48-50, 58, 84, 95
 Turkish Linguistic Society,
 foundation, 21, 25f.
 character, 49f.
 status and budget, 51
 publications, 54f.
 general policy, 50, 57/8
 Turkish substitutes for foreign words,
 13f., 17/8, 26, 29-37, 41-43, 58, 88ff., 97ff., 104ff.
- Türk Dili*, 54/5
Türkçe Sözlük, 40f., 43, 57, 59, 75
Türki-i basit, 9
- University of Ankara, 41, 45
 University of Istanbul, 22, 30, 38f., 41, 44, 87
 Us, Hakkı Tarık, 50
- vowel, long, 23, 60, 105
 vowel harmony, 23, 60, 61, 85
- Western civilization, 10, 20, 76f., 81
 women, language of, 18
 word families, 93
 word formation, 26, 82, 93
- Yalçın, Hüseyin Cahit, 48
Yeni Lisan, 18
 Young Turk language reformers, 16-21, 54, 57, 65f., 71, 81, 109/10
- Ziya Gökalp, 17, 25, 70, 93
 Ziya Paşa, 10



Library

IAS, Shimla

494.35 H 511 L



00010773

*Copies can be purchased from the Secretary of the Israel
Oriental Society, P.O.B. 7001, Jerusalem (Israel),
or from Messrs. E. J. Brill, Oude Rijn 33a-35,
Leiden (Holland), or from Messrs. Luzac & Co.,
46 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.*