



New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 5, Issue 4 (2018) 12-22



ISSN 2547-8818

www.prosoc.eu

Selected Paper of 7th Cyprus International Conference on Educational Research (CYICER-2018) 07-09 June, 2018, Acapulco
Hotel Convention Center in Kyrenia, Cyprus

Semantic features of the use of English business terms in Turkic languages

Gulzhan Doszhan*, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 2 Satpayev Street, Astana 010008, Republic of
Kazakhstan

Suggested Citation:

Doszhan, G. (2018). Semantic features of the use of English business terms in Turkic languages. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 5(4), pp 12–22. Available from:
www.prosoc.eu

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Huseyin Uzunboylu, Near East University, Cyprus
©2018 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

It is to consider that on the basis of international relationships, interlingual contacts amplify, certainly, loanwords concern to one of its main indicators. The dictionary fund of any language is enriched at the expense of the internal lexical resources of this language and at the expense of loanwords of other languages. In this regard, it should be noted that Turkic languages accept a large number of borrowings and terms from English. Such language situation is one of the reasons for the emergence of an interference process as a result of which the standard of speech of the Turkic people is broken. In this paper, the semantical peculiarities of English business terms in Turkic language are comprehensively analysed and puts forward a number of constructive recommendations on the development of Turkic terminological fund.

Keywords: English business terms, Turkic languages, semantics, language contacts.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Gulzhan Doszhan**, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 2 Satpayev Street,
Astana 010008, Republic of Kazakhstan.
E-mail address: gul2005@list.ru / Tel.: +7-702-666-0815

1. Introduction

The objective of this study is a description of lexical-semantic features of borrowed English business terms inside the range of terminological groups of contemporary Turkic languages such as Turkish and Kazakh.

The analysed group of business terms of English-American origin is investigated parallelly in the stock of words of Turkish and Kazakh languages and in their professional and stylistic variations as well as on the level of everyday speech activity of native speakers determined by their speech culture.

Functioning of this intensively growing lexical group reflects a wide range of social-economic processes occurring in modern Turkic states. This active layer of a lexical system of language, on the one hand, bears an evidence of the scientific and technical progress of these countries involved in the process of globalization, on the other hand, the problem of Anglicisms—is an interesting object for sociolinguistic observations.

Subject and ideographic classification of the borrowed English business terms allows drawing a conclusion about the change of both conceptual and linguistic world images of the Turkic nations, about new phenomena in their social life requiring a language fixation.

Penetration of borrowed English business terms in Turkic languages connected with the multi-level financial business processes fixed at the lexical level of this language being under the influence of American–British culture, semantic features of which remain insufficiently studied.

2. Theoretical and methodological basis for research

The theoretical basis of research was prepared based on ideas and views of such scientists as Danilenko, Dijk, Evans, Golovin, Johanson, Kandelaki, Karasik, Kiyak, Kurmanbayuli, Khudaybergenova, Leontyev, Leychik, Lotte, Levinson, Potebnya, Sorokin, Tatarinov, Vinokur, Waterman, Zhuravlev as well as papers of other domestic and foreign linguists involved with problems of language contacts.

The methodological basis of the study includes works of modern linguists on general and Turkic linguistics, on the theory of borrowings, on sociolinguistics, prepared using materials about languages of various systems. To solve the tasks assigned in this research, we used descriptive and comparative methods: the first one was used for selection and classification of language materials, the second one—as the basis to establish lexical-semantic interlinguistic ties between lexical items; method of componential analysis—was used to fix the limits of the subject of the study.

3. Contact linguistics: Concepts and issues

According to the results of studies by a linguist J. Waterman, it is possible to find such interesting facts on the interaction and interpenetration of the various cultures and languages:

‘The most common way that languages influence each other is the exchange of words. Much is made about the contemporary borrowing of English words into other languages, but this phenomenon is not new, nor is it very large by historical standards. The large-scale importation of words from Latin, French and other languages into English in the 16th and 17th centuries were more significant. Some languages have borrowed so much that they have become scarcely recognizable. Armenian borrowed so many words from Iranian languages, for example, that it was at first considered a branch of the Indo-Iranian languages. It was not recognized as an independent branch of the Indo-European languages for many decades’ (Waterman, 1976).

According to the theory of ‘language contacts’, the Swedish linguist L. Johanson made the significant contribution to the research of loanwords in the lexical fund of Turkic languages. A framework of its scientific studies was not limited to only one of Turkic languages. Studying the history

of the development of the lexical fund of all Turkic languages, he offered the conception 'Code-Copying Model'.

The Code-Copying Model, developed by L. Johanson has been used to describe and explain the effects of language contact in various settings, but with a bias for settings that involve a Turkic language. The model has much to offer to contact linguistics in general, especially the explanatory potential of attractiveness. Language change is notoriously hard to predict, but if we can find out what exactly determines an element's degree of attractiveness, we can start forming hypotheses. Attractiveness must clearly be a relative notion, in the sense that things are attractive in a given contact situation, with a given pair of languages in a given sociolinguistic setting, rather than in an absolute sense. Furthermore, differentiation and relativisation of attractiveness appear necessary. As Johanson distinguishes between copying in imposition ($L1 > L2$) and in adoption ($L2 > L1$), it may be potentially useful to view attractiveness separately in adoption and in imposition, as they are not necessarily the same. The model views different degrees of copying: an item has material, semantic, combinational and frequent properties that can copy entirely (corresponds to lexical borrowing) or partially (corresponds to 'loan morphosyntax', 'loan semantics', etc.). The two types of copying referred to as global and selective copying, respectively. In this light, some units may prove to be attractive for global copying and yet some for selective copying (Johanson, 1998).

The analysis of linguistic papers dedicated to the problem of borrowings shows a permanent aspiration of linguists to expand the area of study of loanwords as 'import of concepts' being investigated in cultural linguistics and cognitive linguistics (Karasik, 2002). Up until now, many linguists agree that in order to have a more thorough understanding of certain facts of language, it is necessary to step over the bounds of linguistics to the area of mental processes of the individual. Thus, having developed ideas of Ferdinand von Humboldt, A. A. Potebnya points out that 'the world of mankind in each moment is subjective, it is the change of world view', and language—is 'not a reflection of the existing world view but an activity composing it' (Potebnya, 1993). Leontev (1997) considers language as the system of reference points required for a person to carry out activity in the world of his native culture, i.e., in social and objective world, and the consciousness—as 'world pattern opening to the subject in which he himself is included, as well as his actions and status'.

Having understood the entire complexity of this problem, we, however, suggest that the use of borrowings by various people will depend on many factors of objective and subjective nature, and understanding and interpretation of some borrowings by an individual can differ from definitions proposed in dictionaries and educational guidance. In spite of the rapid development of the society, the cultural interaction and globalization processes are demonstrated in language by new words and this is quite natural; 'old' language can be constantly seen under 'new language' with its finite attitude to life and death, to labour and money, to man and woman and to 'strangers'. The reasons for borrowing words are probably should be looked for not in the language itself and not in speech (text) but in an extralinguistic reality. New meanings (as well as new words) appear under coercion of an extralinguistic reality; as a result of an abstractive work of human thinking disclosing traits of similarity between individual items and performing a transfer of title from one subject to another under the influence of various reasons of both the objective and subjective nature.

In any area of human activity, one of the key problems is the common conceptual base and the corresponding special thematic terminology. The issue on the preparation of sectorial terminological dictionaries is one of the vital ones in modern linguistics. This issue is discussed in papers of the leading domestic and foreign scientists during several decades as it is closely connected with such problems as the status of the terminology and its place in the language system, peculiarities of the system forming terms of different languages and many other issues.

Among the definitions of the notion 'term' which are existing in modern linguistics, we are inclined to adhere to the definition proposed by Leychik (1989): 'Term is the lexical unit of the certain language

for special purposes denoting the common—certain or abstract—notion of the theory of certain special field of knowledge or activity’.

In Soviet linguistics, there are two main approaches known in the study of the term: normative and descriptive. At a normative approach, the term is considered as a lexical unit of a certain type with the special semantic and grammatical structure which distinguishes it from the words of a common literary language. The followers of a normative approach worked out requirements to the term, the essence of which lies in the fact that such term shall be monosemantic, clear, systematic, brief and without synonyms (Kandelaki, 1979; Kiyak, 1989; Lotte, 1961; Tatarinov, 1994). In their studies, a term is presented not as a dynamic element, functioning in living speech and, therefore, being subject to changes, but as a static element of the sphere of fixation. Such a term is called ‘an ideal term’ in the linguistic literature.

Studying the term in the area of its functioning, the followers of the descriptive approach cast doubts on appropriateness to impose requirements to terms as to the static element of the sphere of fixation (Danilenko, 1971; Golovin, 1971; Vinokur, 1939). The specificity of this approach, in their opinion, consists in the fact that term is not a specific word, but just a word in a special function. It means that any word can be the term, and any term can pass to the sphere of commonly used vocabulary. Distinctions between the term and the word in non-terminological use lie not in the sphere of their functioning. At that, the term being the linguistic unit belongs to language and abides by its laws, modifying in each specific case, so it can be polysemic; it is peculiar for it to have synonyms, antonyms and phrases when expressing the defined notion. Modern studies confirm the rightness of the followers of the descriptive approach and we share their opinions in relation to the object under consideration—the term—in full.

A language having borrowed foreign words does not leave them invariable over a long period of time. These words are gradually converted in compliance with their phonetic, morphologic and lexical regularities and brought into line with the system of language in the whole, i.e., they are exposed to the process of adoption and assimilation. As a result of this process, all borrowings lose their alien nature, discontinue attracting attention against the vocabulary being specific for the borrowing language and become its integral part.

On the principle that borrowed words are changed according to the internal laws of a target language in their grammatical structure, sound appearance and meaning, the linguistics sets three types of borrowings assimilation: grammatical (morphological), phonetic and lexical assimilation. However, these three types of assimilation are closely related as they all have their own peculiarities, their own specificity.

3.1. Grammatical assimilation

Forming a connection with the vocabulary of goal language, all borrowed words are subject to the laws of development of the basic word stock, which jointly with a grammatical system of the language change them according to internal laws of language development. The process of assimilation of borrowed words in any language is expressed first of all in their subordinacy to its grammatical system. The grammatical system worked out during the epochs which penetrates into the essence of the language, including its lexical fund.

3.2. Phonetic assimilation

As soon as one or another foreign word is borrowed, its sound appearance undergoes changes and is subordinate to the regularities of the sound system of the borrowing language. If the borrowed word is fixed in the language, disseminates in it, then it will be inevitably subject to the process of phonetic assimilation; at that, its completeness and speed will be determined as peculiarities of the sound composition of this word and also its importance and prevalence in the language.

3.3. Lexical assimilation

The issue of lexical assimilation can be resolved correctly on the basis of two moments: 1) relationship between borrowed words to the basic word stock and to all the remaining vocabulary of the language; 2) subordinacy of borrowed words to specific lexical regularities of the language and internal laws of its vocabulary development.

The word falling within the foreign language environment loses contact with the words of its native language and is subordinate to lexical regularities of the borrowing language in its further development. It is expressed in the fact that this word gradually becomes more and more common to use in this language; it gains the capacity to word formation, develops polysemy, is freely combined with words of original vocabulary and enters the composition of phraseological units.

Taking into consideration all the above mentioned, we can emphasize the following features of lexical assimilation of borrowed words and terms:

1. Borrowed words and terms lose their primary etymologic meanings peculiar to them in the source language that is usually accompanied by the loss of their former conceptual ties as well as their inner form;
2. further development of these words and terms are going in accordance with the laws of development of vocabulary of this language, which is expressed in semantic and stylistic differentiation of borrowings under the influence of synonymous vocabulary of the borrowing language and in appearance of new figurative meanings that are absent to the corresponding words in the source language;
3. Degree of combination of borrowings with the words of native language and their ability to enter phraseological units;
4. Development of word-formation efficiency of borrowed words in English language;
5. Borrowed words and terms acquire a nationwide usage up to their inclusion into a basic word stock of this language.

Scientific-and-technological progress, cultural and educational achievements of one nation is as a rule gradually becomes the achievements of other nations. When communicating and sharing information, the certain linguistic elements, mostly lexical ones, are exchanged inevitably. Lexical changes of various intensities occur in different periods of the language development. ‘...Gradual evolution of vocabulary under the suitable conditions and at a given historical time results in its significant transformations. Lexemes are changed not only gradually and permanently, but irregularly in the periods of especially intensive social life, in the periods of significant and cardinal social-cultural changes...’ (Sorokin, 1965). Turkish and Kazakh languages are not the exceptions in this regard. In particular, their contacts with the world languages are rooted in the remote past. Alien borrowing is characteristic for all periods of development of the Turkish and Kazakh standard languages. Through the whole history of its development, the agglutinative Turkish and Kazakh languages were being affected by various languages.

4. The role of English business terms in the formation of business discourse of Turkic nations

‘Each world language of the present-day humanity development functions as:

- i. a language based on which one of the greatest national cultures was established;
- ii. a basic language of the modern science, culture, engineering and collaboration of people of one or more large regions of the world;
- iii. one of the languages of the world development;
- iv. one of the languages for international community and collaboration’ (Zhuravlev, 1984). There is no doubt that English complies with these requirements mostly.

Intensification of political-economic and cultural-humanitarian integrations of the countries of the world in the conditions of globalization influences on the increase in interlingual contacts. As the most important means of the international communication English language is applied at all levels of the international relations, being in many countries as the state or official language, it is in a great demand in the system of the public relations in a number of the world countries. After the II world war, the role of English language sharply increased. At the beginning of XXI century, the English language managed to turn into a language of science and engineering, an innovation and technology, the spheres of informatisation and culture, economy and business.

In this regard, the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nazarbayev in the address to the people of Kazakhstan 'Strategy Kazakhstan—2050: New Political Course of the Established State' noted the importance of English words in the terminological system of the Kazakh language: 'It is necessary to remember that any language develops in the case when it is in interrelation with other language. If the basis of a modern scientific terminology was made by the words which have entered from Latin, during the development of information technology, the English language surely takes root into other languages of the world with the new words and concepts. We shouldn't lag behind this process.

After creation of a rich terminological fund of the Kazakh language conforming to high requirements of modernity, we have to introduce it step by step to all spheres of the public relations. We should conduct modernisation of the Kazakh language. It is necessary to make the language modern, to look for consensus in terminology issues, forever resolving the issues of translating international and foreign words into the Kazakh language. These issues should not be resolved by a circle of solitary figures. The Government should resolve this. There are terms commonly adopted in the whole world that enrich any language. But tend to make life unnecessarily complicated, we often bring in confusion to our minds and swarm our own archaic memories. There are plenty of examples like that' (Nazarbayev, 2012).

According to a long-term Strategy 'Kazakhstan—2050' studying of a role of the English language in a lexical and terminological system of the Kazakh language, it is one of the main objectives of domestic philological science. In recent years, the most part of English loanwords in the lexical fund of Turkic languages are business lexemes. In this regard, the official, scientific, publicistic and literary texts in the Kazakh and Turkish languages in oral and written communication semantic mistakes in which incorrect understanding of values of English business lexemes and terms, remoteness from the value of the original word, in direct translation or lack of an emotional and estimated connotation of words are often met. The review on research materials shows a lack of works in domestic linguistics in complex investigating semantic aspects of English business lexemes in Turkic languages. It is a reason for why the business discourse of Turkic nations has not created yet. All aforesaid allows defining the relevance of a subject and necessity of its scientific judgment.

5. Semantic analysis of the use of English business terms in Turkic languages

One of the well-known linguists of Kazakhstan Sherubay Kurmanbayuli noted the relevance of complex research on integrative aspects of issues of borrowings: 'It would seem that various name of the borrowed foreign words during the different periods of development of society, formation of terminology isn't so significant. Actually, it is necessary to approach to this circumstance seriously because by means of these names it is possible to define on how many loanwords by the national intellectuals, scientific community, and society as a whole are estimated. The borrowed terms carry out not only nominative activity, but also estimated. It is the most important problem for language which needs to be considered from the linguistic and psycholinguistic point of view' (Kurmanbayuli, 2001).

It is known that the originality of concrete language is caused by two groups of factors:

- i. its origin defining a place of language in a circle of related languages;
- ii. its interaction with related and unrelated languages, i.e., language contacts.

Language contacts are one of the most important factors of extra linguistic character promoting creation in the language of certain innovations. Practically, each language comes under the influence of the next languages in diachronic process. Social and language interaction between various states and the people expands and deepens language contacts.

Modern linguistics questions of semantics belong to an object of research of a functional lexicology. In research works of the western linguists, the semantics of the borrowed lexemes are focused in two research tendencies. Thus, British linguists and cognitologists Evans and Green (2006) point out that 'according to the dictionary view, the core meaning of a word is the information containing in the word's definition. And this is a proper domain of lexical semantics'. The rest information that has connected with the word bears the encyclopedic character and is bound to pragmatics, which is 'an area that some linguists consider to be external to the concerns of linguistics proper'. Pragmatics and semantics are opposed to one another as a science, which deals with the change of word meaning in the process of its functioning, on the one hand, and as a science about the meaning of a word, on the other hand. Thus, the authors sum up from the position of 'dictionary view that semantic knowledge is autonomous from other kinds of knowledge' (Evans & Green, 2006).

As known, Dutch linguist, Levinson (1983) noted: 'The pragmatics investigates the aspects which haven't captured the semantic theory of value', his colleague, the known expert in the field of pragmatics van Dijk (1976) states: 'As pragmatics definition of systems of the description of a language form, value and activity enters'.

Borrowed terms from the European languages are mainly of terminological fund of Turkish. Lately, the language tendency shows that generally English fills a terminological niche of the Turkish language. Anglicisms in the present-day Turkish standard language develop multiple groups of lexical units by thematic and semantic diversities. The most important factor in mastering English words is a necessity to denote new realities in a borrowing language. Appearing new scientific and technical inventions are in need of their own name.

A considerable part of the borrowed terms in Kazakh is used in the nominative function. Semantics peculiar for these words in Russian is transferred to Kazakh as they do not have the equivalents in Kazakh. During penetration of the borrowed word in a new linguistic sphere, the aspiration to convey their semantics through explanation is observed as it is incomprehensible for speakers of the borrowing language.

Percentage ratio of vernacular and international words in Kazakh has not been studied yet. First, the borrowing is a long process; second, the etymological dictionaries are not enough. The scientists still debate the translation of international terms into Kazakh. In this connection, the Khudaibergenova (2003) noted that: 'The basic requirement to borrowing the terms is not to use the alien word if the native language has already had a familiar and motivated term with similar meaning. It is desirable to fill the terminological lexical gaps with available international words. In case of unequal level of motivation of the synonymous terms, the preference shall be given to the most motivated terms'.

The English business terms relating to the social-economic life of Turkey and Kazakhstan are emphasized in Table 1:

Table 1. English business terms in Turkish and Kazakh

English business terms in Turkish	English business terms in Kazakh
<i>Aksiyoner (auctionist); avans (advance); acente (agency); agroekonomi (agroecconomy); amortisman (amortization); analiz (analysis); anti-damping (anti-damping); antitrost (anti-trust); bankamatik (bancomatic); banka (bank); banker (banker); baypas (by-pass); blue chips (blue chips); boarding card (boarding card); broker (broker); butce (budget); capital (capital); catering (catering); cash card (cash card); kariyer (career); koentegrasyon (cointegration); koleksiyon (collection) cek (check/cheque); komisyon (commission); konfigurasyon (configuration); konsorsiyum (consortium) kontrat (contract); kooperatif (cooperative); kredi (credit); kriz (crisis); deflasyon (deflation); ekonomik (economic); finans (finance); firma (firm); hypermarket (hypermarket); enflasyon (inflation); leasing (leasing); limit (limit); makroekonomi (macroeconomics); nominal (nominal); operasyon (operation); performans (performance); kota (quota); rasyonalizasyon (rationalization); sektor (sector); transfer (transfer); garanti (warranty), etc.</i>	<i>агент (agent); акция (action); аудит (audit); аудитор (auditor); банк (bank); банкир (banker); бартер (barter); бенефициар (beneficiary); бренд (brand); бюджет (budget); брокер (broker); ваучер (voucher); дилер (dealer); дистрибьютер (distributor); дефолт (default); фирма (firm); менеджмент (management); менеджер (manager); инфляция (inflation); бизнес (business); маркетинг (marketing); дебитор (debtor); депозит (deposit); депозитор (depositor); кредит (credit); кредитор (creditor); экономика (economy); индоссамент (endorsement); индекс (index); импорт (import); экспорт (export); супермаркет (supermarket); гипермаркет (hypermarket); капитал (capital); консалтинг (consulting); инвестиция (investment); инвестор (investor); холдинг (holding); компания (company); индустрия (industry), андеррайтер (underwriter); андеррайтинг (underwriting); факторинг (factoring); франчайзинг (franchizing); демпинг (dumping); офсет (offset), etc.</i>

6. Topical issues of the establishment of the common Turkic terminological fund

The role of the borrowed words in various languages is distinct and depends on specific and historical conditions of the development of each language. In this regards, Turkic languages have much in common both with the grammar system and lexical structure. The similarity of Turkic languages enables each Turkic languages to be mutually enriched with the vernacular words among themselves. However, they did not always have an opportunity to be mutually enriched at various stages of the complex history.

In June 1924, during the First Congress of Kazakh Intelligency which congregated in Orenburg, the founder of the Kazakh linguistics, great scientist Ahmet Baitursynov has proved how the words of Turkic people could be used and noted that ‘in absence of the alike terms in Kazakh, they should be borrowed from the languages kindred to Kazakh. It is performed on the following grounds:

- i. although the most of words of the kindred languages do not have the common forms but have the common roots, so they are easily understood, heard and they are not as strange for pronunciation as a word of non-kindred language;
- ii. Turkic people had and have the continuous communication among themselves, and therefore, the most of the words of one language can be known for the representatives of another language without any common roots’ (Kurmanbayuli, 2001).

After a long time, the first attempts to facilitate in collaboration of Turkic countries in this regard were taken in 1999 when a special task group was established with the help of the Turkish Information Society. October 2001, the First Turkological Forum was arranged with regard to the collaboration in information technologies. Later on, the meetings in Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan were arranged with regard to various spheres of terminology. In 2011, the Ninth Forum of Terminologists of Turkic Countries was arranged in Astana by the Committee on Languages of the

Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Kazakhstan together with the Turkey Committee on Languages and Turkish Society of Information Technology. The turkologists gathered at the forum to try and strengthen ties of fraternal peoples in science and, basing on the worldwide experience of cooperation of kindred languages, develop a strategy for borrowing and unifying terminology; create a common fund of industry terminology, especially in information technology.

In recent years, the idea of the creating of the common Turkic terminological fund gained a new impulse. It promoted establishment Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States (CCTS) in 2009 as an international intergovernmental organisation, with the overarching aim of promoting comprehensive cooperation among Turkic States. Its four founding member states are Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey. Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan abstained from accession to this organization.

In May 25, 2010 in Astana, the President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev and the President of Turkey Abdullah Gul opened the new research centre—Turkic academy. The initiative of the establishment of Turkic academy, which would be engaged in studying and research of language, history and culture of the Turkic people, belongs to the Kazakhstan leader and to them for the first time was stated in October 2009 at the IX Summit of Heads of the Turkic countries in Nakhichevan (Azerbaijan).

In consideration of the recommendations by the Council of Wise Men, which serves as the advisory board of the CCTS, a Terminology Committee was set up with the participation of academics from the member states of this organization in 2012.

First Meeting of the Terminology Committee, founded with a view of convergence among national languages of the Turkic Council, was held in Istanbul on November 16, 2012.

The Meeting brought together scholars commissioned by the governments as national representatives as well as experts from member states of Turkic council, Turkic academy, heads and analysts of Turkic linguistic structures.

Participants elaborated on the basic principles of developing common terminology and agreed that the related academic endeavours should be collected under a single roof and expedited. Other issues agreed upon during the Meeting which include preparation of a glossary of common terms and an illustrated explanatory dictionary of common words as well as further improvement of the Comparative Dictionary of Turkic Languages. It is expected that the Committee will convene several times a year and the organizational actions in the sphere of all-Turkic terminology will be carried out by the Turkic Academy.

7. Conclusion

Based on the examples given above and reviewed the literature on the study topic, it may be concluded that the English business lexemes and terms penetrated almost in all spheres of the economical communication of Turkey and Kazakhstan.

Studying the semantic features of the English business terms in Kazakh and Turkish, the following trends can be noted:

- i. most of English business lexemes in Turkish were borrowed through French, and through Russian in Kazakh.
- ii. most of English business terms in Kazakh and Turkish were borrowed through semantic assimilation.

It was found out that the most of the borrowed terms in Kazakh and Turkish languages are the international words, i.e., the units of the international lexical fund, in this regard a notion itself denoted by a word is often of internationality.

While studying the works of the Turkish and Kazakh scientists, the negative attitude of linguists to the borrowed words from West-European languages, particularly from English, becomes clear; most of scientists are committed to clean a native language and replace the borrowed words with proper vernacular words or general Turkic terms.

The most important reasons for penetration and use of the words borrowed from English in modern Turkish and Kazakh are of extra linguistically. However, the semantics of these borrowed words in Turkic languages is ambiguous. Due to this, a national coloration, orthographic and pronunciation norms of the lexical fund of a population being the native speaker of these languages is disturbed. This problem can be resolved by the joint efforts of the scientists of Turkic countries. Specifically, it should be noted that establishing a common electronic terminological base of Turkic people and national corps of Turkic peace and its constant updating will facilitate in effective meeting of the goal stated.

References

- Danilenko, V. P. (1971). *Исследования по русской терминологии (Researches on the Russian terminology)*. Сборник статей (The proceedings of papers, p. 231). Moscow, Russia: Nauka.
- Evans V. & Green M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics. An introduction* (830 p). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Golovin, B. N. (1971). *О некоторых аспектах лингвистического и информационного изучения термина (About some aspects of linguistic and informational studying of term)*. Материалы научного симпозиума: «Семиотические проблемы языков науки, терминологии и информатики» (The materials of a scientific symposium «Semiotics Problems of Languages of Science, Terminology and Informatics») (p. 64). Moscow, Russia: MGU.
- Johanson, L. (1998). Code copying in Irano-Turkic. *Language Sciences*, 20, 325–337.
- Kandelaki, T. A. (1979). *Терминологическая работа в системе научных учреждений АН СССР (Terminological work in the system of scientific institutions of AS of the USSR)*. Вопросы языкознания (*Problems of Linguistics*), 5, 123–132.
- Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс (Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse)*. Перемена (Peremena), p. 477.
- Kiyak, T. R. (1989). *Лингвистические аспекты терминоведения: Учеб. пособие (Linguistic aspects of a terminology: manual)*. Kiev, Ukraine: UMK VO.
- Kurmanbayuli, S. (2001). *Туыстас тілдерге ортақ терминологиялық қор қажет (It is necessary to create common terminological fund for related languages)* (p. 30). «Мемлекеттік тілдің қолданылу аясын кеңейту мәселелері» ғылыми-практикалық конференция материалдары. (Materials of scientific-practical conference «Problems of expansion of the sphere of use of a state language»). Kokshetau, Kazakhstan: Kokshe-polygrafia.
- Khudaibergenova, A. (2003). *Принципы построения переводного идеографического словаря банковской терминологий (на материале русского, английского и казахского языков)*. (The principles of creation of the translated ideographic dictionary of the banking terminology (on the materials of Russian, English and Kazakh languages) (p. 28). Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. (Summary of the abstract of the dissertation for the scientific degree of Candidate of Philology). Almaty, Kazakhstan: Izdatelsky dom KazGYU.
- Leontev, A. A. (1997). *Основы психолингвистики (Psycholinguistics bases)*. Moscow, Russia: Smysl.

Doszhan, G. (2018). Semantic features of the use of English business terms in Turkic languages. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 5(4), pp 12-22. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Leychik, V. M. (2009). *Предмет, методы и структура терминоведения* (Subject, methods and structure of terminology). Moscow, Russia: URSS.

Lotte, D. S. (1961). *Основы построения научно-технической терминологии* (Bases of creation of scientific and technical terminology). Moscow, Russia: AN SSSR.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nazarbayev, N. (2012). Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: new political course of the established state.

Potebnya, A. A. (1993). *Мысль и язык* (*Thought and Language*) (p. 192). Kiev, Ukraine.

Sorokin, U. S. (1965). *Развитие словарного состава русского литературного языка в 30–90 гг. XIX века* (*The development of vocabulary of Russian standard language in 30–90 years of XIX century*). Moscow; Leningrad, Russia: Nauka.

Tatarinov, V. A. (1994). *История отечественного терминоведения. Классики терминоведения: Очерк и хрестоматия* (The History of National Terminology. Scholars of Terminology: essay and reader). Moscow, Russia: Moskovskiy litsey.

van Dijk, T. A. (1976). *Pragmatics of language and literature*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: North Holland.

Vinokur, G. O. (1939). *О некоторых явлениях словообразования в русской технической терминологии: Сб. статей по языкознанию* (About some phenomena of word-formation in Russian technical terminology: the collection of articles on linguistics) (pp. 5–6).

Waterman, J. (1976). *A history of the german language* (p. 4). University of Washington Press.

Zhuravlev, V. K. (1984). *Современная идеологическая борьба и проблемы языка* (*Modern ideological fighting and language problems*). Moscow, Russia: Nauka.