

New Trends and Issues
Proceedings on Humanities
and Social Sciences

Volume 6, Issue 5 (2019) 092-098



www.prosoc.eu

Selected Paper of 8th Cyprus International Conference on Educational Research (CYICER-2019) 13-15 June 2019, Cyprus
Science University, North Cypru

Problems of vitality of the Turkic languages in the age of globalisation

Gulzhan Doszhan*, PhD, Associate Professor of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan,
Kazakhstan

Gulzhan Gauriyeva, Candidate of Pedagogical sciences, Professor of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

Suggested Citation:

Doszhan, G. & Gauriyeva, G. (2019). Problems of vitality of the Turkic languages in the age of globalisation. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online].
6(5), pp 092–098. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Received from; revised from; accepted from.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof.Dr. Huseyin Uzunboylu, Near East University, Turkey.

©2019 United World Center of Research Innovation and Publication. All rights reserved.

Abstract

In recent years, there is an apparent increase in interest of linguists to do comparative studies on lexicology over the genetic and typologically related languages. This paper has sought to critically research the role of mutual lexical enrichment of kindred languages and assimilation of loanwords, in particular, anglicisms to the vitality, maintenance and revitalisation of Turkic languages in the age of globalisation. The most important reasons for penetration and use of words and terms borrowed from English in modern Turkic languages have extra linguistic nature. However, intra linguistic factors are not an exception. Owing to distinctions of graphic bases of the alphabets and pronunciation norms of Turkic languages, the level of phonetic, grammatical and semantic assimilation of loanwords and terms in these languages are not identical. Because of incomplete phonological and graphic adaptation of loanwords, it becomes clear that in the Turkic languages national colouring, phonetic and orthographic norms of these languages are partly changed.

Keywords: Vitality, lexical system, Turkic languages, globalisation, anglicisms.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Gulzhan Doszhan**, PhD, Associate Professor of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. *E-mail address:* gul2005@list.ru

1. Introduction

Language and nation are inseparable concepts, and therefore a language's ups and downs naturally depend on the vitality of the people creating it. The language of growing and developing nation is thriving, where in a dying nation, the language disappears. The linguistic theory has long had an eerie term 'dead languages' including not only the languages of small nations and tribes but also great ones in terms of their place and role in the history of planetary civilisation, like Sanskrit, Coptic, Avestan, Hun and even Latin. While calling these languages absolutely hopeless and lifeless would not be quite true: despite the fact that they have long fallen into disuse and no one speaks them, these languages are the progenitors, historical antecedents and fertile ground for many new and modern languages.

Many world-renowned linguists believe that Turkic languages have a clear common origin with the language of the ancient Sumerians, the Etruscans and even the Mayan language without any doubt. Language can be likened to a family tree book, in which the national history is depicted by the universe of words and meanings. Studies of genetic and typological links between related languages allow visualising and objectively reconstructing a picture of ethnic groups, development of nations. Moreover, if to take into account that the nations and ethnicities of the Altaic language family (including along with the Turkic language, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus and even Japanese and Korean) in the second millennium BC spoke the same language, and that the Altaic family and the world's most widespread Indo-European family make up single Nostratic macrofamily, it is easy to suggest a 'linguistic roar' in the history of the Eurasian supercontinent and whose 'tamgas' determined its major landmark milestones.

Intensification of political-economic and cultural-humanitarian integrations of the countries of the world in the conditions of globalisation influences on 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 system of the public relations in a number of the world countries. After the Second World War, the role of English language sharply increased. At the beginning of XXI century, 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 N. A. Nazarbayev in the address to the people of Kazakhstan 'Strategy Kazakhstan-2050' noted importance of research English words in 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 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 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 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 long-term Strategy 'Kazakhstan-2050', studying of the English language in a lexical and terminological system of the Kazakh language—is one of the main objectives of domestic philological science in the context of theory of language vitality. In recent years, the most part of loanwords in vocabulary of Turkic languages are anglicisms. In this regard in official, scientific, media and literary texts in the Kazakh and Turkish languages in oral and written communication semantic mistakes in

which incorrect understanding of values of English lexemes and terms, remoteness from value of the original word, in direct translation or lack of an emotional and estimated connotation of words are often meet. The review on research materials shows lack of works in domestic linguistics in a complex investigating semantic aspects of English words in Turkic languages. And it is a reason for why the vitality of Turkic languages has cause concern. All aforesaid allows defining the relevance of a subject and necessity of its scientific judgment.

2. Theoretical and methodological basis for research

The end of XX and beginning of XXI centuries were marked in the world by dramatically intensified globalisation process. World community experiences a complex period of all social processes which in particular is conditioned also by the development of information technologies. Globalisation covered economic, political and cultural spheres of the society. This phenomenon is discussed in all branches of modern science: sociology, culturology, political science, and, of course, in linguistics.

In this connection, K. Khanazarov, a well-known scientist on linguistic philosophy, considers that 'Globalisation is an objective process which by no means is aimed at causing damage to the existing languages. However, it breaks the basis of languages by its speed-up and expansion, destroys the foundation on which thousands of languages are based, especially languages of small nations, folks, tribes and ethnic groups' (Khanazarov, 2007).

English is a motive power of globalisation and information; therefore, it is called 'global language'. One of the criterions of globalisation of English is quickly spreading anglicisms which bear valuable installations of the West European culture. In this way, the world and national mass media is a spreader of anglicisms in all languages.

The current position of the present day languages primarily depends on the position of their ethnic speakers. If it is remembered that the most states in the modern world are polyethnic, multicultural and mixed-language, these factors also affect the development of official language of any country. As for sociolinguistic and ethnopolitical parameters, the development of official language is significantly affected by such factors as ethnodemographic situation, economic development, political regime, sociocultural capability of people, migration processes, etc. Geopolitical factor also affects the development of official language of one or another state.

Language vitality is an indicator of a language's sustainability, and of the extent to which intervention is needed for its maintenance. Vitality is not a property of a language itself, nor of a population does that speak a language, but rather a description of the relationship between a language, its speakers and its wider linguistic, social and political context. It therefore reflects how the overall language ecology impacts an individual language and its speakers (Stanford & Whaley 2010). Several measures of language vitality exist. Many measure vitality on a unilinear continuum from safe (or some variant) to extinct, e.g., Fishman (1991), Wurm (1996), Krauss (1997, 2007), Lewis & Simons (2010) and Grenoble & Whaley (2006). Such models were rejected for the present purposes, as they do not capture subtle but important shifts in vitality. Instead, Roche used a multi-factorial model that reflects the complexities of language vitality. Two models—the UNESCO Ad-hoc Experts Group on Endangered Languages' (2003) nine-factor model, and the ELDIA (European Language Diversity for All) model—were rejected, as the incompleteness of the historical record made it impossible to provide estimates for so many factors. Instead, Bradley's (2010a) five-factor model was used, as it enabled sufficient detail to be developed from the available historical data. Roche (2017), therefore, focus on these factors in issues of language vitality histories: policy; setting (absolute and relative number of speakers, prestige); reproduction (intergenerational transmission, speakers' attitudes towards their language); identity and domains.

Preservation of indigenous Turkic peoples and ethnic groups and their language on the Eurasian space is a topical and difficult issue. This is related to that globalisation, being the world-scale process, and its roots belong to the economy and policy. The world market and common information space is

the primary motive. Also, the impact of globalisation can be observed at the levels of households and culture, and integration of cultures of more developed countries in native cultures can be seen as well. And this process is very delicate and not always positive.

In context of globalisation, there is undoubtedly an issue related to the language vitality. What parameters does the language vitality have? Currently, the scientists adhere to the following parameters of language vitality:

1. Absolute number of the ethnic speakers;
2. Ratio of the speakers of this language to the total strength of ethnic group;
3. Change of areas of language use;
4. New fields of language use;
5. Mass media;
6. Training materials and literacy rate with regard to this language;
7. National language education plays significant role in its vitality as the literacy rate is closely related to the social and economic development. For this purpose, the training and electronic resources are necessary for various sciences, taking into account all age groups and all levels of the competence in language;
8. Governmental language policy including the official status and use of language;
9. Attitude to the language of members of the corresponding ethnic group;
10. Level of documenting of this language (Azizova, 2010).

Based on the said criterion, this paper will assess the current state and development trends of the lexical fund of Turkic languages, the role and impact of English borrowed words to these languages.

The theoretic and methodological basis of the study include works of modern linguists on general and Turkic linguistics, on theory of borrowings, on sociolinguistics, prepared by using materials about languages of various system. The theoretical basis was prepared based on ideas and views of such scientists as M. Charette, J. Aitchison, M. Clyne, A. Aksoy, B. Brendemoen, E. Haugen, Z. Korkmaz, F. Sezgin, M. Sari, K. Acar, H. Furquan, A. Baitursynov, K. Zhubanov, Sh. Kurmanbayuly, M. Khul-Muhammed as well as papers of other Kazakhstan and foreign linguists involved with problems of language vitality.

To solve the tasks assigned in this paper, we used descriptive and comparative methods: the first one was used for selection and classification of language materials, the second one was used as the basis to establish semantic interlinguistic ties between lexical items; method of componential analysis was used to fix the limits of subject of study; methods of classification and systematisation were also used in this paper as well as methods of linguistic observation and correlation in diachronic aspect.

To guarantee the reliability of results of the study, the sociolinguistic method for correlation of linguistic and social phenomena was taken into account in the process of preparation of this paper. Methods of functional and semantic analysis were widely used in this paper alongside with methods of typological analysis.

3. A brief review to history of development of lexical systems of Turkic languages

In an era of Turkic domination in Eurasia in the wake of the flowering of the Great Turkic khanate, the Turkic language also survived a series of apogees. Ancient Turks invented the world's most advanced writing and engraved the history of the ancestors in immortal lyrics on rocks. Single root of modern Turkic languages spoken by six independent nations—the Turks, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Azeri, Kirghiz, Turkmen, as well as over 30 other ethnic groups totalling about 200 million people is the language of ancient Turks. In 1969, the Institute of Linguistics of the USSR Academy of Sciences released the Old Turkic dictionary of more than 20,000 words and phrases only from the texts of ancient Turkic, so-called 'runic' monuments dating back to VII–XII centuries. The scale of the lexical richness of the ancient Turks' language can be figured out by this comparison: the world literature

classic, Shakespeare, who died in the XVII century, used a total of 15,000 words in all his works (Kul-Muhammed, 2011).

There are about 200 million people in the world belonging to Turkic ethnic groups separated by large territories and various faiths. The one common thing that they share is a language. However, they did not always have an opportunity for mutual renewal of relations and enrichment of languages at different stages of the complex history.

Lexical system of Turkic nations was significantly affected by the Russian language. Almost the whole socio-political and scientific terminological system in the languages of people of the former USSR was borrowed from Russian or developed under its strong influence. Only languages of the Baltic States—Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian—are exceptions. The corresponding terminological systems had been developed in these languages in many ways before Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia entered into a part of the USSR' (Musorin, 2004). In this connection, the Turcologist Kudaybergen Zhubanov in the 60s noted that: 'The prospect for developing Kazakh, a trend for enriching this language with the terms and words, denoting the engineering and actions of modern culture, from foreign languages (mainly from Russian) will not allow ignoring them for no particular reason. Taking this into account and also the necessity to unify the alphabet with the rest (alphabets) of Turkish ethnic groups, these three consonant letters: ϕ [ph], η [h] and χ [kh] should be introduced in (Kazakh) alphabet' (Zhubanov, 1966).

In Post-Soviet territory, Azerbaijani, Altaians (Kumandins, Lebedins, Maymalars, Oyrots, Telengits, Teleses, Teleuts, Tuba, Tubalars, Chalkans, Chuyas), Balkars, Bashkirs, Gagauzs, Kazakhs, Kirghizs, Kara-Kalpaks, Dolgans, Kumyks, Karachays, Nogais, Meskhetian Turks, Tatars (Kazan, Barabin, Siberian, Crimean, Kasim, Mishars, Nogai Tatars, Turins, Ishims, Tarlyks, Teptyars, Arins), Tuvins, Turkmens, Uzbeks, Khakas, (Kachins, Sagays, Beltirs, Kyzyls, Koybals), Uigurs, Chulyum Turks, Shors (Abalars, Abins, Shors), Chuvashs, Yakuts, Karaims speak in Turkic languages.

Azerbaijani, Afshars, Sonkors, Kashnays, Turkmens, Eynalus, Khorosani Turks, Hallajess live in Iran; Turkmens—in Iraq; Afshars, Turkmens, Uzbeks—in Afghanistan; Kazakhs, Tuvins, Khotons—in Mongolia; Uigurs, Lobnors, Kazakhs, Salars, Sary Uigurs, Fu-Yu Kirghiz—in China; Gagauzs, Turks, Tatars—in Bulgaria; Turks—in Yugoslavia and in Albania (Alishev, 1993).

For the last 25 years, the diapason of lexical items of Turkic languages is considerably extended. That is why the majority of lexical structure of Turkic languages is being changed. These changes are closely connected with political, social, technical and cultural spheres of Turkic states. In this regard, the vocabulary of the mentioned languages is filled with international words. Especially professional lexis and term system are being intensively developed, political-social terminology is being formed, the meanings of many terms and loan words are being extended, and cultural, scientific, economical and other new words (neologisms) are appeared.

4. Urgency 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 respect, Turkic languages have much in common both with grammar system and lexical structure. Similarity of Turkic languages enables each Turkic language to be mutually enriched with the vernacular words among themselves. However, Turkic nations 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 Intelligence which congregated in Orenburg, the founder of the Kazakh linguistics 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:

- 1) although the most of words of the related 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;
- 2) Turkic people had and have continues 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' (Kurmanbayuly, 2001).

After the long time, the first attempts to facilitate in collaboration of Turkic-language countries in this regard were taken in 1999 when a special task group was established through the help of the Turkish Information Society. In October 2001, the First Turcological 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 9th 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 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. To 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 organisation.

President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev and President of Turkey, Abdullah Gül, opened the new research center—Turkic academy in May 25, 2010 in Astana. The initiative of 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, terminology committee was set up with the participation of academics from the member states of this organisation 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 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 organisational actions in the sphere of all-Turkic terminology will be carried out by the Turkic Academy.

5. Conclusion

This paper has sought to critically research the role of mutual lexical enrichment of kindred languages and assimilation of loanwords, in particular, anglicisms to the vitality, maintenance and revitalisation of Turkic languages in the age of globalisation. The most important reasons for penetration and use of the words and terms borrowed from English in modern Turkic languages have

extra linguistic nature. However, intra linguistic factors aren't an exception. Owing to distinctions of graphic bases of the alphabets and pronunciation norms of Turkic languages, the level of phonetic, grammatical and semantic assimilation of loanwords and terms in these languages are not identical. Because of incomplete phonological and graphic adaptation of loanwords, it becomes clear that in the Turkic languages national colouring, phonetic and orthographic norms of these languages are partly changed. This problem can be resolved by the joint efforts of the scientists of Turkic countries. Specifically, it should be noted that the establishing a common electronic terminological fund of Turkic people and national corps of Turkic world and its constant updating will facilitate effectively in meeting the stated goals.

References

- Alishev, A. (1993). *Turkic phenomenon*. Karachay-Balkar world. Retrieved from <http://www.elbrusoid.org/articles/poznat/387258/>
- Azizova, N. (2010). *Globalization and problems of development of the Uzbek language*. Retrieved from <https://www.coursehero.com/file/26027135/Azizova-N-Globalisation-and-Problems-of-Development-of-the-Uzbek-Lanquaqedoc/>
- Kul-Muhammed, M. (2011). *Treasury of the Kazakh language*. Retrieved from <http://www.kazpravda.kz>
- Khanazarov, K. Kh. (2007) *К проблеме развития философии языка* (p. 134) (To a problem of development of philosophy of language) Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
- Kurmanbayuly, Sh. (2001). *Туыстас тілдерге ортақ терминологиялық қор қажет* (It is necessary to create common terminological fund for related languages) // «Мемлекеттік тілдің қолданылу аясын кеңейту мәселелері» ғылыми-практикалық конференция материалдары (p. 30). (Materials of scientific-practical conference «Problems of expansion of the sphere of use of a state language»). Kokshetau, Kazakhstan: Kokshe-polygrafia.
- Musorin A. (2004). *Основы науки о языке* ((p. 196) (Science bases about language). Educational supply. Novosibirsk: Novosibirskoe knижное izdatelstvo.
- Nazarbayev, N. (2012). Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: new political course of the established state. Retrieved from <https://primeminister.kz/enpage/article-101>
- Roche, G. (2017). *Linguistic vitality, endangerment, and resilience* (vol. 11, pp. 190–223). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press. Retrieved from <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/lcd> <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24733>
- Zhubanov, K. (1966). *Қазақ тілі жөніндегі зерттеулер* (Reseaches about Kazakh language) (p. 265). Almaty.