



This book chapter was originally published by De Gruyter as:
Afacan, Ş. (2023). **Historical aspects of linguistic and emotional changes**. In G. L. Schiewer, J. Altarriba, & B. C. Ng (Eds.), *Language and emotion: An international handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 281-301).
De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110347524-013>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, nontransferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Provided by:

Max Planck Institute for Human Development
Library and Research Information
library@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

Şeyma Afacan

13 Historical aspects of linguistic and emotional changes

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Simple together: linguistic community formation in the late Ottoman Era
- 3 Contested emotions of the late Ottoman Empire
- 4 Contested languages and words of the early Republican era
- 5 Conclusion
- 6 References

Abstract: The history of emotions is a complicated field presenting a considerable diversity of views. The story of emotive words and the emotional impact of words in Turkish is further complicated by the lengthy and effective implementation of language planning in Turkey. Even though Turkish language reform is accepted as one of the longest, most famous, and successful implementations of language planning, we know little about how it affected cultural patterns and the emotional life of speakers. This chapter shows a degree of interplay between linguistic and emotional change in the case of Turkish, in particular Ottoman Turkish, at a discursive level. It argues that there was a degree of awareness about the role of language in the formation of a new emotional community in the late Ottoman Empire before the implementation of language planning by the Republican government, even though we don't know much about the implications of this awareness. This process began with the rising concerns about language simplification in the late Ottoman Empire. The formation of linguistic community fuelled a new discussion among the educated class about which emotions should be expressed, cultivated or suppressed. Emotional restraint surfaced as the most important social value of the new emotional community, participated in primarily by the literati and possibly by the readers. Speakers were motivated to unite emotionally in their concern for the common good of their society. In the early Republican period, the principle of monolingualism was implemented in order to speed up linguistic community formation.

Ultimately, the chapter leaves us with a picture of a long process of negotiation during which some languages, emotions and words were contested in a largely unsystematic way in order to achieve linguistic and ideological unity.

1 Introduction

“Emotion”, as a definition of how humans feel, is a modern category, not an old one. Conventional knowledge of emotions, far from being a static given, is a modern product with a fairly recent history of constant and continual transformation. Before the spread of bio-

Şeyma Afacan, Istanbul, Turkey

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110347524-013>

medicine in the 19th century, various conceptualizations of human nature, such as passions of the soul, affections, and humours in different constellations and forms, were already available (Dixon 2003: 5). Much of this transformation was fuelled by a gradual departure from theological and traditional understandings of human psychology, which were already vast to begin with. As Ute Frevert shows, the Enlightenment brought a “comprehensive understanding of emotions” to Europe to some degree, but this understanding was “deeply ambivalent and fluctuating, varying according to contemporary experience and perspective” (Frevert 2014: 4). Such richness should further call for sensitivity to particularities in the historiography of the non-Western world, which was shaped by a variety of cultural and political contexts before the supremacy of universalized bio-medical models.

The journey of *duygu*, ‘emotion’ in modern Turkish, is further convoluted. It represents not only the surfacing of emotion as a modern product, but also the process of language planning in the late Ottoman Empire. This is revealed by its appearance in 1876 in *Lehçe-i Osmanî* (‘The Ottoman dialect’). *Lehçe-i Osmanî* was one of the first lexicons in Ottoman Turkish with a separate section devoted to “Turkish” and a clear agenda for language simplification. In this lexicon *duygu* (‘emotion’) appeared as a derivative of the old Turkish verb *-duy/-tuy* (‘to sense and hear’) (Ahmet Vefik Paşa [1876] 2000: 126; Tietze 2016, 1: 667). Since then modern Turkish has been through a series of linguistic reforms to such an extent that the old language today is called by a different name: Ottoman Turkish.

Turkish language reform is accepted as one of the longest, most famous, and successful implementations of language planning (Doğançay-Aktuna 2004: 7). Language planning is defined as “a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy), change rules, beliefs, and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening) in the language use in one or more communities” (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997: 3). It often involves deliberate change undertaken by governments, yet may also be used by individuals and different non-governmental groups to shape the linguistic behaviour of a community for reasons such as community formation (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997: 5).

Intellectual interest in the debates about language policy dates back to the Tanzimat period. During the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876) the idea of language simplification gained currency in tandem with the growth of publishing activity (Doğançay-Aktuna 2004: 6). Soon after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, the most effective language planning efforts were made by the state within the framework of the Turkish language reform with two major ventures: the adoption of the Latin alphabet in 1928 and the purification (i.e., *Özleştirme*, ‘authentication/Turkification’) of the lexicon and grammar borrowed from other languages, especially Arabic and Persian, in the 1930s and 1940s (Doğançay-Aktuna 2004: 7).

For such a fundamental change in the daily use of language, our knowledge of how language planning affected cultural patterns and the emotional expression of speakers to this day is limited. Language not only forms and constrains our perception of interactions, but also shapes the ways in which we interact with the social world with the help of linguistic tools such as the lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax and discourse level structures (Wilce 2009: 40–45). It provides us with a toolbox to study the unsolidified field of human emotional experience and opens up a new venue for historicizing emotions. Unfortunately, literature on the history of emotions in the late Ottoman Empire is relatively scarce, even

though the subject has begun to attract some interest from researchers (Afacan 2016; Elias 2018; Esmer 2014; Suny 2004; Tuğ 2017). However, there is an extensive secondary literature on the process of language planning and national identity formation, which has already fleshed out how the Turkish language became a major factor in uniting the newly founded nation.

Linguistic reforms were part of an ideological project striving for the construction of a homogeneous Turkish national identity, resting on a single religious (*Sunni*), linguistic (Turkish), and cultural definition through systematic policies of assimilation and exclusion of others (Kadioğlu 2007: 285). In the two decades following the Second World War, social scientists presented Turkey as one of the most successful examples of “a universally defined modernisation process” (Bozdoğan and Kasaba 2000: 5). In doing so, they offered an essential perspective on the framework of national identity formation in Turkey with many “pitfalls and loose ends”, which historians and social scientists still rethink, reformulate and contest (Bozdoğan and Kasaba 2000: 5). Linguistic nationalism, i.e., the use of linguistics and literature for spreading nationalistic ideas, is an important part of this framework with serious literary repercussions concerning intelligibility, vocabulary, terminology, and language impoverishment.

There was a degree of awareness about the role of language in the formation of new communities in the late Ottoman Empire, even though knowledge about the implications of this awareness is limited. During this period, the way in which speakers experienced emotions and put them into words mattered significantly to the press and public intellectuals. In this new phase, speakers were encouraged to unite emotionally in their concern for the common good of their society. In detailing our understanding of how speakers were expected to unite emotionally, the chapter suggests using the framework of emotional communities developed by Barbara Rosenwein. Rosenwein (2006), in her seminal piece *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, explores emotions in the early Middle Ages, a period long before the formation of nation states. She shows the role of affective styles in forming “emotional communities”, which she defines as “groups in which people adhere to the same norms of emotional expression and value – or devalue – the same or related emotions” (Rosenwein 2006: 2). A number of emotional communities could co-exist within an allegedly unified national community; any emotional community is in need of shared emotional norms to come together.

In visiting various phases of the relationship between language and emotions in the process of formation of a national identity, the chapter consists of three main sections, each with a distinct focus. Section 2 focuses on the emerging concerns about language simplification and linguistic community formation among a group of intellectuals in the late Ottoman Empire. Section 3 pays attention to literary debates and the use of literature for promoting emotional restraint as the most praised social value of a new emotional community participated in primarily by the literati, and possibly by the readers. Section 4 visits contested words and languages of the early Republican period and ends with a series of questions about the emotional impact of using neologisms or loanwords on speakers today and in the 1930s, in order to attract the attention of researchers interested in the relationship between language and emotions.

2 Simple together: linguistic community formation in the late Ottoman era

In the Tanzimat Era, Istanbul emerged as one of the most multilingual literary centres of the world in tandem with the growth of publishing activity. Towards the end of the 19th century, a group of intellectuals raised concerns about language simplification and linguistic community formation. Against the backdrop of the Ten Year War Period – i.e., Balkan Wars (1913–1914), the First World War (1914–1918), the occupation of Istanbul (1920–1923), and the Turkish War of Independence (1919–1923) – Turkish national consciousness developed gradually.

“Modern Turkish” (*Türkiye Türkçesi*), the language mainly used in the Republic of Turkey, is a significant member of the Turkic language family. It is grouped with the Altaic section of the Ural Altaic family of languages. The earliest attested forms of written Turkic (also East Old Turkic or Orkhon Turkic, Old Turkic) are found in Göktürk and Uygur inscriptions from the 7th century AD to the 13th century (Erdal 2004: 4–5). The Old Turkic language was spoken in the Tarim Basin and in the centre of the Mongol steppes and was written in the Old Turkic alphabet, known also as runiform. Following the Turkish conversion to Islam in the 11th century, the Arabic alphabet was adopted and Old Anatolian Turkish was introduced into Anatolia by the Seljuk Dynasty.

Despite the long historical roots of modern Turkish, dating back to the 7th century AD, it would be ahistorical to search for a clear and unchanging ethnic Turkish identity from the ancient past onwards. For centuries, the Ottoman Empire remained a “classic example of the plural society” which was “as diverse as any in history” for almost half a millennium (Braude and Lewis 1982, 1: 1). According to Şerif Mardin, daily usage of Turkish in the palace represents “a wider, latent but hegemonic influence of Turkish” even in the “classical” period of Ottoman history (Mardin 2002: 120–121). However, in the Ottoman Empire there were other signifiers for Turkish speakers; for example, Osmanlı was used often in an official capacity by the state, and Rumi used in common vernacular. Between the 13th and 17th centuries, it was the heyday of *Rumi* “as a socially and culturally meaningful category” (Kafadar 2007: 16). The lands of the *Rum* (*diyar-ı Rum*) or simply *Rum* (“the lands of Rome”, i.e., eastern Roman lands, Byzantium) as a designation of a physical and cultural geography remained in use even after the 18th century, when it was gradually replaced by Anatolia, *Anadolu*, the Turkicized form of the Greek word *Anatoli* (“east”) (Kafadar 2007: 16). Complexity of ethnic, religious and linguistic identities in the Ottoman Empire went beyond the trinity of Muslims, Christians and Jews, and included different and mixed identities such as Yezidis, Turcomans and Karamanlıs. Ottoman Turkish, *lisan-ı Osmanî*, *Turkî*, *Osmanlıca*, was a product of centuries of linguistic borrowings with a long list of loanwords borrowed primarily from Arabic and Persian but also from other languages of the Empire such as Armenian, Greek and Slavic (Korkmaz 2007: 499). From the late 18th century onwards, the *millet* (i.e., religious community) system emerged as an effort “of the Ottoman administration to take into account the organisation and culture of the various religious-ethnic groups it ruled” (Karpas 1982, 1: 141).

During the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876), the idea of language simplification gained currency in tandem with the growth of publishing activity (Doğançay-Aktuna 2004: 6). The

period of Tanzimat (1839–1876), meaning ‘ordering, setting in order, regulating’ was a distinct turning point due to the intensification of reforms in military, social, administrative, judicial, and bureaucratic spheres, and the establishment of the principle of equality of all subjects before the law by defining Ottoman citizenry (Davison 2012: 202). During this period, the centre of power shifted from the palace to the new actors (high bureaucracy and intelligentsia), fuelling fierce intellectual debates and cultural transformations (Findley 1992: 152). The *millets* were pushed to reform their internal governance system, including the schooling system (Bruce 2009: 383–384), which was reflected in the subsequent rise of vernacularization.

The second half of the 19th century witnessed the rise of one of the most multilingual literary centres of the world: the Imperial capital, Istanbul. In the wake of the “communications revolution”, i.e., technological innovations in communications and printing activities in the Ottoman lands in the second half of the 19th century (Findley 1989: 174–179), Istanbul emerged as a world-class literary centre (Strauss 2003: 40). While French attained the status of a semi-official language of the Empire, and became a medium of exchange between learned upper class Ottomans of different communities, Istanbul literary culture became a microcosm of multilingualism organized around and across the boundaries of the *millet* system.

Tietze’s discovery of *Akabi Hikayesi* (‘Akabi’s story’) in 1991, 140 years after its first publication, is a great contribution to Ottoman literary history in such a way as to show the multilingual nature of its origins, as well as the silencing of non-Turkish elements (Vardanean [1851] 1991). Written in Ottoman Turkish with Armenian characters by Hovsep Vartanian (1813–1879), *Akabi Hikayesi* tells the story of impossible love between two Armenians whose families are from different denominations: Catholic and Gregorian. As the recent turn in Ottoman literary historiography has shown, *Akabi Hikayesi* was followed by several works produced by various literary communities such as Kurdish, Armenian, Safarad, Karamanlı, and so on. Amidst such diversity, unusual examples of various script and verbal combinations such as Armenian in Ottoman script or Ottoman Turkish in Kurdish script were produced (Strauss 2003: 53) and silenced by one-sided nationalist accounts of official historiographies (Altuğ and Uslu 2014: VIII).

Towards the end of the Tanzimat era, the need for a systematic policy of language simplification for propaganda purposes was raised by the public intellectuals and the press. The introduction of new media technologies such as journals and magazines as well as new literary forms such as the novel (*roman*) and short stories (*hikaye*) brought with them questions of intelligibility and language simplification. The first examples of Turkish lexicons were published in this era, one notable example being *Lehçe-i Osmanî* (1876) by Ahmed Vefik Paşa and *Kamus-ı Turkî* (1900) by Şemsettin Sami. *Lehçe-i Osmanî* is singled out by its emphasis on language simplification and a special section devoted to Anatolian Turkish. The need for a change in alphabet was often articulated by some influential Ottoman statesmen such as Münif Paşa and Ahmet Cevdet Paşa very early on in the 1860s (Levent 1960: 53). In the 1880s and 1890s, language emerged as one of the main ingredients in the mixture that holds a community together in the writings of leading intellectuals such as Şemsettin Sami and Ahmet Mithat, who advocated the policy of language simplification (Sadoğlu 2003: 107–120).

In the late 19th century, education and literacy were on the state agenda. The estimated literacy rate just before the First World War was at least between 10 % and 15 % and was estimated to have been much higher in the late 19th century (Georgeon 1995: 173). Relying on the 1894/95 census, Kemal Karpat gives the illiteracy rate as 46 % of the whole population in the districts counted, or 34.3 % excluding children under 10 years old (Karpat 1985: 221). For the latest figure before the alphabet change, Georgeon, relying on the 1927 census, estimates the literacy rate to be between 8.15 % and 10.6 % of a population of 13,660,000 (Georgeon 1995: 170). This shows that the literacy rate was on a considerable rise before the First World War, yet demographic, economic and social disruptions due to constant warfare caused a pause in educational improvement and the rise in literacy rates.

Before the implementation of linguistic policies in the early Republican period, a cohesive linguistic community had already begun to form in the late Ottoman Empire. The Ten Year War Period – i.e., Balkan Wars (1913–1914), the First World War (1914–1918), the occupation of Istanbul (1920–1923), and the Turkish War of Independence (1919–1923) – was formative in the development of a new linguistic community. As Benjamin Fortna aptly puts it, “there were many important late Ottoman precursors to the Republican ‘language revolution’”, in other words, “changes in text and inevitably in language were gradual and anticipated the nationalist turn, rather than being triggered by it” (Fortna 2011: 7). A new language, i.e., a new practice of Turkish based on the Istanbul vernacular, was used systematically as a means of propaganda. Poetry, short stories and fiction were effectively used to serve *Milli Edebiyat* (‘the National Literature’) by a group of writers spearheaded by Ömer Seyfettin, Ali Canip Yöntem, and Ziya Gökalp, who discussed simplifying the language and eliminating Arabic and Persian borrowings in *Genç Kalemler*, the literary journal associated with the national literature movement (Adak 2018: 2). In this period, the name “Turk” acquired new positive connotations which inspired the official ideology of the Turkish Republic (Mardin 2002: 122).

The Balkan Wars (1913–1914) had significant psychological and demographic impact, leading to the development of Turkish nationalism. The trauma of being defeated by former Ottoman subjects in the Balkans started a period of “national emergence”, which ended ideological disputes in favour of the rise of Turkish nationalism (Zürcher 2010: 148). With the loss of the Balkan territories, about 2.5 million Muslim Turkish speaking people immigrated from the Balkans to Anatolia (Toprak 2002: 45–46). This ushered in a new cultural era in which a patriotic, nationalist, and anti-Western framework dominated intellectual products and was being used as a means of war propaganda. Propaganda in the beginning of this period still relied heavily on Islam, rather than Turkish nationalism. Even for the post-Balkan War period, “national culture” went through major fluctuations and transformations. Turkish nationalism with a secular tendency gained an upper hand after Arab revolts in 1917 (Köroğlu 2007: XI). During the occupation of Istanbul (1920–1923), the intelligentsia was in “a greatly intensified emotional state of mind” (Köroğlu 2007: 48), as reflected by the sentimental tone of articles, pertaining to politics, and Istanbul became a nest of rising protests and social movements. Linguistic community formation ran alongside with national propaganda and a discussion about new emotional rules, as we will see below.

3 Contested emotions of the late Ottoman Empire

In conventional understanding, the rise of nationalism goes hand in hand with emotionalization, and rightly so. In terms of propaganda, the intensification of collective sentiments such as love of the nation is a given in the process of formation of imaginary bonds between fellow citizens. Since the publication of *Treatise on the Origin of Language* in 1772 by Herder, language has been known to be “the organ of thought”, which shapes linguistic patterns and frameworks of how each linguistic community thinks and feels (Herder [1772] 2002: 110). His theory includes “a metaphysical assumption about the aesthetic operation of human thought and collective belonging” (Fox 2002: 237) through national communal feelings. In addition, Benedict Anderson’s concept of “imagined community” has been a useful and outstanding contribution to the field in showing the socially constructed nature of nationalism since 1983. Each nation constructs an imaginary community, given that “members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson 1991: 6). In Rosenwein’s interpretation, “emotional communities are in some ways what Foucault called a common ‘discourse’: shared vocabularies and ways of thinking that have a controlling function, a disciplining function. Emotional communities are similar as well to Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’: internalised norms that determine how we think and act and that may be different in different groups” (Rosenwein 2006: 25). The key in the creation of nationalistic propaganda is to have “a common stake, interests, values and goals” which can be shared through social relations as well as texts (Rosenwein 2006: 24).

Unfortunately, our understanding of late Ottoman emotional landscapes is limited to less than a handful of sources, such as Ronald G. Suny’s seminal piece on hatred as the basis of ethnic violence (Suny 2004) and Orhan Pamuk’s depiction of collective melancholy which started a lively academic discussion (Helvacıoğlu 2013; Işın 2010; Pamuk 2003). More research on the subject is necessary in order to go beyond commonsensical knowledge about collective feelings of belonging and national identity. What this chapter intends to highlight, however, is an anti-emotional side of a newly founded community’s emotional life. In this new regime, any emotional expression which did not serve a collective interest was perceived as a serious threat to the formation of a new emotional community and faced harsh criticisms. A certain anti-emotional rhetoric surfaced in literary representations and intellectual writings, which encouraged the value of emotional restraint. This rhetoric was based on a number of imaginary binaries, such as collective versus individual feelings, thoughts versus feelings, and reason versus emotions, all of which were considered to be mutually exclusive and in conflict with one another. Some emotions, such as passionate love (*aşk*), jealousy (*kıskançlık*) and sadness/melancholia (*hüzün*), were stigmatized and labelled as “selfish” or “shallow” feelings. To put it simply, emotional restraint was poised as the most exalted social value of the new emotional community.

The “positivistic” foundations of anti-emotional rhetoric derived from medical culture. The secondary literature on positivism, specifically Beşir Fuat’s involvement with the literary debate between realism (*hakikiyyun*) and romanticism, revealed how medical culture had become a hotbed of the problematization of emotions (Hanioğlu 2005; Okay 1969).

Beşir Fuat joined the discussion of realism and romanticism in 1885, with a biography of Victor Hugo and a commentary on the alleged bad influence and low quality of romanticism in comparison to Emile Zola and realism. Drawing on an alleged opposition between poetry and science, Beşir Fuat stipulated that literature must be in accord with the “scientific realities” of his time, such as positivism, determinism, and physiology. In an effort to demystify emotions, he adopted the medical approach of an identified German scientist: the human heart was a bodily organ, rather than the reason why we “love, cry, hope, hate” (Beşir Fuat 1300/1883: 401). Similarly, the secretion of tears was a function of brain physiology and therefore was to be approached as a medical phenomenon (Okay 1969: 113). Similar comments were made by medical doctor Şerafeddin Mağmumi, whose medical dictionary *Vücut-ı Beşer* (‘Human Body’) took a critical attitude to love-related (*aşkî*, ‘pertaining to love’) activity on the basis of being “a biological response caused by cerebral activity” (Mağmumi 1892: 258). Cerebral activity was “caused by constant thinking creating a thin fluid layer on the surface of the brain” and close to semi-madness (Mağmumi 1888: 22). In the Second Constitutional Era following in the footsteps of Beşir Fuat, Baha Tevfik took over the task of criticizing poetry and romanticism, supplying a firmer underpinning fed by psychology. In *Edebiyat Katiyyen Muzırdır* (‘Literature is absolutely harmful’), one of the most contested articles in his series against literature and romanticism, he made every effort to prove “scientifically” that literature was the outcome of a psychological illness: “Without hesitation, we should conclude that literature is nothing but an epidemic, a contagious brain disease” (Baha Tevfik 1910a: 106).

The succession between Şerafeddin Mağmumi, Beşir Fuat, and Baha Tevfik in attacking literature and its effective power was brought to light by Şükrü Hanioglu within the framework of “the implications of Vulgärmaterialismus for literature” and “Ottoman materialism” (Hanioglu 2005: 42–43). According to Hanioglu, Ottoman materialism founded the basis of “the scientism of the Young Turks”, which then shaped Atatürk’s “attitudes and policies” to an extraordinary degree (Hanioglu 2011: 48). Here, I see the anti-emotional aspect of Ottoman materialism as the starting point of a larger movement of bifurcating emotions with reason, which in the second Constitutional period went beyond medical and materialist circles.

Rising interest in psy-sciences at the turn of the 20th century onwards popularized the alleged split between emotions and reason. In this process, psy-sciences were gradually turning into a tool for “managing individuals” and encouraging emotional restraint with a deliberate and open agenda to regulate his/her feelings, and an alleged authority granted by science. From the foundation of *Darülfünun*, today’s Istanbul University, in 1900 onwards, a short period of intense translation activities started (Afacan 2016: 89). While new books on human psychology were published to amalgamate old established theories of the soul and bio-medical perspectives, emotional expression and restraint became an important interest to Ottoman literati.

In the second Constitutional period, love surfaced as the most commonly stigmatized and discussed emotion. One of the first books about “pathological forms of love”, *Aşk-ı Marazî* (‘Pathological love’) by Dr Nazım Şakir (1326/1910), came out in the second Constitutional era. This was a popular subject according to Dr. Şakir, given the spread of “pathological forms of love” and the rising interest in medical explanations about love (Nazım

Şakir 1326/1910). In this book he merges philosophical and literary theories of love with psychiatric cases such as love among hysterics, superior degenerates, and imbeciles, covering different forms like erotomania, fetishism, masochism, and sadism. The sense of departure from old traditional approaches to emotions was not limited to medical circles. The next year, M. Arif welcomed psychological approaches to love in *Aşk Nedir?* ('What is love?') (Arif 1911). He rejected traditional tools for making sense of love, such as philosophy, for being "frivolous", and criticized psychiatric approaches for being old-fashioned (Arif 1911: 4). According to Arif, the most cutting-edge perspective on love was the theory of obsession and this came from psychology (Arif 1911: 6).

Philosophy journals became new venues to speculate on emotions from the angle of the alleged dichotomy between reason and emotions. A number of journal articles on emotion were published in *Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası* ('Journal of New Philosophy'), a philosophy journal established by M. Zekeriya Sertel and Ahmed Hamdi Bey in Salonica in 1911, which contained contributions by some authors of the *Genç Kalemler* circle, primarily Ziya Gökalp. One anonymous article series entitled 'Human being, thought and feeling' ("İnsan, fikir, his"), for example, took a clear stance against emotional experiences and encouraged emotional suppression to the death: "The more progress and improvement is made, the less intensely feelings are felt and the more triumphant thoughts are. For the deep thinkers feelings and thoughts are in a constant and endless fight, suffice it to say. We wish that thoughts, which bring happiness to humanity, are the winners, and that feelings are crushed to death" (Anonymous 1911: 31).

Foundations of this approach were laid in Ziya Gökalp's theory of nationalism, being in tune with the policies of the Committee of Union of Progress (CUP), which sought demographic planning and social control over individuals (Ahmad 1993: 31). In unfolding Gökalp's contributions to the formation of Turkish national identity, the secondary literature has emphasized its collectivist nature, which always prioritized national consciousness (*milli şuur*) over individual rights and attacked what it deemed "selfishness" (Kadioğlu 2002: 289–292). Kadioğlu has maintained that "in the Turkish context, the concept of modern citizenship evolved in such a way as to exclude a liberal individualist dimension" (Kadioğlu 1998: 40). With the popularization of Ziya Gökalp's social theory, encapsulated by his famous motto "No individual but society, no rights but duty" (*Fert yok cemiyet var, hak yok görev var*), focus on the common good became a hegemonic discourse. Written propaganda frequently emphasized societal duty over individual rights. One of the strongest examples is a poem Gökalp wrote from the perspective of a soldier whose final line is: "with closed eyes, I carry out my duty" (Heyd 1950: 124). In this period, the sphere of reading went through a process of "militarisation of learning", which continued into the early Republican Era "in attempting to inculcate an ethos of the soldier in every young reader, not merely those attending military schools" (Fortna 2011: 37).

The dream of complete rationality would look bizarre to modern eyes, yet the dichotomy between emotions and reason resonated with many people at the turn of the 20th century. Indeed, the alleged dichotomy between mechanical objectivity and self-control versus fragile feelings became a common theme in problematizing emotions in the second Constitutional period. In 1912 one of the most well-known Ottoman feminists, Halide Edip Adivar, penned an autobiographical novel about the unconventional life story and emotional jour-

ney of a young well-educated woman named Handan, whose three consecutive love stories all ended poorly. Refik Cemal, the husband of Handan's beloved "docile" sister Neriman, first finds it hard to make sense of Handan's devilish and passionate inner world. After putting the blame on the culture of psychological introversion and digging further among the reading elite, Refik Cemal expresses his deep gratitude for his loving and caring wife Neriman for being oblivious to this world of desires and emotions. According to Refik Cemal, women, except for Neriman, are nothing but assemblages of a nervous system, perfectly masked by ornaments (Adivar [1912] 2011: 99). Trapped in the world of psychological introversion, Handan experiences a number of "unidentified and unnamed emotions", in her words, because of her love for her unfaithful husband. She wonders "if what she deems as the human heart is nothing but a nervous system (*cümle-i asabiye*) in her unfaithful and selfish husband's body" (Adivar 2011: 137). In the end, the nervous system once more restores highly gendered moral order and takes away Handan's mind as well as life. Her funeral was nothing but a source of gossip and humiliation, even though she never acted upon her feelings for Refik Cemal.

As a fierce defender of female rights in the late Ottoman Empire, it is unexpected of Halide Edip to punish Handan, yet it is expected of the spread of anti-emotional rhetoric and the value of emotional restraint as the ending suggests. Historians of science and emotions would not find it hard to read Halide Edip's message. As Dror, Hitzer, Laukötter and León-Sanz (2016) clearly illustrate, the promotion of an alleged dichotomy between mechanical objectivity versus fragile feelings was not unique to the late Ottoman intellectual milieu. Scientific technologies of the era promoted a "masculine emotional culture of self-control and restraint" as opposed to a "feminine emotional culture of sensitivity and feelings" (Dror et al. 2016: 11) As Dror, Hitzer, Laukötter and León-Sanz remind us, there is no "emotionless state" or "rationality" even in scientific thinking, with reference to Fleck's notions of "styles of thinking" and "collectivist thinking", which postulate that "the entire process of scientific research (from observation to explanation) and the epistemic interest of the scientist were regarded by Fleck as driven by emotions" (Dror et al. 2016: 13). This double-sidedness, however, was not perceived and acknowledged by the "men" of science at the time.

As the mouthpiece of scientific circles, Baha Tevfik's problematization of literature boiled down to the question of whether literature speaks to the selfish, "sensitive" and "irrational" side of emotions. Through an unusual love story between an old homosexual couple who decide to fight jealousy together, Baha Tevfik rewrites the rules of love in *Aşk, Hodbinî* ('Love, egoism') within an immoralist framework (Baha Tevfik 1910b: 92). Stigmatising "lust, passion and jealousy", he depicts how love should ideally be experienced and expressed. By leaving the story open ended, he also leaves to the readers the question of whether love in reality could be completely detached from such selfish feelings – lust, passion and jealousy: "Now I understand that real love starts after the age of 80, a type of love that is beyond lust, passion and jealousy.' Nail leans on the couch, lights his cigarette. Enis sits down at the piano and plays a waltz: 'When Love Blossoms...' [...] The melody of passionate love spreading like waves from the piano answers to this feeling: If only love could be detached from egoism [...]" (Baha Tevfik 1910b: 92). In another story, *Kıskançlık* ('Jealousy') by Baha Tevfik, love at last enters into the domain of mental health: the

cold-hearted and free-spirited protagonist consults a friend, who introduces himself as an expert on mental health, about the intricacies of passionate love, and thus learns how to govern his as well as the loved one's excessive emotions (Baha Tevfik 1910c: 2–4).

How do we explain how someone as passionate about individual freedom as Baha Tevfik could stigmatize passionate love on the basis of promoting selfishness? Baha Tevfik is the author of *Felsefe-i Ferd* ('Philosophy of the Individual'), a heteroclite compilation consisting of articles on diverse subjects such as education, physiology, ethics, philosophy, officialdom, marriage, socialism, and anarchism, which praises the concept of the individual. He was among very few intellectuals who had serious reservations about rising nationalism in the Ottoman Empire (Mignon 2009: 30–33). However, the sense of urgency for saving the Empire after the Balkan Wars rendered intellectual products as sheer sources of propaganda. In these sources, while the value of emotional restraint was encouraged, personal feelings were attacked as threats to the common good of the society and the common goal of saving the Empire.

There were different imaginations for the future of the Ottoman Empire, as well as different value systems for holding imaginary Ottoman society together, be it nationalistic, scientific or religious. However, prioritizing the common good in the time of crisis became the common concern. The concept of "common good" was at the heart of the formation of Turkish nationalism, which stood for values of "unity and uniformity" as opposed to diversity and plurality (Cizre 1998: 13). While emotional discourses of saving the Empire and sticking together spread, emotions themselves were often depicted as irrelevant, dangerous, and sometimes pathological, in particular allegedly "fragile" and "selfish" feelings such as passionate love (*aşk*), jealousy (*kıskançlık*) and sadness (*hüzün*).

No work could depict the urge to leave the past culture of "emotional roller coaster" behind more clearly than *Rüyada Terakki* ('Progress in a Dream'). One of the first science fiction novels produced in the late Ottoman Empire, *Rüyada Terakki* depicts how a certain culture of emotional restraint relates to the trauma of the Balkan Wars (1912–1913). *Rüyada Terakki* begins with a dream of the protagonist Nazım, who is deeply upset about the position of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Wars, in which he meets his grandfather, Molla Davut. In this dream Molla Davut takes his grandson to the 23rd century Ottoman Empire. Easily impressed by advanced technology such as sleeping machines, flying machines, and ten-story factories, Nazım soon realizes that most of these machines are based on his own sketches in the 19th century. For Nazım, men are similar to machines and the "new men" of the 23rd century will achieve perfection (*insan-ı kamil*) (Davudzâde Molla Mustafa Nazım [1913] 2012: 56–61). The "new men" are unaffected by demonic desires and egotism, thanks to childhood indoctrination into a moral code based on Islam. Free of craving for coffee, tea, or cigarettes, "they work relentlessly", which they consider a religious virtue (Davudzâde Molla Mustafa Nazım 2012: 61). One difference between the successful new Ottomans and the old ones is their approach to emotions and reason.

In a play Nazım attends in the 23rd century, Ottomans of the future watch the extreme suffering of the Ottomans of the early 20th century during the Balkan Wars. The play, as expected, is full of sadness and a sense of agony. When seeing soft-hearted Nazım's sadness, Naim Bey from the future intervenes and differentiates past and future attitudes towards sadness (*hüzün*): "We don't like sadness. However, these people are fond of anything

which causes grief and sadness perpetually. As you will see the more they are exposed to agitating sounds, dramatic songs, melancholic gestures, and attitudes which would move them, the more they are satisfied” (Davudzâde Molla Mustafa Nazım 2012: 173). In the 23rd century, however, people simply don’t feel sad. It is important to notice that here there is an ambivalent attitude towards sadness. Mollazade places great importance on achieving maturity through the Sufi path. In the bright future, when complete maturity is achieved in the 23rd century, it is as a result of the suffering and anguish experienced in the past. Ironically, however, the happy and stable individuals of the 23rd century are completely freed from the sense of sadness and weaknesses of the heart.

Anti-emotional rhetoric was not only limited to literary representations. In the salons of Istanbul, the question of what sorts of emotions were welcome in a newly established collective culture was discussed widely. In an old mansion on the Princes’ Islands, Ziya Gökalp criticizes Yahya Kemal for his “soft spot” for his friends, and for developing “shallow feelings” (*dar hisler*): “Virtues such as loyalty (*vefa*), friendship (*dostluk*) and interpersonal relationships (*şahsi rabtalar*) belong to the old world. In the new world an individual only loves his/her community and collective notions. He does not let his time and feelings to be wasted by a few people. Neither does he pursue such shallow and frivolous dreams such as friendship” (Beyathı 1977: 85–86). This is, after all, how Americans live their dreams and make the most of their lives in a brand-new world according to Gökalp. In response, Yahya Kemal asks wittily why Gökalp preferred his good friend, Yahya Kemal, over his community, i.e., the members of the Committee of Union and Progress, which Gökalp often finds “too crowded” and adds: “What you describe as shallow feelings, are indeed emotional bonds between friends, which in my understanding are not new, are not old. They are with us since the beginning of mankind and will always be there” (Beyathı 1977: 85–86).

Public and theoretical reaction to Gökalp’s hostility towards individual feelings came from Mustafa Şekip Tunç. In 1921, when Tunç was contributing to *Dergah* magazine, the collectivist aspect of Ziya Gökalp’s scientism (*ilimcilik*) and collectivism was criticized fiercely. Tunç focused on the importance of the individual, and questioned whether personal feelings such as passion (*ihtilas*) were detrimental to the collective order. He proposed that the focus should be on the individual as the basis of society: “It is easy to say ‘no individual but society’, yet in reality it is meaningless and could only be attained for a short period of time through despotism. Society should be attentive to individuals’ needs, lest revolutions or revolts break out often” (Tunç 1921a: 52). He penned a series of articles about passions in his column *Ruhiyat* (‘Psychology’) in *Dergah*, such as “Passions in Politics” and “The Benefits of Passions” with an introduction informing us about how passions “have lately become a major subject of complaint in political discourses” and how they are of “great interest to all of us [them]” (Tunç 1921b: 162). For Tunç, the conflict between collective and individual feelings was illusionary and mistaken. He also believed this was true of the conflict between personal passions and the common good, even though such presupposed binaries were taken for granted in his time (Tunç 1921a: 52).

Needless to say, imagining the nation as emotionless as possible was also self-contradictory, given that rising nationalism entailed the intensification of collective feelings among fellow citizens. However, this belief was shared by many, with a strict division between individual and collective feelings. Intellectuals, who were often placed into different

categories such as materialists, Islamists, and nationalists, and who indeed built their narratives on different values such as religious devotion, nationalism or being scientifically minded, expressed antagonism towards emotional expressions and literary representations, unless these feelings served a clear collective purpose. In other words, the value of emotional restraint served as a new common value for binding intellectual groups which rarely came together and for forming a new emotional community among the Ottoman literati. This group shared the belief in the role of language in the formation of a new community through the use of literary propaganda texts expressed in simple language.

4 Contested languages and words of the early Republican era

Given that a certain linguistic community had already started to be formed in the late Ottoman Empire, the early Republican ruling elite was well versed in the role of language in community formation when the Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923. During the foundational years of the Republic of Turkey, an extensive programme of reforms in daily life towards secularization and modernization of the newly founded Republic were implemented under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. The newly founded early Republican government implemented such effective language reforms, which developed the policies of monolingualism and unity.

Language planning in Turkey started with Turkish language reform, which involved two major phases: the adoption of the Latin alphabet in 1928 and the purification (i.e., *Özleştirme*, ‘authentication/Turkification’) of the grammar and lexicon in 1930s and 1940s. Kemal Atatürk’s expression of the link between language and emotions became the motto of Turkish language reform:

National sentiment (*milli his*) is strongly tied to that of language. National language that is rich in content is the most effective means for the cultivation of national sentiments (*milli his*). Turkish is among the richest languages, as long as it is used carefully. The Turkish nation, which saved the country and protected its independence, must save its language from the tutelage of foreign powers now. (Arsal 1930: 1)

As Hale Yılmaz has shown, the alphabet change “should be understood both in the context of the early Republican state’s nationalizing, secularizing language reforms and in the context of its modernist, developmentalist goals, for which a literate society was a prerequisite” (Yılmaz 2013: 140). On 1 November 1928, the Alphabet Law was passed to switch to the Latin alphabet from the Arabic alphabet. The Alphabet Law followed on from the Abolition of the Caliphate in 1924, which was a major turning point in giving legitimacy to the newly founded nation state taking precedence over religion (Berkes 1999: 450–460). Secularism became a central tenet of early Republican ideology, which for Azak was catalysed by the spread of the fear of Islamic fanaticism (Azak 2010: XI). The Kemalist State promoted an allegedly pure form of Turkish Islam restricted to the individual conscience (*vicdan*) (Parla and Davison 2004: 108), that is “personal, rational and enlightened” as opposed to

reactionary Islam (Azak 2010: 175). Kemalists, as Bozarslan argues, fitted Islam into their nationalist ideology instead of replacing it, and it played a crucial role in the definition of a national identity (Hamit Bozarslan 2000: 61–73).

Apart from ideological underpinnings, there were practical reasons for the alphabet change as was stated in the bill of 31 October 1928: “the system of the Arabic letters does not contain vowel signs, which our language needs” (Strauss 2008: 490). With eight vowels (*e, ı, o, ö, ü* in addition to three Arabic short vowels), some elements unknown in French and some original creations such as *ğ*, the new alphabet was considered to be an original Turkish creation. A circle of “nationalist linguists” found their own ways to develop an alternative to the science of philology in the West and unique solutions “that they devised in their quest for further Turkish westernisation” (Aytürk 2004: 2). However, the alphabet reform did not solve the problem of the literacy rate overnight and many people continued to use the old alphabet primarily for practical reasons (Yılmaz 2011: 678).

In the 1930s and 1940s, language reform brought fundamental and long-lasting change in the Turkish lexicon. During this period, the Turkish Language Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*), founded in 1932, served as a versatile tool fulfilling many roles: “a private association; a learned society; a nationalist club; a federation of patriotic committees; a satellite of the single party; a parliamentary adjunct; a propaganda workshop and outlet; an auxiliary organisation to the state; an academic institute; a branch of a ministry; a government agency; and a presidential pastime” (Szurek 2015: 95). The Turkish Language Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*) and leading intellectuals made extensive efforts for reviving forgotten Turkic words, or coining new words based on Turkish roots, suffixes, and neologisms. Consisting mostly of words compiled as a result of a collaborative public effort of “word collection mobilization” (*söz derleme seferberliği*), the “Collection of Turkish Equivalents of Ottoman Words” (*Osmanlıcadan Türkçeye Söz Karşılıkları Tarama Dergisi*) offered a great number of equivalents, which could reach as high as 77 Turkish substitutes for a single Arabic word as in the example of *hediye* (Lewis 2000: 50). In response to criticisms of incomprehensibility, the long list of synonyms, phonetically incorrect new constructions, further escalation of the difference between written and spoken Turkish and arbitrariness due to extreme purism, a much smaller version, the “Ottoman Turkish Pocket Glossary” (*Osmanlıcadan Türkçeye Cep Kılavuzu*), was published.

The early Republican government operated on the same principles of unity and common good. In the long run, these principles intensified the problem of linguistic exclusion. The focus on the common good was sharpened in the early Republican period with the systematic use of Turkish as the national and common language. From 1924 onwards, school textbooks used in the classrooms frequently emphasized the duties rather than the rights of citizens (Üstel 2004). As the principle of “How happy is the one who calls himself/herself a Turk!” demonstrates, the newly founded Republic made a claim for civic nationalism, inclusive of all ethnic identities. However, in practice it had a strong exclusionist aspect, which was reflected in the language policy of the early Republican era. In this period, any expression of ethnic differences became taboo, effectively excluding non-Muslims and non-Turkish speakers (Yıldız 2001: 300). Language reform fully created the Turkish linguistic community by silencing other languages such as Kurdish, Armenian, Greek, Judeo-Spanish, Romani and Zazaki and establishing the hegemony of Turkish.

One of the most well-known examples of exclusionary policy is the “Citizen, Speak Turkish” (*Vatandaş, Türkçe Konuş*) campaign. While it began as a student initiative in 1928, the “Citizen, Speak Turkish” campaign soon became a massive movement, which shows how “the mobilisation of university students, teachers, intellectuals, and journalists to create a homogenous Turkish nation in accordance with the state’s aim has facilitated the Turkification process and contributed to the reproduction of Turkish nationalism” (Aslan 2007: 250). As Alpay argues, “mother tongue”, *anadili* in Turkish, as a term has mistakenly come to correspond exclusively to Turkish due to a long period of censorship and fear-mongering campaigns targeting ancestral languages, even though there are 52 different languages and dialects in present-day Turkey according to data provided by the Foreign Office (Alpay 2010: 83–87). Due to the ethno-religious boundaries of Turkish nationalism, those who are able to call themselves Turk remain a limited and privileged group (Yıldız 2001: 301).

The new regime promised happiness to Turkish citizens, as reflected by its motto: “How happy is the one who calls himself/herself a Turk!”. One could easily assume that the early Republic of Turkey was a scene of emotional intensity and variety with great potential for dynamism and change about which we know very little. As Sara Ahmed and Anne-Marie Fortier remind us in a recent attempt to “re-imagine communities”, each community has its own requirements and set of relations which are open to negotiation and change. We ought to not take the concept of “community” for granted and remember that the meaning of “being with” a group might differ in each case (Ahmed and Fortier 2003: 253). Therefore, any emotional community should be perceived to be in a constant state of evolution and change, rather than stagnant and identical to the Ottoman Empire community of the past. To draw conclusions about emotional communities in the early Republican period, further research is needed. However, it is clear that the belief in the interconnectivity between emotional and linguistic change was inherited and internalized by the Republican authorities.

One starting point for further research would be the argument of “loss of emotional content”, which was argued by Geoffrey Lewis, the author of one of the most well-known and comprehensive accounts of the Language Revolution, *The Turkish Language Revolution: A Catastrophic Success* (Lewis [1999] 2000). This book presents the language reform as a “catastrophic success”, due to the loss of the Turkish of the 1920s and 1930s rather than the Ottoman lexicon of earlier times (Lewis 2000: 4). In this work, he presents the argument of “the loss of emotional content”: even though some neologisms do not misinform the reader, and some of them were actually successfully internalized, they lack “emotional content” (Lewis 2000: 152). Two of the most striking examples Lewis gives are *özgürlük* and *bağımsızlık*, which lack the “emotional content” of their old equivalents, *hürriyet* and *istiklal*, respectively. Today’s new words mean the same, but the emotional content of the older ones is unknown to younger generations: “you do not miss what you have never known” (Lewis 2000: 152), Lewis concludes.

Here, unfortunately, Lewis does not unfold what he means by “emotional content” in reference to the repercussions of language change. One could easily assume that *özgürlük* could have had more or notable emotional intensity for a speaker given its ideological significance for a number of reasons, such as using a new word, leaving the past behind,

moving forward, belonging to a community, feeling more modern and so on. Furthermore, learning a new word does not automatically erase an old word from memory, as Lewis also reminds us (Lewis 2000: 150). In the case of *istiklal*, it might be a stretch to assume that its emotional content is unknown to new generations, even if we assume that *istiklal* might have triggered feelings of national sovereignty more intensely than *bağımsızlık* in the 1930s or in the current day. Co-existence of synonyms in time could lead to fine distinctions between meanings, and emotion words take a natural organic course of action such as the co-existence of *aşk* ('passionate love') and *sevgi* ('love, amity') referring to different forms of love. Although *yürek*, of Turkish origin, and *kalp* of Arabic origin refer to the same organ, the heart, "there is a division of labor between them in terms of emotional load" (Baş 2017: 135) according to Melike Baş: *Kalp* is associated with love and compassion, while *yürek* is linked with sadness, distress, fear, and cowardice (Baş 2017: 135). However, it is clear that Lewis's argument opens a new window into a whole range of interactions between language and emotions, about which we know very little.

As for the early Republican regime's efforts at top-down linguistic reforms, it is crucial to remember that each political regime has its own political vocabulary open to ideological agendas, as Tanıl Bora reminds us (Bora 2018). However, words evolve in their own way and take unexpected turns transcending ideological agendas. There certainly was a drastic change in the emotional landscape for Turkish speakers in the 1930s, yet it would be too simplistic to interpret the change as a loss of all emotional content in the Turkish language. What remained the same between the late Ottoman and the early Republican periods was the awareness of the role of language in the formation of a new community which would hypothetically share similar emotional values.

5 Conclusion

This chapter has shown a degree of reciprocity between linguistic and emotional change in the case of Turkish, in particular Ottoman Turkish, at a discursive level. It has argued that there was a degree of awareness about the role of language in the foundation of a new emotional community in the late Ottoman Empire before the implementation of language planning by the Republican government, albeit we don't know much about the ramifications of this awareness. This process started with the rising concerns about language simplification in the late Ottoman Empire. The formation of linguistic community generated a new discussion among the educated class about which emotions should be cultivated or suppressed. Emotional restraint appeared as the most important social value of the new emotional community, participated in primarily by the literati and possibly by the readers. Speakers were encouraged to unite emotionally in their concern for the common good of their society. In the early Republican period, the principle of monolingualism was implemented in order to expedite linguistic community formation.

This leaves us with a picture of a long process of negotiation during which some languages, emotions, and words were contested in a largely unsystematic way in order to achieve linguistic and ideological unity. However, neither do we know much about the emotional landscape in the early Republican era, nor can we follow the further evolution

of the culture of emotional restraint in the 1930s and beyond. One important avenue for further research is in how the words used to describe emotion in the Turkish language themselves were altered. In relation to the major political, cultural and social changes which Turkey experienced starting from the 19th century, a number of emotion terms came and went, about which we know very little. From the angle of emotion studies, synonyms are to be taken as hints towards different intensities of emotional experiences and sometimes reflective of major cultural changes in the past. In Ottoman Turkish, a large selection of emotion terms, from *heyecan* to *teessür*, came with a semantic map of terms based on Arabic trilateral word roots. For *his*, the most commonly used word for ‘feeling’ and the verb ‘to feel’, for example, the semantic map involved *hiss-i müşterek* (‘*sensus communis*’), *mahsus(e)* (‘sensible’), *ihsasat* (‘sensations’), *havass-ı hamse* (‘five senses’), *hiss-i zahiri* (‘external senses’), *hiss-i batini* (‘internal senses’) to *hissiyat* (‘sentiments’), most of which are lost today. This variety of emotion words enables us to develop and measure different scales and ranges of emotions of different intensities with a sense of historicity going beyond the limited perspective of the seven basic “universal” emotions of Ekman (i.e., anger, contempt, fear, disgust, happiness, sadness and surprise), something that historians must do to localize and historicize emotions.

Another striking question is proposed by the changing emotional impact of words, both neologisms and traditional words, which still remain in use. Picking up from where Lewis left off, one can look for new ways to compare the emotional intensity of new and old words. How can we interpret the emotional impacts of using neologisms or loanwords on speakers today? Such questions would deepen our understanding of how language planning affected cultural patterns and the emotional life of speakers in the early Republic of Turkey or beyond. They would facilitate comparative studies between different cases of linguistic and emotional changes across countries. With its unique position as a culture with an emotional-linguistic landscape heavily influenced by political strategies, language planning in Turkey could be a gold mine for emotion studies.

Acknowledgements

This chapter was supported by the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Center for the History of Emotions. I am sincerely grateful to Ute Frevert, Emanuel Szurek, Özgür Türesay, Berna Kamay, Burcu Gürsel and my colleagues at the Center for the History of Emotions for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this chapter.

6 References

- Adak, Hülya. 2018. Literature (Ottoman Empire). In Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer & Bill Nasson (eds.), *1914–1918-online. International encyclopedia of the First World War*. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin. https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/literature_ottoman_empire (accessed 25 January 2019).
- Adıvar, Halide Edip. 2011 [1912]. *Handan*. Istanbul: Can Yayınları.

- Afacan, Şeyma. 2016. *Of the soul and emotions: Conceptualizing “the Ottoman individual” through psychology*. Oxford: University of Oxford PhD thesis.
- Ahmad, Feroz. 1993. *The making of Modern Turkey*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, Sara & Anne-Marie Fortier. 2003. Re-imagining communities. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6(3). 251–259.
- Ahmet Vefik Paşa. 2000 [1876]. *Lehçe-i Osmanî*. Recep Toparlı (ed.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991 [1983]. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism revised edition*. London & New York: Verso.
- Anonymous. 1911. İnsan, Fikir, His [Human being, thought and feeling]. *Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası* 1. 31.
- Arsal, Sadri Maksudi. 1930. *Türk dili için*. İstanbul: Türk ocakları ilim ve sanat heyeti.
- Aslan, Senem. 2007. Citizen, Speak Turkish!: A nation in the making. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 13(2). 245–272.
- Aytürk, İlker. 2004. Turkish linguists against the West: The origins of linguistic nationalism in Atatürk’s Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies* 40(6). 1–25.
- Azak, Umut. 2010. *Islam and secularism in Turkey: Kemalism, religion and the nation state*. London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baha Tevfik. 1910a. Edebiyat Katiyen Muzırdır. *Piyano* 10. 106.
- Baha Tevfik. 1910b. Aşk, Hodbinî. *Piyano* 8. 92.
- Baha Tevfik. 1910c. Kıskançlık, Teşvik 1. 2–4.
- Baş, Melike. 2017. The metaphoric conceptualization of emotion through heart idioms in Turkish. *Cognitive Semiotics* 10(2). 121–139.
- Berkes, Niyazi. 1999 [1964]. *The development of secularism in Turkey*. New York: Routledge.
- Beyatlı, Yahya Kemal. 1977. *Mektuplar ve Makaleler*. İstanbul: Yahya Kemal Enstitüsü.
- Bora, Tanıl. 2018. *Zamanın kelimeleri: yeni Türkiye’nin siyasi dili* [The words of time: The political language of the new Turkey]. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Bozarlan, Hamit. 2000. Ortadoğu’da ve Türkiye’de Milli Din İslam ve İslamcılık [National religion, Islam and Islamism in the Middle East and Turkey]. *Birikim* 129. 61–73.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel & Reşat Kasaba (eds.). 1997. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Braude, Benjamin & Bernard Lewis (eds.). 1982. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The functioning of a plural society*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Bruce, Masters. 2009. Millet. In Agoston Gabor & Bruce Masters (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, 383–384. New York: Facts on File.
- Davison, Roderic H. 2012. Tanzimat. In Peri J. Bearman, Thierry Bianquis, Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri van Donzel & Wolfhart Heinrichs (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., 202. https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/tanzimat-COM_1174?s.num=11&s.au=%22Ursinus%2C+Michael+O.H.%22 (accessed 20 January 2020).
- Davudzâde Molla Mustafa Nazım. 2012 [1913]. *Rüyada Terakki ve Medeniyet-i İslâmiyeyi Rüyeyet* [Progress in a dream and envisioning Islamic civilization]. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Dixon, Thomas. 2003. *From passions to emotions: The creation of a secular psychological category*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, Serenay. 2004. Language planning in Turkey: Yesterday and today. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 165. 5–32.
- Dror, Otniel E., Bettina Hitzer, Anja Laukötter & Pilar León-Sanz. 2016. An introduction to history of science and the emotions. *The History of Science Society* 31. 1–18.
- Elias, Jamal J. 2018. Mevlevi Sufis and the representation of emotion in the arts of the Ottoman world. In Kishwar Rizvi (ed.), *Affect, emotion, and subjectivity in Early Modern Muslim empires: New studies in Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal art and culture*, 185–211. Leiden: Brill.
- Esmer, Tolga U. 2014. The precarious intimacy of honor in late-Ottoman accounts of para-militarism and banditry. *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 18. <https://journals.openedition.org/ejts/4873> (accessed 1 August 2018).
- Findley, Carter V. 1989. *Ottoman civil officialdom: A social history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Findley, Carter V. 1992. *Bureaucratic reform in the Ottoman Empire: The sublime port, 1789–1922*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fortna, C. Benjamin. 2011. *Learning to read in the late Ottoman Empire and the early Turkish republic*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fox, Russell A. 2003. J. G. Herder on language and the metaphysics of national community. *The Review of Politics* 65(2). 237–262.
- François, Georgeon. 1995. Lire et écrire à la fin de l'Empire Ottoman: quelques remarques introductives. *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 75/76. 169–179.
- Frevort, Ute. 2014. Introduction. In Ute Frevort, Christian Bailey, Pascal Eitler, Benno Gammerl, Bettina Hitzer, Margrit Pernau, Monique Scheer, Anne Schmidt & Nina Verheyen (eds.), *Emotional lexicons: Continuity and change in the vocabulary of feeling 1700–2000*, 1–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. 2005. Blueprints for a future society: Late Ottoman materialists on science, religion, and art. In Elisabeth Özdalga (ed.), *Late Ottoman society: The intellectual legacy*, 28–117. London & New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. 2011. *Atatürk, an intellectual biography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Helvacıoğlu, Banu. 2013. Melancholy and Hüzün in Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul. *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 46(2). 163–178.
- Herder, Johann G. 2002 [1772]. Treatise on the origin of language. In Michael N. Forster (trans. & ed.), *Philosophical writings*, 65–164. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heyd, Uriel. 1950. *Foundations of Turkish nationalism: The life and teachings of Ziya Gökalp*. London: Luzac.
- Hovsep, Vardanean. 1991 [1851]. *Akabi Hikayesi: İlk Türkçe Roman*, A. Tietze (ed.). İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık ve Kitapçılık.
- Işın, Engin F. 2010. The soul of a city: Hüzün, Keyif, Longing. In Deniz Göktürk, Levent Sosyal & İpek Türel (eds.), *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural capital of Europe?*, 35–47. (Planning, History and Environment Series.) Abingdon, UK & New York: Routledge.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 1998. Citizenship and individuation in Turkey: The triumph of will over reason. *CEMOTI* 26. 23–42.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 2002. Milliyetçilik-liberalizm ekseninde vatandaşlık ve bireysellik [Citizenship and individuation along the nationalism-liberalism axis]. In Tanıl Bora (ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünce tarihi* 4. 284–292. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 2007. Denationalization of citizenship? The Turkish experience. *Citizenship Studies* 11(3). 283–299.
- Kafadar, Cemal. 2007. A Rome of one's own: Reflections on cultural geography and identity in the lands of Rum. In Sibel Bozdoğan & Gülru Necipoğlu (eds.), *History and ideology: Architectural heritage of the "Lands of Rum"*, 7–25. (Muqarnas 24.) Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Kaplan, Robert B. & Richard B. Baldauf. 1997. *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Karpat, Kemal H. 1982. Millets and nationality: The roots of the incongruity of nation and state in the post-Ottoman era. In Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The functioning of a plural society*, vol. 1, 141–170. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Karpat, Kemal H. 1985. *Ottoman population, 1830–1914: Demographic and social characteristics*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Keyman, Fuat. 1997. Kemalizm, Modernite Gelenek [Kemalism, modernity, tradition]. *Toplum ve Bilim* 72. 84–99.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep. 2007. Loanwords and affixes related to everyday life in the written language of Turkish as spoken in Turkey. In Zeynep Korkmaz (ed.), *Türk dili üzerine araştırmalar* 3 [Studies on Turkish], 497–503. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Köroğlu, Erol. 2007. *Ottoman propaganda and Turkish identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I*. London & New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Levent, Agah Sırrı. 1960 [1949]. *Türk dilinde gelişme ve sadeleşme evreleri* [The stages of the development and simplification of the Turkish language], 2nd edn. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

- Lewis, Geoffrey. 2000 [1999]. *The Turkish language reform: A catastrophic success*, 2nd edn. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- M. Arif. 1327/1911 *Felsefiyat-ı hazıradan aşk nedir? Ve aşkın tıp ve ilm ül-ruh nıkat-i nazarından mütalâa-ya ilmiyesi* [What is love as a new philosophy? And scientific studies of love from the point of medicine and psychology]. Dersaadet [Istanbul]: Sühulet Kitaphanesi.
- Mağmumi, Şerafeddin. 1888. *Bela-ı Aşk* [The trouble of love]. In Şerafeddin Mağmumi, *Başlangıç*, 22–38. Istanbul: İstapan Matbaası.
- Mağmumi, Şerafeddin. 1892. *Vücut-ı Beşer* [Human body]. Istanbul: Nişan Berberyan Matbaası.
- Marcel, Erdal. 2004. *A grammar of old Turkic* (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Central Asia). Boston: Brill.
- Mardin, Şerif. 2002. Playing games with names. In Deniz Kandiyoti & Ayşe Saktanber (eds.), *Fragments of culture: The everyday of modern Turkey*, 115–128. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mignon, Laurent. 2009. Osmanlı özgürlükçülüğünün peşinde: Baha Tevfik ve felsefe-i ferd'i [In search of Ottoman liberation: Baha Tevfik and his philosophy of individual]. In Laurent Mignon, *Ana metne taşınan dipnotlar: Türk edebiyatı ve kültürlerarasılık üzerine yazılar*, 25–34. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Nazım Şakir. 1326/1910. *Aşk-ı Marazi* [Pathological love]. Istanbul: Matbaa-yı Hayriye ve Şürekası Muhtar Halit Kütüphanesi.
- Okay, M. Orhan M. 1969. *İlk Türk pozitivist ve naturalisti: Beşir Fuad* [Beşir Fuad: The first Turkish positivist and naturalist]. Istanbul: Hareket Yayınları.
- Pamuk, Orhan. 2003. *Istanbul: Hatıralar ve Şehir*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Parla, Taha & Andrew Davison. 2004. *Corporatist ideology in Kemalist Turkey*. Syracuse & New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Rosenwein, Barbara A. 2006. *Emotional communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sadoğlu, Hüseyin. 2003. *Türkiye'de ulusçuluk ve dil politikaları* [Nationalism in Turkey and the politics of language]. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Sakallıoğlu, Cizre Ü. 1998. *Rethinking the connections between Turkey's "Western" identity versus Islam*. Critique 9. 3–18.
- Strauss, Johann. 2003. Who read what in the Ottoman Empire (19th–20th centuries)? *Middle Eastern Literatures* 6(1). 39–76.
- Strauss, Johann. 2008. Literacy and the development of the primary and secondary educational system; the role of the alphabet and language reforms. In Erik-Jan Zürcher (ed.), *Turkey in the twentieth century: La Turquie au vingtième siècle*, 497–517. Berlin: Schwarz.
- Suny, Grigor R. 2004. Why we hate you: The passions of national identity and ethnic violence. *UC Berkeley: Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3pv4g8zf> (accessed 10 August 2012).
- Szurek, Emanuel. 2015. The linguist and the politician: The Türk Dil Kurumu and the field of power in the 1930–40s. In Marc Aymes, Benjamin Gourisse & Élise Massicard (eds.), *Order and compromise: Patterns of government and administration in Turkey and the Ottoman Empire*, 68–96. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Tietze, Andreas. 2016. *Tarihî ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı* [Historical and etymological dictionary of Turkish language of Turkey]. Ankara: TÜBA Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.
- Toprak, Zafer. 2002. Cihan Harbinin Provası: Balkan Harbi. *Toplumsal Tarih* 10. 45–46.
- Tuğ, Başak. 2017. *Politics of honor in Ottoman Anatolia: Sexual violence and socio-legal surveillance in the eighteenth century*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Tunç, Mustafa Şekip. 1921a. Ruha bir dikkat [A glimpse into the soul]. *Dergah* 1(4). 52.
- Tunç, Mustafa Şekip. 1921b. İhtiras Nedir? [What is passion?]. *Dergah* 11(1). 162.
- Unidentified author. 1882. Kalp. tr. Beşir Fuad. *Envar-ı Zeka* 15. 401.
- Uslu, Mehmet Fatih & Fatih Altuğ (eds.). 2014. *Tanzimat ve edebiyat: Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda modern edebi kültür* [Tanzimat and literature: Modern literary culture in Ottoman Istanbul]. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Üstel, Füsün. 2004. *"Makbul vatandaş" in peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten bugüne Türkiye'de vatandaş eğitimi* [In search of an ideal citizen: Civic education in Turkey from the second Constitutional era to today]. Istanbul: İletişim.

- Yıldız, Ahmet. 2001. *Ne mutlu Türküm diyebilene: Türk ulusal kimliğinin etnoseküler sınırları* [How happy is the one who can call himself a Turk: The ethno-secular boundaries of Turkish national identity]. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yılmaz, Hale. 2011. Learning to read (again): The social experiences of Turkey's 1928 Alphabet. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 43(4). 677–697.
- Yılmaz, Hale. 2013. *Becoming Turkish: Nationalist reforms and cultural negotiations in early republican Turkey*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Wilce, James M. 2009. *Language and emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zürcher, J. Erik. 2010. *The young Turk legacy and nation building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*. London: I. B. Tauris.