

ATATÜRK AND TURKISH LANGUAGE REFORM

FAHİR İZ*

Language Reform is one of the most controversial issues of contemporary Turkey.

Essentially a cultural even a scientific problem which, one would expect, to be handled or studied only by experts, it tended in recent decades, to become increasingly involved with political issues. So much so that almost anyone who is interested in the problems of Modern Turkey in general, is tempted to join the controversy, often with emotional partisanship.

Although its origins are rooted, as we shall see, in the fundamental cultural change of a thousand years ago and remained alive through the centuries of the evolution of the Turkish language, some Turkish writers and quite a few foreign scholars (turcologists or others) surprisingly consider this movement just as anyone of the series of Reforms of the Republican era. Some even go so far as believing it to be nothing but a “capricious” enterprise of Atatürk or a new-fangled idea put forward by the Turkish Linguistic Society founded by him. It is also true that some writers change their approach to the problem according to the political climate, proving further that it is not easy for them to be unbiased on this issue.

This is most unfortunate, because Turkish Language Reform is essentially a cultural phenomenon which should have nothing to do with contemporary politics.

The need for a reform in a language may have many diverse causes. But the classical example of language reform, as witnessed in the histories of the German, Hungarian, Finnish and Norwegian languages for instance, appear to be the result of a reaction against an unreasonable overflow of foreign elements in the written language, making it virtually unintelligible to ordinary speakers of that language.

* Emeritus Professor of Turkish Language and Literature, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.

This is particularly true in the case of Turkish which had to struggle through the centuries for survival and independence.

A brief survey of the evolution of the Turkish literary language is necessary here to make this point sufficiently clear.

The most important of the oldest of the surviving specimens of the Turkish language are the Orkhon Inscriptions found in present day Outer Mongolia. Inscribed in the Turkish so-called Runic alphabet and erected in memory of two Turkish princes in 730's, they are written in pure Turkish and in spite of the strong Chinese cultural impact at the time, contain very few loan words. Their polished style suggests a considerable previous development of the language.¹

Later in the 9th to 11th centuries the kingdom of Uighur Turks flourished in present day Chinese Turkistan or Sinkiang. These Turks came under the influence of neighboring cultures. The majority of them were Buddhists. But in the same kingdom there were large Turkish minority groups which belonged to Manichaeism, Brahmi and Nestorian faiths.²

Excavations carried out during the late 19th and early 20th century by expeditions in the Chinese Turkistan brought to light substantial religious materials of the Uighur Turks. Experts have been at work for the last 70 years on this important legacy and in the light of this research, we are able to say that the pre-Islamic Central Asian Turks made systematic efforts to preserve the identity and independence of the Turkish language. Although they were exposed to strong Chinese, Indian and Iranian cultures and languages they were not tempted to transfer in bulk the foreign linguistic terminology and expressions of their new religions. Apart from a very limited number of inevitable loan words, they carefully looked for and found a Turkish equivalent for every Chinese, Indian or Iranian word or expression. When this was impossible they coined new words making the best use of Turkish roots and suffixes.³

Central Asian Turks came into contact with Islam in the 8th century and by the end of the 10th this new faith had replaced Buddhism and all the other religions professed by them.⁴

¹ Annemarie von Gabain, "Altürkische Literatur", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, vol.2, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 211-243.

² Idem, *op. cit.*, passim.

³ Idem, *op. cit.*, passim.

⁴ Phillip K.Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, eighth edition, London 1963, pp. 209-210.

Islam came everywhere with his holy book the Qur'an which was always studied and recited in the original Arabic, and soon the *medrese's*, the classical Islamic educational institutions, where the teaching medium was also Arabic, were set up in all the lands of the new faith. This resulted in almost complete obliteration of national languages and cultures in many areas such as Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and North Africa.

Iran and Turkistan reacted against this total cultural assimilation avoiding thus the loss of their national languages and within two or three centuries they rediscovered their national languages and within two or three centuries they rediscovered their national identities by creating a new national literature in the vernacular.

In the meantime, what happened in Iran between the Arab conquest and the emergence of Firdawsi's forerunners also happened in Turkish lands during the transition period: Arabic became the main written language used by the Turkish contributors to Islamic scholarship and sciences.

We do not know for certain when exactly the Muslim Turks of Central Asia revived their written literary tradition. There is evidence that this may have happened towards the end of the 10th century. We possess a unique manuscript of an interlinear translation of the Qur'an, preserved in a 13th century copy, which, according to its linguistic characteristics, may belong to that period. This text is of vital importance for the study of the development of the Turkish language. Because we see that the early Muslim Turks followed closely the cultural tradition of their Buddhist and Manichaeian forefathers namely, they did not choose the easy way of borrowing thousands of Arabic words and religious terms *in toto*, but tried to find their equivalent in Turkish. The very word Qur'an is rendered with the Turkish word *Okıgu* (reading material, reader). And many words and expression which were later indiscriminately and uncritically borrowed wholesale from the Arabic, are given in pure Turkish. Thus, thousands of Arabic terms such as *âyat*, *rabb*, *rasûl*, *îmân*, *mü'min*, *müşrik*, *kâfir*, *hakk*, *secde*, *azab*, etc. are rendered in the vernacular.⁵

The same can be said about the first major literary work of the early Muslim Turks, the *Kutadgu Bilig*, written in 1069 by Yusuf Has Hacib,

⁵ Fahir İz, *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Nazım*, vol.1, part 2, Istanbul 1967, Giriş (Introduction).

the chamberlain to the Sultan of Kashghar. This is an allegorical poem of more than 6000 couplets on the art of government. Although in this work the Arabo-Persian poetical forms and technique have already been adopted, the language is surprisingly free from foreign loan words.⁶

We have yet another work of unusual importance, though of a different nature, written in 1070's, i.e. during this same period of transition from pre-Islamic to Islamic culture: *Divanü Lûgat-it Türk* of Mahmut of Kashghar. This is a comprehensive Turkish-Arabic dictionary, containing ample specimens of contemporary Turkish poetry and proverbs, an invaluable document which shows us clearly the richness and the degree of development of the Turkish language at time of the great cultural change.⁷

The literary language developed in the lands of the Karakhanids, the first Muslim Turkish dynasty in Asia, set the pattern for later Turkish literary productions in Central Asia, Khorezm and the Golden Horde. And the majority of the literary and religious works produced in these areas during the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, show a predominantly Turkish character, although the influence of the Arabo-Persian culture and the number of loan words are gradually increasing.

As the Eastern Turkish world did not have a lasting political center which would have acted as a unifying factor, its literary language lacked the uniformity of the Western Turkish which I shall discuss later. In all the literary works of this period, the elements of the standard written language are combined with those of spoken local dialects.

The uniformity of the Eastern literary Turkish was achieved, up to a point, under the Timurids in Central Asia, and during the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, Eastern Turkish, now called Chaghatai, had its classical age.

In the meantime, the influence of the Arabic and particularly Persian language and literatures had reached a climax in Central Asia, and Persian had become a fashionable literary medium. But a number of leading writers and poets particularly Alişir Nevai, Babur and Bahadur Han,

⁶ Ahmet Caferoğlu, "La littérature turque de l'époque des Karakhanides", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, vol. 2, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 267-275.

⁷ Fahir İz, *op.cit.*

struggled and eventually succeeded in securing the survival and later the supremacy of the Turkish language in the area.⁸

We must now turn to the West and follow the development of Western Turkish which eventually became the written language of Turkey.

During the period of cultural change in Turkish Central Asia, where the city dwelling populations were gradually assimilating the new religion and culture of the Arabo-Persians, another branch of the population, the Oghuz Turks, mostly nomads, moved in large numbers towards South-West and founded the great Seljuk Empire. By the end of the 12th century they had settled in most parts of Asia Minor and set up the Anatolian Seljuk State of Konya. New waves of migrating Türkmens, under the pressure of invading Mongols, contributed to a rapid turkification of Asia Minor and already by the middle of the 13th century we witness the appearance of the first Turkish poets in Anatolia.

In the meantime the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate began to crumble under Mongol pressure and several Turkish principalities emerged in various parts of Anatolia and Turkish, gradually, replaced Persian as a literary medium.

But what gave real impetus to the movement was an edict by the ruler of one of the Anatolian principalities, Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey, who, in 1278, banned the use of any other language but Turkish for all purposes.

This is a turning point in the history of the Turkish language in Anatolia. Many Anatolian princes and some early Ottoman Sultans, not only required that Turkish should be used instead of Persian, but urged writers to avoid flowery style and use the everyday language of the people. A typical example is the order given by Murad II to Mercümeke Ahmed for a new translation of *Kâbus-Nâme*, enjoining him to use a simple, clear Turkish so that everybody could easily understand it.

A kind of linguistic snobbism of replacing Turkish words by their Arabic and Persian equivalents in literary works also started as early as the 15th century.

⁸ Janos Eckmann, "Die tschaghataische Literatur", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, vol. 2, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 304-382.

To avoid a frequent misunderstanding, I would like to point out emphatically that Western Turkish poetry and prose followed two different paths of development, from linguistic point of view.

After Yunus Emre (d. 1321), a contemporary of Dante, and perhaps the greatest of all Turkish poets, who used the language masterfully, giving the best specimen of spoken Turkish of his time, Turkish poetry developed in three different categories. Of these folk poets and popular mystic poets used, as a rule, the vernacular, with some sporadic exceptions.

As to the language used by *divan* poets or court poets, it is strikingly different before and after the conquest of Istanbul in the middle of the 15th century. The courts of the Anatolian *Bey*s were in small Anatolian towns such as Aydın, Kastamonu, Balıkesir, Kütahya, and both the princes and their court poets were in daily contact with ordinary people. The situation was not different in the first capitals of the Ottomans, Bursa and Edirne. In these circumstances it was natural for poets to use a language very close to that spoken by the people.⁹

After the conquest of Istanbul however, a different kind of court life developed in the new capital and the Sultan and poets alike tended to seclude themselves from ordinary people.

A comparison of the vocabulary used by court poets before and after 1450's is very revealing.

The vocabulary of *divan* poets is considerably limited. There are less than a thousand staple words occurring constantly in all poems such as: sun, moon, sky, clouds, stars, water, sea, waves, rain, snow, dew, wind, flood, ice, river, mountain, earth, dust, fire, etc., or parts of the human body: head, hair, face, forehead, eyes, eyebrows, eyelashes, mouth, lips, teeth, tongue, ears, cheeks, chin, hands, feet, heart, chest, bones, nails, blood, sweat, etc. or the names of common animals, trees, flowers, colors or frequently used adjectives such as pretty, ugly, good, bad, large, small, high, low, wide, narrow, etc.

Now the court poets of the pre-conquest era predominantly use the Turkish of these words. Whereas, after the middle of the 15th century un-

⁹ Fahir İz, "Turkish Literature", *Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 2, Cambridge 1970, pp. 682-691

til the end of the 19th, the divan poets following the pervasive linguistic snobbism in poetry, substitute the Arabic, and particularly the Persian equivalents of these everyday words and avoid more and more Turkish ones, unless forced by the metre or rhyme.¹⁰

Ottoman Turkish prose on the other hand followed a very different line of development.

There is a tendency to believe that Ottoman Turkish (which, by the way, is not a well defined term), was very different from Turkish and was consistently used in Turkey, until the Reform movement, as the standard written language.

Surprisingly, it is still not yet generally recognized that the artificially created court or chancery language, heavily loaded with Arabic and Persian loan words and grammatical rules where the Turkish element was reduced to the minimum, was *not* universally and consistently used as a standard written language, but was limited to certain types of writing and preferred by a limited number of authors.

Classical Ottoman literary biographers did not attach much importance to prose except the ornate and artistic prose (*inşâ*), which borrowed some of the techniques of divan poetry. But even then they would mention prose writers only in passing. They dealt exclusively with poets. Occasionally they would add shortly "his *inşâ* was also appreciated by the connoisseurs", or, "he is known as a *münşi* as well". They would ignore everything else if written in plain Turkish or in a moderately simple language: Because it was not literature.

This prejudicial approach to Turkish literature, which was by the way adopted by E. J. Gibb in his *History of Ottoman Poetry*, gave rise a hundred years ago to a legend concerning the creation of Modern Turkish written language.

The mid-19th century modernists, the Tanzimat writers published the first Turkish private news-paper, introduced from the French many new literary genres such as the essay, news-paper articles, short story and novel. They also wrote the first Turkish play.

¹⁰ *Idem, Eski Türk Edebiyatında Nazım*, vol. 1, part 2, Istanbul, 1967, Giriş (Introduction).

And within two decades they came to believe that they had created Turkish prose, even the standard written Turkish! In 1870, a critic among these early modernists, Ebüzziya Tevfik, categorically stated that Turkish prose was plain and straightforward at the start. But from the early 16th century onwards it began to lose its Turkish character and did nothing but imitate the worst type of Persian *inşâ*. 17th century was the climax of this development. In the 18th and 19th centuries literary taste deteriorated and prose writers reached a dead-lock. Şinasi, the pioneer of the Tanzimat literary school, arrived at the right moment to save the Turkish written language from collapse. He remodelled it, polished it and became a guide for future development.

These ideas, which are far from corresponding to facts, were repeated and accepted uncritically until recently.

The reason behind this sweeping and erroneous statement was that, except for the *münşeat* collections or a few chronicles and religious treatises, the main bulk of the Ottoman Turkish prose-output was unknown to Tanzimat modernists and their immediate successors.

The fact is that only a small portion of Ottoman Turkish prose works are written in the artificial and flowery *inşâ* style, the rest is either based on straightforward and very readable colloquial Turkish or in a moderately mixed language. The printed copies of some Ottoman prose works are misleading as they have often been touched up by the 19th century proof-readers trained in the chancery tradition.

There are two reasons why Tanzimat writers have been considered as innovators in language:

1) In their time the official jargon used in government office had reached new extremes which caused strong protest even from many administrators themselves. The modernist writers realized that they could not use unintelligible language while addressing large audiences. Consequently they made (not always successfully) efforts to use a comparatively simple Turkish. But compared with masterpieces of classical Turkish prose outside the *inşâ* their style sounds awkward, halting or flat and uninspiring, at times even artificial. None of them achieved the natural and genuinely popular style of an Aşıkpaşazade, or Dede Korkut Stories, or of a Peçevi, Fındıklılı Silahdar Mehmed and many others.

2) The second reason is that the Tanzimat writers were immediately followed by writers of the Servet-i Fünun school which represent a linguistic reaction by their creation of a hopelessly artificial and precious style.

In retrospect, the language of the Tanzimat writers appeared comparatively close to popular speech.¹¹

But the heart of the matter was not merely to experiment occasionally with a simpler written language: the official jargon used in government offices remained unchanged, the language of school text books and of most periodical and newspaper was far from being based on colloquial Turkish and no writer thought of changing thousands of cliché expressions borrowed from the Arabic.

But it must also be admitted that a certain linguistic consciousness began to emerge clearly among most writers of this period. The problem of language was kept alive all through and every writer of consequence joined in the discussion in one way or another.

Apart from Ahmed Midhat, the prolific popular writer and journalist who not only advocated the need for a simpler Turkish and defended his view against extreme traditionalists,¹² but actually used it in his many works and articles, three names stand out from among those who elaborated on the argument of linguistic reform: Ali Suavi, Ahmed Vefik and Şemseddin Sami.

Particularly Şemseddin Sami, the distinguished lexicographer, encyclopaedist, journalist, translator who also wrote plays and novels, is the only writer who, as early as in 1880's understood the true nature of the problem and put forward ideas and suggestions which were by far more scholarly and more advanced than even those of the language reformers of the following generation.¹³ He explained in various articles and in the, now famous, introduction of his Turkish dictionary, that the word *Türkçe* (Turkish) which was used generally to mean "the coarse speech of illiterate Anatolian peasants", was actually the language spoken by a whole nation stretching from the Adriatic to the frontiers of China, that Ottoman was simply the name of a dynasty like the Habsbourgs and could not be

¹¹ *Idem*, "Ottoman and Turkish", *Essays on Islamic civilisation presented to Niyazi Berkes*, edit. Donald P. Little, Leiden 1976, pp. 118-139.

¹² Ahmet Midhat, "Osmanlıca'nın ıslahı," *Dağarcık*, No.1 (1871).

¹³ Şemseddin Sami, "Lisan-ı Türki 'Osmani'", *Hafta*, No. 12 (1881), p. 177 ff.

applied to a language, that it was impossible to call a national language an amalgam composed of three languages but spoken by no one, that it has been a grave error for Western Turks not to have followed the development of Eastern Turkish written language, and most important of all, that if a linguistic reform was to be considered, it was necessary to try to revive archaic Turkish words used in early literary works and borrow materials from other Turkish words used in early literary works and borrow materials from other Turkish dialects and Anatolian *patois* rather than from the Arabic and Persian which belonged to very different linguistic patterns.¹⁴

These ideas, incredibly advanced for the time, were bound to be isolated and remain ignored until after the revolution of 1908 which upset so many established values.

Mehmed Emin's sensational poems in the late 1890's in colloquial Turkish and in the popular syllabic metre, did not have any following either, for a different reason: their author had good intentions, but, unfortunately was a mediocre poet, and failed to understand the spirit of genuine folk poetry which he tried to adopt. In this respect, Rıza Tevfik's experiments were more successful and inspired young poets of the pre-Republican generations.¹⁵

In spite of the existence of conflicting currents on the problem of language and partial failures of the partisans of reform, the Reform ideas were obviously nearing a climax.

In the face of strong pressures of both the Arabic and Persian languages, the Turkish protest had started very early. From the 14th century mystic poet Aşık Paşa, through all the classical era up to Tanzimat and to the second Constitution of 1908 a host of writers and poets had continued to complain bitterly about the neglect of the Turkish element in Ottoman works and urged the use of a more understandable Turkish.¹⁶

But the first organized attempt at a linguistic reform with well defined principles, was inaugurated, in 1911, by the young short story writer

¹⁴ *Idem*, "İfade-i Meram" (Preface) To *Kamus-ı Türki*, 1317-1319H./1899-1901.

¹⁵ For Mehmed Emin see: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden, s.v., (to be published in 1987) and for Rıza Tevfik see: "Bölükbaşı", *op.cit.*, suppl., s.v.

¹⁶ Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad (Fuad Köprülü), *Milli Edebiyat Cereyanının İlk Mübeşşirleri ve Divan-ı Türki-ı Basit*, İstanbul 1928, *passim*.

Ömer Seyfeddin and his friend Ali Canib in the Salonika literary review *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens).

The extreme partisans of linguistic snobbism in Istanbul, advocates of a precious style in literature such as Cenab Şehabeddin, Halid Ziya, Süleyman Nazif, Ali Ekrem and others immediately attacked and tried to kill the movement by ridicule.¹⁷

They might have easily succeeded if Ziya Gökalp, the emerging leader of cultural nationalism, had not soon joined the movement lending it his prestige and his persuasive ability.

Within ten years this movement became very popular among young writers and poets so much so that even some of the celebrated opponents of the reform began to touch up and republish their works in this reformed Turkish which was called *Yeni Lisan* (New Language).

Here are the principles of the reformers as formulated by Ziya Gökalp:

- 1) Arabic and Persians grammatical rules in Ottoman Turkish should be suppressed,
- 2) Arabic and Persian words for which there are current Turkish synonyms should not be used,
- 3) Arabic and Persian loan words which are used in popular speech should be spelt and pronounced according to Turkish phonetics,
- 4) Archaic Turkish words should not be revived,
- 5) No words or suffixes should be borrowed from other Turkish dialects,
- 6) Scientific terms and expressions for which there are no Turkish equivalents should be coined from the Arabic (Gökalp himself coined several sociological terms based on Arabic which remained in use for nearly two decades).

It is clear that Gökalp's idea of language reform was far from being radical. It was limited in scope and fell behind the comprehensive and far reaching reform suggested by Şemseddin Sami who had a much sounder and wider linguistic background than Gökalp.

¹⁷ For Ömer Seyfeddin and "Yeni Lisan" Movement see: Tahir Alangu, *Ömer Seyfeddin, Ülkücü bir Yazarın Romanı*, Istanbul 1968.

But in spite of its shortcomings, it must be admitted, that Gökalp's contribution to language reform was considerable. The movement started by Ömer Seyfeddin was followed up relentlessly by Gökalp who, assisted by his enthusiastic colleagues in the University, strongly influenced a generation of young poets and writers whose approach to language and literature became much more indigenous than that of their predecessors.¹⁸

So that, when Gökalp died in 1924 much of the dead word had been eliminated from the *literary* language and a host of poets, short story writers and novelists began to use a language not very different from colloquial Turkish, a fact which misleads now many critics of the language reform movement of the Republican era. According to these, the goal had been achieved before the Republic, making a further intervention unnecessary and that the language should have been left to its "normal evolution".

Now, an extensive research which I carried out, in recent years, on the language of (a) non literary works, (b) daily newspapers, (c) periodicals, (d) official correspondence, (e) school text books of science and humanities, of the period immediately preceding the Alphabet Reform (a forerunner of the systematic language Reform movement), i.e. the years between 1924 and 1928, showed beyond any doubt, that the "New language" movement started in 1911 did not have any tangible effect on written Turkish outside a *section* of strictly literary works. I said only a section, because, even in literature, some writers continued to ignore Gökalp's instructions.

A typical example is Yakub Kadri's well known novel *Hüküm Gecesi*, published as late as 1927. There we come across hundreds of Arabic and Persian words and expressions which would be unthinkable to use now in any non-humorous writing, such as: *enaniyet*, *irtiaş*, *elyak*, *nâmer'i*, *istirkab*, *lâyelenahi*, *ıştial*, *tesemmüm*, *kemal-i mutavaat*, *meham-ı umur*, *haysiyet-şiken*, *menfaat-naendiş*, etc.

Needless to say that in the new edition of the novel all these and similar words have been replaced by their Turkish equivalents.

Ziya Gökalp's key principles of *Yaşayan Türkçe* (living Turkish) and *Türkçeleşmiş Türkçedir* (what has become Turkish is Turkish) did not help

¹⁸ For a survey of Ziya Gökalp's ideas on language see: Uriel Heyd, "Foundations of Turkish Nationalism", *The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, London 1951, p. 115 ff.

much to turkify school books, newspaper, or the official language. Because it was impossible to draw the line of the so called "living Turkish" which changed according to the educational and cultural background of the speaker.

Thousands of words such as *tensikat*, *hafriyat*, *teslimat*, *me'kûlat*, *mahrakat*, *melbusat*, *matbuat*, *müraselat*, or *müteammid*, *müteannid*, *mütebâid*, *mütebariz*, *mütebellir*, *mütecasir*, *mütecelli*, *mütecessim*, *mütecennin*, *mütedair*, *mütedavil*, *mütehhlil*, *müteenni* or expressions such as *zaviye-i kaime*, *deveran-ı dem*, *cümle-i asabiye*, *amûd-ı fikari*, *miyah-ı cariyeye*, *silsile-i cibal*, *Bahr-i Muhit-i Atlasi*, *Bahr-ı Muhit-i Müncemid-i Şimali*, *Cezayir-i Bahr-i Sefid*, *Cezayir-i Isnâ Aşer*, *Düvel-i Muazzama*, *Hilal-i Ahmer*, *Himaye-i Eftal*, *Kurun-ı Ulâ*, *tedrisat-ı taliye*, *mesarifat-ı gayri melhuze*, etc., etc. which were part of the "living Turkish" in the late 1920's (my generation remembers them well from their school days), consequently part and parcel of standard written Turkish are long dead and buried for younger generations.

No individual writer or committee could have achieved a systematic turkification of the terminology of all the fields of knowledge, of the official style of government departments, the language of daily papers and particularly of school text books.

This is what was achieved in one decade, after the foundation of the Turkish Linguistic Society in 1932, by Atatürk.¹⁹

Here are the main principles of the Republican phase of the language reform under the personal guidance of Atatürk:

1) All the problems of the Turkish language should be taken into consideration as a whole,

2) Old Turkish (archaic) words used in early Ottoman Turkish works and later replaced by Arabic and Persian loan words should be systematically collected and published,

3) Turkish words used locally by the people all over Turkey which are not known in standard written Turkish should also be collected and published,

¹⁹ For an extensive discussion of views opposed to language Reform see: Fahir İz, "Cumhuriyet Devrinde Türk Yazı Dilinin Gelişmesi", *Maat Gökberk Armağanı*, Ankara 1983, pp. 173-189.

4) New words should be created from Turkish roots, using Turkish suffixes, for concepts for which there are no equivalents in old or modern Turkish,

5) Scientific terminology should be based on Turkish. If necessary new words should be created from Turkish roots,

6) The result of this research should be put at the disposal of writers, authors, teachers and the general public.

These aims have been on the whole attained.

The balance of the achievements of the Republican phase of the language reform movement during its 50 years of existence, its contributions and its over-criticized shortcomings and errors is definitely in favour of the development of standard Written Turkish²⁰.

Already by the end of the 1940's, only a decade after the death of the Great Reformer, a whole generation of young writers, had made the goals of the Reform their own and had taken over the movement almost completely.

The majority of neologisms are being put forward now by these writers and their younger successors and the Linguistic Society's contribution does not go beyond advice and recommendation, except in the case of scientific and technical terms.

Turkish language Reform which was dormant in the 1920's was given a great impetus by the organizing hands of Atatürk who moulded it into a systematic movement encompassing all aspects of Turkish literary and cultural life.

²⁰ For a general survey of various phases of the Turkish language reform movement, see: Ağah Sırrı Levend, *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*, 3rd edition, Ankara 1972, and Uriel Heyd, *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*, Jerusalem 1954.