

**Language, Identity and Politics in Turkey: Nationalist Discourse on Creating a
Common Turkic Language**

Yilmaz Bingol*

This paper aims to analyze ever growing trend among Turkish nationalist toward creation of a common literary language for all Turkic peoples. The issue is not indeed new. It may trace back to the nineteenth century, but got a great acceleration during the establishment of Turkish Republic in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Although the modernization movement led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his comrades had a different agenda excluding and/or ignoring Turkic elements of Central Asia, this policy faced severe resistance from traditionalists, that is, from both Turkist-nationalists and Islamists since the very beginning of the modernist reform movement.

The dispute between modernists and traditionalists which may be classified as Islamists and Turkists, arose from their different perceptions of national identity, but continued in terms of their different ideological, methodological and linguistic approaches as well. This paper aims to mainly focus on the nationalists' political behaviors regarding creation of a common Turkic language. Nevertheless, it is essential, in this juncture, to reflect briefly the general tendencies of all groups regarding the language policy that should have been implemented in Turkey.

For each of these groups the importance of any measure relating to language policy has been the extent to which it might promote its own particular identity. Kemalists sought a Western identity for the new Turkish Republic and thus any Kemalist modernist language policy measures should be considered in light of their identity-oriented preferences. They favored two Western concepts, secularization and nationalization, as important norms of the new Turkish identity. They were also nationalist in

the sense that they favored creation of a Western-type nation-state based on the Turkish elements of Anatolia within the national borders of Turkey. Thus, they favored the adoption of Western numerals and of the Latin alphabet, while at the same time they attempted to cleanse Turkish of loanwords borrowed from Arabic and Persian, the languages of Islamic religion and culture.

Traditionalists, both Turkists and Islamists, have argued that modernist language measures would damage Turkic and Islamic layers of national identity. Islamists, for their part, claimed that this language policy would sever links with the rich Turkish-Islamic heritage and cut off communication with the Islamic world that Turks had led for several centuries. Islamists, taking Islam as their point of reference, resisted the use of the Latin alphabet and favored the maintenance of the Arabic alphabet, the script of the Holy Qurʾān. Islamists have also favored continued use of Arabic and Persian words which had long been current in Turkish and which are also used by their Muslim brothers in other parts of the Islamic world.

Turkist-nationalists, on the other hand, claimed that the modernist language policy would create a gap between generations as well as among Turkic peoples. Therefore, they have attempted to promote an irredentist identity. Their attitudes on the alphabet have been shaped with a view toward external Turks (*d. Türkler*, i.e., Turkic-speaking peoples living in the former Soviet Union, Northern Middle East and the Balkans). Although in the early 1920s they had favored the Arabic alphabet and resisted the adoption of the Latin alphabet, they gave up this resistance in the late 1920s when the Soviet government decided to adopt modified Latin alphabets for the Soviet Turkic languages. The Turkists favored the promotion of Turkic words, while at the same time they opposed the expelling of Arabic and Persian loanwords current in common usage. For them the important point was whether or not these words had been used by the other Turkic peoples living outside Turkey.

The nationalist group of the traditionalists finally reached their goal when in 1983 the Turkish Language Society was nationalized and its control transferred from modernists to Turkist-nationalists. This shift also brought about an alteration in language policy. The attempt at purification was completely abandoned, and traditionalists targeted words of European (i.e., English and French) origin in place of Arabic and Persian loanwords to be replaced by words of Turkish origin. Under the leadership of the newly formed Society, a trend was initiated toward the use of words from the old Turko-Islamic tradition as well as from the contemporary Turkic languages.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the independence of the Turkic Republics in 1991 created an initial euphoria among nationalist Turkish intellectuals. In an attempt to make all Turkic people closer to one another by emphasizing historical and cultural closeness of Turkic peoples; rehabilitating some common Turkic figures; and incorporating other cultural and linguistic Turkic elements from Central Asia, traditionalists expanded the Kemalist rational approach of creating an Anatolia-based Turkish identity in favor and expense of a greater Turkic identity.

The creation of a common Turkic language has always been at the top of nationalist agenda. The idea of creating a common language from among the Turkic languages, based mostly on Turkish of Turkey, has been given serious consideration by the Turkist-nationalists especially after the takeover of the TDK to nationalists. Many prominent Turkologists and influential officials of the TDK after 1983, such as Zeynep Korkmaz and Ahmet Bican Ercilasun proposed a long-term strategy to plan the adaptation of a common literary language for the entire Turkic world.

Before examining the current aspiration of nationalist on creating a common Turkic language, it is crucial to explore the thoughts of Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) on linguistic issues, as Turko-Islamic circles have long respected Gökalp as the true father of Turkism and Turkish nationalism, and they were greatly influenced by Gökalp's ideas. In applying his nationalist thinking to his understanding of linguistic matters, Gökalp, a sociologist, noted that the most ill-adapted foreign elements in Turkish were those that required knowledge of Arabic and Persian to be used correctly. He suggested that these Perso-Arabic words could be expelled from the language provided that there were substitutes of Turkish origin. Nevertheless, Gökalp strongly favored keeping such words that had been commonly used in popular language, no matter what their origin might be. Gökalp considered all the words that were known and used by the public to be Turkish or at least Turkified words. To Gökalp, for example, such words as *hefte* (week), *nerduban* (stairs), and *çarçube* (frame) might be of foreign origin, but these words had been absorbed by Turkish phonetic rules and adopted into Turkish as *hafta*, *merdiven*, and *çerçeve*, respectively, and thus such words should be regarded as Turkish, or Turkified words.¹

In order for a word to be national it does not have to necessarily be of Turkish origin, wrote Gökalp, adding, "to Turkists, all the words that Turkish people know and internalize are national."² As for his views on scientific terminology, Gökalp proposed that Turkish words be used in principle, while Arabic and Persian terms might be kept but without using their grammatical rules --i.e., the Arabic and Persian *izafe*. Some technical and

professional words might also be taken from European languages. He made it clear, however, that if there is no Turkish substitute, it is much better and healthier to take words from Arabic and Persian than from French or Russian.³ This, in turn, demonstrates that traditionalists favored creation of a national identity that would be inclined toward Eastern elements rather than Western ones.

Gökalp also expressed his aspiration for the creation of a unified, common literary and scientific language for all Turkic peoples, if not all Islamic peoples. In his infamous *Türkle mek slamlak Muas,rlak mak*, Gökalp pointed out that it is of course extremely important to implement reforms jointly among all Turkic peoples, if not among all Muslims. In other words, it is essential for all Turkic peoples to have a common literary and scientific language.⁴

In line with Ziya Gökalp's aim of creating a common language among all Turkic peoples, which in turn would help create a greater Turkic identity, Turko-Islamic circles contended that modernists' linguistic policies blatantly ignored Turkic elements outside Turkey. This line of reasoning was first and most effectively brought forward by the Research Institute for the Turkish Culture (*Türk Kültürünü Ara t,rma Enstitüsü* abbreviated hereafter as TKAE). The Institute was established in 1962 in order to promote Turkish and other Turkic cultures and included prominent traditionalist figures. In the first edition of the TKAE's official publication, *Türk Kültürü* (Turkish Culture), the Institute announced, "We aim to pay special attention to the partitioning of Turkish dialects [i.e., Turkic languages], which took place in the last couple decades, and we will also concentrate on such topics as comparative studies on the dialects, grammar and lexicography [among Turkic languages]." They further stated that in their research on Turkish folklore, not only would they include Anatolia, but they would also pay special attention to the other regions of the Turkic world.⁵

The TKAE's perspective with regard to the language reform movement was, not surprisingly, different from that implemented by the TDK. In the first edition of the *Türk Kültürü*, the Institute continued that they did not see the question of language reform as a narrow matter only within the borders of Turkey; rather they considered this phenomenon within "the cultural unity of Turkish [i.e., Turkic] world that would embrace all the written languages and literatures of the Turkish dialects [i.e., Turkic languages]." They explicitly pointed out that they were not against the language reform, stating, "our language should be simplified and Turkified." "However," they added, "this matter [i.e., language reform] is not only about the Turkish of Turkey, but it also concerns the other dialects [i.e., Turkic languages] at the same time and to the same degree. Thus the language reform should be

regarded as a whole and should be implemented as a common endeavor for all the other dialects. Finding new words in place of such words as *kitap* and *kalem*, which have also been used in the other Turkish dialects, could be meaningful only if these new words are adopted by the other Turkic people as well.⁶

The same line of thought was repeatedly put forward by some other individual Turkists. In "The Words Uniting Turkism" (*Türklü ü Birle tiren Kelimeler*), an article published in the Turkish daily *Tercüman* in the late 1970s, Ahmet Bican Ercilasun, who would later become the president of the TDK in 1992, disparaged the purifiers for damaging "the linguistic unity in the Turkic world." Providing a list of words which have been used commonly among Turkic peoples and which were in the process of expulsion from the language, Ercilasun argued "every word that was expelled from the language by the purifiers would cut a bond securing Turkic unity."⁷

Among the words that Ercilasun notes were such very important words as *edebiyat* "literature," *eser* "work," *tenkid* "criticism," *ahsi* "personal," *mühim* "important," *usul* "method," *nesil* "generation," *mesele* "problem," *fikir* "thought," *cihan* "world," *hayat* "life," and *tecrübe* "experience." In place of these words, the TDK had already suggested the neologisms *yaz,n*, *yap,t*, *ele tiri*, *ki isel*, *önemli*, *yöntem*, *ku ak*, *sorun*, *dü ün*, *acun*, *ya am*, and *deney(im)*, respectively. Many such neologisms were adopted and still in use in modern Turkish vernacular either in place of, or in addition to, their Ottomanisms.⁸ According to Ercilasun, these words unite the Turkic world. Providing some passages from the Azeri, Turkmen, Uzbek, Kyrgyz, and Kazak literary works containing these words, Ercilasun argued, "these words that have been in the language for centuries are being used not only by the Turks of Turkey, but these words are also being used and understood by millions of Turkish [i.e., Turkic] people living in Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, China, and Russia."⁹

For many traditionalists, the greatest damage that modernists caused to the national language was their deliberate creation of a gap between generations living in Turkey as well as a gap among Turkic peoples. A leading voice among those who thought that the purist movement would break ties between generations was again Ahmet Bican Ercilasun. Claiming that the Turkish Language Society had created a new language that was remote from the everyday speech of the common people, Ercilasun has argued, "most of the words that had been made up by the purists were completely new words being heard by the public for the first time. The understanding and adaptation of these words by the public would only be possible by memorizing them just as learning a new word from any other foreign language."¹⁰

Claiming that these nonsensical linguistic policies of the TDK had led to a communicative gap between generations, Ercilasun wrote that breaking the ties between generations would not only pave way to the destruction of our language, but it would also mean the demolition and disappearance of our culture forever.¹¹

Language as a tool of communication, Ercilasun affirmed, has two dimensions: time (*zaman*) and place (*mekân*). A language should be able to supply communication between a nation's people living in different places (the place dimension of the language), as well as in different times (the time dimension of the language). Asserting that the TDK in collaboration with authorities had created a communicative gap in terms of both of these dimensions, Ercilasun demonstrated how these had happened under the direction of purists, in his term, with the policies of *uydurmacılar* (concocters, which also has a connotation in Turkish of *öliarsö*). With regard to the time dimension of the language, Ercilasun stressed that today's generation could no longer understand previous generations, indicating sadly that while English intellectuals and public completely understand Shakespeare's works which were written 400 years ago, Turkish ones do not even understand at least half of Atatürk's *Gençli e Hitabe* (Speech to the Youth) which was written just 37 years ago.¹²

With regard to the place dimension of the language, Ercilasun asserted that the purist movement broke the ties of communication between individuals of the Turkish nation living at the same time, but living in the same place or possibly different places. In this regard, Ercilasun believed that the newly created language caused a gap (a) among present speakers of Turkish living in Turkey and (b) between the Turks of Turkey (*Türkiye Türkleri*) and the external Turks (*d, Türkler*), referring to the Turkic peoples living in the former Soviet Union, Middle East and the Balkans.

In order to explain the gap among speakers in Turkey, Ercilasun drew attention to the duality of the language created by the purist policies, reasoning that we may very well categorize the manuscripts published in Turkey into two groups: those written in Turkish, and those written in a made-up language. In such a situation, a duality and disconnection appeared among the individuals of the Turkish nation.¹³ Taking some passages from texts collected from the Anatolian dialects as evidence, Ercilasun further stated, "In the language spoken in Anatolia, I have never met with such concocted words as *ulus* [nation], *ba ,ms,z* [independent], *ya am* [life], *örne in* [for example], *öykü* [story], *kent* [city], *yan,t* [answer], *gereksinim* [need], *sözcük* [word], *s,nav* [examination], *ko ul* [condition], and *neden* [reason], but these passages are full of such words that we all know, as *umumiyetle* [often], *te kilat* [institution], *millet* [nation], *müstakil* [independent], *hayat* [life], *mesela* [for example], *hikâye*

[story], *ehir* [city], *cevap* [answer], *ançane* [tradition], *ihtiyaç* [need], *imtihan* [examination], and so on.¹⁴

As a part of his views on the linguistic gap between *öTurksö* inside and outside Turkey, Ercilasun sadly explained how the purist policy had created a communicative gap between *Türkiye Türkleri* and *d, Türkler*: *öIn recent years, some of our politicians who traveled in the Turkish lands in the Soviet Union have written in their memoirs that the Turks living over there [i.e., Turkic peoples] have repeatedly complained about the made-up words being used on Turkish radio and television.ö*¹⁵ In order to demonstrate how the purist policies had damaged the relationship between Turkey and Turkic people, Ercilasun again cited some passages written by Turkic intellectuals living in various parts of the Turkic world. Stating that none of these people use such Turkish neologisms as *yaz,n öliterature,ö toplum ösociety,ö önem öimportance,ö kuram ötheory,ö araç ötool,ö yap,t öwork,ö kimlik öidentity,ö* and so on, Ercilasun stated with anger, *öAn Uzbek Turk from Tashkent does say edebiyat [literature], nazariye [theory], cemiyet [society], ehemmiyet [importance], vas,ta [tool], eser [work], and so oní or a professor of literature from Baku says edebiyat [literature], mühim [important], eser [work], hususen [particularly], mukaddes [holy], umumi [general], and so oní or a linguistic professor from Tehran says hüviyet [identity], tabii [natural], millet [nation], hususiyet [peculiarity], ançanevi [traditional], and so on.ö*¹⁶

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the independence of the Turkic Republics of Central Asia in 1991 created an initial euphoria among nationalist Turkish intellectuals. Referring to these events, A. B. Ercilasun wrote in 1993, *öTurkism is now at a very important turning point. There is now a great society in the world, which speaks one language, and whose members can support each other. If they are able to become a united whole (bütünle ebilirlerse), these republics and societies carrying the name Türk, would not break, but would constitute a great power.ö*¹⁷ Ercilasun went on, *öThe Turkish language is the most important tool linking these people(s). Provided that they love, unify, enlarge and enrich this language, their closeness would be consolidated, and their power would be expanded.ö*¹⁸

At the beginning of the 1990s, Ercilasun's point of view was shared to a certain extent by the Turkish government and the Language Society, which he then headed, and both began to pay special attention to the region. Because the TDK had become an official institution of the state, its orientation and policies in the post-1983 era may be regarded as reflecting the official stance of the Turkish state. Ankara began to promote the Turkish of Turkey as a kind of additional language, a *kultursprache* for the Central Asian Turkic peoples. Turkist-nationalist linguists in particular gathered around the TDK and put forward for public

discussion the possibility and advisability of creating a new language with elements common to Turkish and the main Turkic languages.¹⁹

To this end, Turkist-nationalist individuals and groups have used books, articles and conferences, in an effort to reestablish Ismail Gaspiransky (*Gasp,ral*, in Turkish) as a major figure. *Gasp,ral*, is a nineteenth century Crimean Tatar leader, publisher and educator, whose slogan, "unity in language, thought, and mission" (*dilde, fikirde, i te birlik*) emphasized the establishment of a common literary language close to the Istanbul vernacular of Turkish to serve the entire Turkic world. Mehmet Saray's *Türk Dünyasında Eğitim Reformu ve Gasp,ral, Ismail Bey* (Education Reform in Turkic World and *Gasp,ral, Ismail Bey*), and Nadir Devlet's *İsmail Bey (Gasp,ral)*, both published by Turkish Ministry of National Education, in 1987 and 1988, respectively, are two examples. Hasan Eren's articles "Dilde Birlik" (Unity in Language), and "Dilde Birlik Yazıda Birlik" (Unity in Language and Writing); and the expanded section on *Gasp,ral*, and other nationalist Turkic figures in Ahmet Bican Erçilasun's *Türk Dünyası, Üzerine Makaleler- incelemeler*, should be regarded as attempts to reestablish *Gasp,ral*, as a figure of major importance of the common Turkic world.²⁰

In addition to these publications, Turkist-nationalists organized a series of conferences in late 2001 to honor the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Ismail Bey *Gasp,ral*, (1851-1914). A Symposium on a Century of *Gasp,ral*'s Ideals (*Yüz Yılda Gasp,ral'ın İdealleri Sempozyumu*) was held on October 20, 2001 and sponsored by the nationalist association *Türk Ocakları*. On October 26-27, 2001 the Cultural Association of Crimean Turks in Turkey and the Turkish International Cooperation Agency (TICA), a section of the Turkish Ministry of State in charge of the Turkey's relationships with the Central Asian Turkic Republics, co-sponsored an International Symposium on Ismail Bey *Gasp,ral*, (*Milletlerarası İsmail Bey Gasp,ral Sempozyumu*). On November 3, 2001 the Cultural Association of Crimean Turks in Turkey, and the Emel Kırım Endowment held the *İsmail Bey Gasp,ral Konferansı*. In addition to these events the journal *Türk Edebiyatı*, devoted its October 2001 issue to Ismail Bey *Gasp,ral*.²¹

The idea of creating a common language from among the Turkic languages, based mostly on Turkish of Turkey, has been given serious consideration by the Turkist-nationalists. Zeynep Korkmaz, a prominent Turkologist and influential official of the TDK after 1983, proposed a long-term strategy to plan the adaptation of a common literary language for the entire Turkic world. According to her plan:

1. A common Turkic alphabet based on Latin script should be validated for all Central Asian Turkic republics and peoples;
2. All these republics and peoples should have their consciousness of a common literary language raised;
3. For creation of such a common literary language, initially a language with a literary tradition [Turkish?] should be taken as a communicative language, and then this literary language gradually be enriched by taking words and other linguistic materials from other Turkic dialects;
4. For easy communication, practical and scientific grammar books and dictionaries should be prepared;
5. For such words as are used in the Turkish of Turkey but not in the other dialects, or vice versa, glossaries should be prepared;
6. Phonetic differences between the Turkish of Turkey and other dialects should be standardized on the basis of the newly created common literary language;
7. In order to ascertain the semantic differences that appear in these dialects, glossaries of the synonyms and antonyms should be prepared;
8. In order to obtain a uniform scientific and technical terminology, common equivalents of European terms in Turkish and Russian terms in other Turkic languages should be sought out and advantage taken of those terms that are common in several dialects;
9. For each Turkic dialect, literary anthologies should be prepared and significant literary texts should be placed in each other's schoolbooks.²²

Many of the principles marked out by Korkmaz, Ercilasun and other Turkist-nationalists on different occasions have already been adopted. Turkey offered to help with the transition from the Cyrillic to the Latin Alphabet by providing Azerbaijan and the Central Asian Turkic Republics, textbooks, typewriters and printing machines together with the training necessary for using them. Some representatives from all five of the republics reacted favorably.²³ A round-table conference, held in Istanbul in November 1991, adopted a common alphabet of 34 letters, and at meetings in Istanbul in March 1992 and in Ankara in March 1993, representatives of the five republics decided in principle to adopt the Latin alphabet gradually.²⁴

To facilitate communication, several Turkish newspapers --e.g., the Turkish Islamist *Zaman*, the nationalist *Türkiye*, and liberal *Milliyet*-- opened offices in the new republics. Turkey's state television service (TRT) began broadcasts to more than fifty million people in

all five Turkic republics and Tajikistan. Turkish-language television broadcasts from Ankara include newscasts four times a day, as well as documentaries, general information, music, and children's programs. All these were in Turkish and about a third are in an easily understood simplified language. Subtitles were meant to encourage and facilitate the use of the Latin alphabet in local languages as well.²⁵

At a scholarly level, in order to facilitate communications, a new dictionary of the main Turkic languages was prepared by a commission headed by TDK President Ahmet Bican Ercilasun and a group of scholars from Turkey and the other Turkic republics. *Kar ,la t,rmal, Türk Lehçeleri Sözlü ü* (Comparative Dictionary of Turkic Dialects), published by the Turkish Ministry of Culture, was printed in Latin characters in the alphabetical order of the Turkish of Turkey and lists Turkish and its equivalents in Azeri, Bashkurt, Kazak, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Tatar, Turkmen, Uyghur, and Russian. Another book by Ercilasun, *Örneklerle Bugünkü Türk Alfabeleri* (Today's Turkic Alphabets with Examples), deals with the various alphabets of Turkish and the other Turkic languages, Latin, Arabic, and Cyrillic.²⁶ In addition the Language Society published in 1998 an Uzbek-Turkish and Turkish-Uzbek Dictionary, titled *Özbek Türkçesi ó Türkiye Türkçesi ve Türkiye Türkçesi - Özbek Türkçesi Kar ,l,klar Klavuzu* (A Glossary of Equivalents for Uzbek Turkish-Turkey Turkish and Turkey Turkish-Uzbek Turkish).²⁷

Seeking to promote the languages and literature of the Turkic peoples and bring them closer together, in spring 1996 the Society began publishing a biannual Journal of Language and Literature of Turk[ic] World (*Türk Dünyas, Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*). In this journal, Turkish as well as other Turkic scholars published many articles on Turkic languages and literatures in mostly Turkish but also in other Turkic languages. Another TDK project aimed at promoting Turkic epics in Turkey. The 'Project on the Collection of Epics of the Turkic World, Their Conversions into the Turkish of Turkey, and Their Publications' (*Türk Dünyas, Destanlar,n,n Tespiti, Türkiye Türkçesine Aktar,lmas, ve Yay,mlanmas, Projesi*) started in 1995, led by Professor Fikret Türkmen and enlisted Ercilasun and other prominent TDK figures. As of this writing, this project is still incomplete.²⁸ In the same vein was the Society's 'Project on the Comparative Grammar and Dictionary of the Turkic Dialects and Sub-dialects- Field Study' (*Kar ,la t,rmal, Türk Lehçe ve iveleri Sözlü ü ve Grameri Saha Ara t,rmas,*). About fifty academicians from Turkey and other Turkic Republics have been working on this project, which started in 1994, and is also yet to be completed.²⁹

Traditionalists' promotion in Turkey of elements taken from Turkic languages is also evident in the Society's YKKB project. Suggesting Turkish equivalents for foreign words

used in Turkish, the Society looked to other Turkic languages as well. Noting that some Turkic languages had adopted Turkish words to replace Russian ones such as Turkish *uçak* for Russian *samolyet*, and that Azeris had already adopted Turkish *çizgi film* cartoon, Ercilasun asked, "Why shouldn't we take advantage of the rich treasure that is just next door to us? Moreover, aren't the words of our brothers considered to be ours, too?"³⁰ Thus the Society suggested adoption of such words from Turkic languages as *erk* condition, *uran* slogan, *çalar* nuance, *dalan* lobby, *ülü* quota and *orun* class (as in *i lik orunu* business class) to replace those words of European origin which had been used in Turkish, respectively, *kondisyon*, *slogan*, *nüans*, *lobi*, *kota*, and *class*. The common Turkic words *kurultay* and *aksakal*, which the Society suggested to replace *kongre* congress, and *duayen* döyөн, respectively, can also be considered in this category. Although the word *kurultay* has to some extent been current in literary works as well as public discourse, the word has not been used so commonly. Instead, the word *kongre* has been preferred in its place. For example, two very important historical events of 1919 related to Atatürk have often been referred to as *Erzurum Kongresi* and *Sivas Kongresi*, but not *Kurultay*.³¹ The word *aksakal*, on the other hand, has also been current in Turkish, but particularly in Anatolian dialects rather than in the literary language, and it had a connotation of old man or tribal leader rather than that of döyөн.

To summarize, especially the post-1983 era witnessed a clear departure from the modernist language policy. After a change in the status of the Language Society in 1983, traditionalists controlled the TDK, and a traditionalist orientation was put into practice. First, Kemalists were almost entirely excluded from positions in the TDK and were replaced by traditionalists. As a result, the attempt at purification was abandoned, and loanwords of European origin replaced Arabic and Persian words as candidates for replacement by Turkish words, and thus use of Arabic and Persian loanwords was promoted. Under the leadership of the newly formed Society, a trend was initiated toward the use of words from the old Turko-Islamic tradition as well as from contemporary Turkic languages. Moreover, unlike the modernist systematic creation of an isolationist identity based on Anatolian Turkish elements, traditionalists initiated a trend aimed at bringing all Turkic people closer to one another and thus, establishing a broader Turkic identity by incorporating Central Asian Turkic elements. As the TDK had become an official institution of the state, its orientation and policies in the post-1983 era, especially the policy of creating a common Turkic language advocated by TDK's President of the time Ercilasun, and Zeynep Korkmaz, may well be regarded as reflecting

NOTES

* Associate Professor of Social and Political Sciences, Kocaeli University, TURKEY

¹ Gökalp, Ziya (1966) *Türkçülü ün Esaslar*, (6th ed.), Istanbul: Varlık Yayinevi.

² Quoted in Timurtaş, Faruk K. (1965), *Dil Davası, ve Ziya Gökalp*, Istanbul: Fakülteler Matbaası, p. 32.

³ Ibid., p.30.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü (1962), *Ön Amacı ve Yolumuz, Türk Kültürü*, November, vol.1, no. 1, p. 7.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ercilasun, Ahmet B. (1993), *Dilde Birlik* (2nd ed.), Ankara: Ecdâd, p. 115.

⁸ I have employed the word *öTtomanizm* in the meaning of old words which had been used in Ottoman Turkish, and for which the Turkish Language Society suggested neologisms.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ercilasun (1993), p. 20.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 21.

¹² Ibid., p. 23.

¹³ Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

¹⁵ Ibid., p.29.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp 32-33.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 16.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Landau, Jacob M. (1995), *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (2nd revised and updated ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p. 212.

²⁰ Devlet, Nadir (1988), *İsmail Bey (Gaspıralı)*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, ; Ercilasun, Ahmet B. (1993) *Türk Dünyası, Üzerine Makaleler-İncelemeler*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları; Eren, Hasan (1975), *Dilde Birlik*, ö in: *Birinci Türk Dili Bilimsel Kurultayı, Sunulan Bildiriler*, pp. 157-164; Eren, Hasan (1991), *Dilde Birlik Yazıda Birlik*, ö in: *Dil ve Alfabe Üzerine Görüşler*, Ankara: AKDİTYK, TDK yay., esp. pp. 209-310; Saray, Mehmet (1987), *Türk Dünyasında Etilim Reformu ve Gaspıralı İsmail Bey*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, ..

²¹ For more information see two web sites devoted to Gaspıralı, one in Turkish <http://www.ismailgaspirali.org/ana.htm>, and the other in English <http://www.iccrimea.org/gaspirali/>.

²² Paraphrased from Korkmaz, Zeynep 1993. "Dilimizin Dünkü ve Bu Günkü Sorunlar, ve Çözüm Yolları," *Türk Dili*, no. 500, August, pp. 155-180, reprinted in her Korkmaz, Zeynep 1995. *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar* (2 vol. collection of the author's works between 1945 and 1995), Ankara: AKDITYK, TDK yay. no. 629, pp. 886-887.

²³ Landau (1995), p. 212. Beyond some statements in rhetoric, however, I found no evidence reflecting movement to implement such a common alphabet among Turkic languages in practice.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 210

²⁶ See Ercilasun, Ahmet B., *et al.* (1991) *Karlı Lehçeleri Sözlüğü*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, ; and Ercilasun, Ahmet B. (1993), *Örneklerle Bugünkü Türk Alfabeleri*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, .

²⁷ Yaman, Ertuğrul and Mahmud, Mizamiddin (1998) *Özbek Türkçesi ile Türkiye Türkçesi ve Türkiye Türkçesi - Özbek Türkçesi Karşılaştırmalı Klavuzu*, Ankara: AKDITYK, TDK yay., no. 695.

²⁸ I would like to thank Belgin Aksu, a language specialist working at TDK, for providing me information regarding this project.

²⁹ Türk Dil Kurumu (1998), *Yabancı Kelimelere Karşılaştırmalı (kinci Kitap)*, AKDITYK, TDK yay. no. 708, p. ii.

³⁰ Türk Dil Kurumu (1995), *Yabancı Kelimelere Karşılaştırmalı* (introduction by Ercilasun), p. 10.

³¹ See, for example, the use of these words in Atatürk's own *Nutuk*, later re-published in a purified language and renamed with a Turkish neologism *Söylev* "The Speech," accessible via internet at <http://ataturk.turkiye.org/soylev/txwrdpdf/nutuk/txttr/ntkdizi.htm>.