

UDC 81.26; IRSTI 16.31.41

<https://doi.org/10.47526/2025-4/2664-0686.273>I.K. YERBULATOVA¹, D.Zh. KUSSAINOVA², A.A. AKBULATOV³¹PhD, Associate Professor, Zhangir Khan West Kazakhstan Agrarian Technical University

(Kazakhstan, Uralsk), e-mail: ilmira.1985@inbox.ru

²Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor
University of Innovation and Technology of Western Kazakhstan
(Kazakhstan, Uralsk), e-mail: dina_kusainova@mail.ru³Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Makhambet Utemisov West Kazakhstan University
(Kazakhstan, Uralsk), e-mail: aidarbek_akbulat@mail.ru

LINGUOPOETICS AND CULTURAL CODES: FEATURES OF TRANSLATING ABAI QUNANBAIULY'S WORKS INTO TURKIC LANGUAGES

Abstract. This study examines the complex interplay between linguopoetics and cultural codes in the translation of Abai Kunanbayev's foundational works across Turkic languages. As a seminal figure in Kazakh literature, Abai's texts present unique challenges for translators due to their rich poetic devices, philosophical depth, and cultural specificity. The research investigates how different Turkic-language translations preserve – or distort – the original's linguopoetic features (rhythm, metaphor, syntactic parallelism) and embedded cultural semantics (nomadic concepts, Islamic references, and Kazakh oral traditions).

Using a comparative analysis of translations into Uzbek, Turkish, and Tatar, the paper identifies three key translation strategies: domestication (adapting content to target cultures), foreignization (preserving source-culture elements), and hybrid approaches. Special attention is given to culturally marked lexemes – such as *zhyr* (heroic epic) and *tamyr* (ancestral roots) – whose semantic fields shift across Turkic variants. The methodology combines corpus linguistics (frequency analysis of poetic formulae) with hermeneutic interpretation of translator choices.

Findings reveal that: Syntactic structures proving most resistant to translation are those mirroring Kazakh oral recitation patterns; Translations into closely related Turkic languages (e.g., Tatar) retain more morphological parallelism than distant ones (e.g., Turkish); 19th-century Islamic terminology undergoes either neutralization or explanatory compensation in modern versions. The study contributes to debates about cultural untranslatability while proposing a “Turkic literary translation framework” that prioritizes: metrical correspondence over strict rhyme, ethno-cultural glossing, and paratextual commentary.

These insights problematize the assumption of Turkic linguistic kinship, ensuring translation fidelity, demonstrating how even cognate languages require active cultural mediation. The research draws on archival materials from the Abai Studies Center (Almaty) and digital corpora of Turkic

* Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз:

Yerbulatova I.K., Kussainova D.Zh., Akbulatov A.A. Linguopoetics and Cultural Codes: Features of Translating Abai Qunanbaiuly's Works into Turkic Languages // *Ясауи университетінің хабаршысы*. – 2025. – №4 (138). – Б. 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2025-4/2664-0686.273>

*Cite us correctly:

Yerbulatova I.K., Kussainova D.Zh., Akbulatov A.A. Linguopoetics and Cultural Codes: Features of Translating Abai Qunanbaiuly's Works into Turkic Languages // *Iasau universitetinin habarshysy*. – 2025. – №4 (138). – P. 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2025-4/2664-0686.273>

Date of receipt of the article 17.06.2025 / Date of publication 30.12.2025

translations (1980–2020), offering new methodological approaches for analyzing literary transfer within language families.

Keywords: literary translation, linguopoetics, cultural codes, Abai Kunanbayev, Turkic languages, translation strategies.

И.К. Ербулатова¹, Д.Ж. Кусайнова², А.А. Акбулатов³

¹*PhD, доцент, Жәңгір хан атындағы Батыс Қазақстан аграрлық-техникалық университеті (Қазақстан, Орал қ.), e-mail: iltira.1985@inbox.ru*

²*педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор
Батыс Қазақстан инновациялық-технологиялық университеті
(Қазақстан, Орал қ.), e-mail: dina_kusainova@mail.ru*

³*филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор
М. Өтемісов атындағы Батыс Қазақстан университеті
(Қазақстан, Орал қ.), e-mail: aidarbek_akbulat@mail.ru*

Лингвопоэтика және мәдени кодтар:

Абай Құнанбайұлы шығармаларының түркі тілдеріне аударылу ерекшеліктері

Андатпа. Бұл зерттеу Абай Құнанбайұлы мұраларының түркі тілдеріне аударылуындағы лингвопоэтика мен мәдени кодтардың күрделі өзара байланысын қарастырады. Қазақ әдебиетінің көрнекті өкілі ретінде Абайдың поэзиясы – бай поэтикалық тәсілдерімен, терең философиялық мазмұнымен және ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктерімен аудармашылар үшін ерекше күрделі мәтін. Зерттеу барысында Абай шығармаларының өзбек, түрік және татар тілдеріндегі аудармаларында түпнұсқаның лингвопоэтикалық элементтері (ырғақ, метафоралар, синтаксистік параллелизм) мен мәдени семантикасы (көшпелі дүниетаным, исламдық тұспалдар, қазақтың ауыз әдебиетінің үлгілері) қалай сақталып немесе өзгеріске ұшырайтыны талданады.

Өзбек, түрік, татар тілдеріндегі аудармаларды салыстырмалы талдау негізінде аударманың үш негізгі бағыты айқындалды: доместикация (мазмұнды қабылдаушы мәдениетке бейімдеу), форенизация (түпнұсқа мәдениетінің элементтерін сақтау) және гибридік тәсілдер. Зерттеу барысында «жыр» (батырлық эпос) мен «тамыр» (рулық тегі мен шығу төркінін білдіретін ұғым) сияқты мәдени тұрғыдан маркерленген лексемалардың семантикалық өрістерінің басқа түркі тілдеріндегі аударма нұсқаларында қалайша өзгертіндігіне ерекше назар аударылады. Әдіснама корпустық лингвистиканы (поэтикалық негіздердің қолданылу жиілігін талдау) герменевтикалық интерпретациялаудағы аудармашылық шешімдердің тұрғысынан қарастыруды ұсынады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері қазақтың ауызекі сөйленім дәстүрін көрсететін синтаксистік құрылымдардың аударуға ең ыңғайлы екендігін көрсетеді; туыстас түркі тілдерінің ішіндегі ең жақындары (мысалы, татар тіліне) жасалған аудармаларда түрік тілі сияқты тілдерге қарағанда морфологиялық параллелизмді көбірек сақтайды; XIX ғасырдағы ислам терминдік ұғымдары қазіргі аудармаларда не бейтараптандырылады, не түсіндірмелі мәнмәтін түрінде ұсынылады.

Зерттеу мәдени аударма мүмкіндігінің шектеулері жөніндегі пікірталасқа үлес қосып, «түркі әдеби аударма моделін» ұсынады. Бұл модель қатаң ұйқасқа емес, метрикалық сәйкестікке, этномәдени түсініктеме беруге және мәнмәтіндік түсіндірмелерді (глоссарийлер, аннотациялар, кіріспе сөздер) қолдануға басымдық береді.

Зерттеу қорытындысында түркі тілдерінің туыстығы аударма жасауда дәл, нақтылықты қамтамасыз етпейтінін, керісінше, тіпті туыстас тілдер арасында да белсенді мәдени делдалдық қажет екенін көрсетеді. Жұмыс Абайтану орталығының (Алматы) архивтік

материалдарына және 1980–2020 жылдар аралығындағы түркі тілдеріндегі аудармалардың цифрлық корпусына сүйене отырып, тілдік туыстық шеңберіндегі әдеби аудармаларды зерттеудің жаңа әдістемелік тәсілдерін ұсынады.

Кілт сөздер: әдеби аударма, лингвопоэтика, мәдени кодтар, Абай Құнанбайұлы, түркі тілдері, аударма стратегиялары.

И.К. Ербулатова¹, Д.Ж. Кусаинова², А.А. Акбулатов³

¹*PhD, доцент, Западно-Казахстанский аграрно-технический университет им. Жангир хана (Казахстан, г. Уральск), e-mail: ilmira.1985@inbox.ru*

²*кандидат педагогических наук, ассоциированный профессор Западно-Казахстанский инновационно-технологический университет (Казахстан, г. Уральск), e-mail: dina_kusainova@mail.ru*

³*кандидат филологических наук, ассоциированный профессор Западно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Утемисова (Казахстан, г. Уральск), e-mail: aidarbek_akbulat@mail.ru*

Лингвопоэтика и культурные коды: особенности перевода фундаментальных трудов Абая Кунанбаева в тюркоязычном пространстве

Аннотация. Данное исследование изучает сложное взаимодействие лингвопоэтики и культурных кодов в переводах фундаментальных трудов Абая Кунанбаева на тюркские языки. Как ключевая фигура казахской литературы, тексты Абая представляют особые трудности для переводчиков из-за богатых поэтических приемов, философской глубины и культурной специфики. В работе анализируется, как различные переводы на тюркские языки сохраняют или искажают лингвопоэтические особенности оригинала (ритм, метафоры, синтаксический параллелизм) и встроенную культурную семантику (кочевые концепты, исламские референции, казахские устные традиции).

На основе сравнительного анализа переводов на узбекский, турецкий и татарский языки в исследовании выделяются три ключевые стратегии перевода: доместикация (адаптация содержания под культуры перевода), форенизация (сохранение элементов культуры оригинала) и гибридные подходы. Особое внимание уделяется культурно-маркированным лексемам – таким как «жыр» (героический эпос) и «тамыр» (родовые корни) – чьи семантические поля смещаются в различных тюркских вариантах. Методология сочетает корпусную лингвистику (анализ частотности поэтических формул) с герменевтической интерпретацией переводческих решений.

Результаты показывают, что наиболее устойчивыми к переводу оказываются синтаксические структуры, отражающие казахские модели устного рецитирования; переводы на близкородственные тюркские языки (например, татарский) сохраняют больше морфологического параллелизма, чем переводы на дистантные языки (например, турецкий); терминология исламского происхождения XIX века подвергается либо нейтрализации, либо объяснительной компенсации в современных версиях. Исследование вносит вклад в дискуссии о культурной непереводаемости, предлагая «тюркскую литературно-переводческую модель», которая отдает приоритет: метрическому соответствию перед строгой рифмой, этнокультурному комментированию и паратекстуальным пояснениям.

Эти выводы ставят под сомнение предположение о том, что тюркское языковое родство гарантирует переводческую точность, демонстрируя, что даже родственные языки требуют активного культурного посредничества. Исследование использует архивные материалы Центра изучения Абая (Алматы) и цифровые корпуса тюркских переводов (1980–2020 гг.),

предлагая новые методологические подходы к анализу литературного трансфера внутри языковых семей.

Ключевые слова: литературный перевод, лингвопоэтика, культурные коды, Абай Кунанбаев, тюркские языки, стратегии перевода.

Introduction

The translation of foundational literary works across linguistic boundaries invariably grapples with the tension between form and meaning, a challenge magnified when source and target languages share historical ties but divergent cultural evolutions. Abai Kunanbayev's (1845–1904) *Kara Sozder* (Book of Words) epitomizes this duality [1, pp. 56–69]. While its Turkic linguistic roots might suggest seamless translatability among sister languages (e.g., Uzbek, Tatar, Turkish), its embedded nomadic epistemologies and orature-derived poetics demand active cultural mediation. This study interrogates this paradox through a systematic analysis of Abai's works in Turkic translations, focusing on the interplay of linguopoetic features and cultural codes.

A notable project to translate Abai's writings into several Turkic languages, launched around his 175th anniversary, revealed significant obstacles in conveying the original's poetic cadence and cultural depth. This research investigates the extent to which these translations retain or transform the source's linguopoetic elements and embedded cultural meanings. It focuses on the strategies adopted – domestication, foreignization, and hybrid methods – and evaluates their impact on transmitting core concepts [2; 3].

Through a comparative study of Uzbek, Turkish, and Tatar versions, the analysis uncovers patterns and divergences in translation practice. The importance of this study lies in its contribution to cultural translation theory, offering insights into how practices can uphold both linguistic precision and cultural fidelity, even among closely related languages.

Archival research reveals:

- Tatar translations (e.g., Färit Yarullin's 1987 version) prioritize morphological kinship, preserving agglutinative rhythms but flattening nomadic metaphors [4];
- Turkish renditions (e.g., 2020 Ankara edition) employ Islamic glossaries, altering Abai's syncretic tone toward theological formalism [5];
- Uzbek variants (e.g., 1995 Tashkent) domesticate pastoral idioms, substituting Kazakh steppe imagery with Fergana-valley analogues [6].

This work advances: a differentiated model of Turkic literary translation, rejecting assumptions of “automatic” mutual intelligibility; protocols for ethnocultural annotation in editions targeting Turkic audiences.

Research methods and materials

This study employs an interdisciplinary methodology combining quantitative corpus linguistics with qualitative hermeneutic analysis. The research design addresses both macro-level patterns and micro-level interpretive decisions.

The foundation of this study is a specialized digital corpus comprising Abai's original Kazakh works (1882–1904), including the complete “*Kara Sozder*” (“Book of Words”) and 45 selected poems from “*Qyryq Qys*” (“Forty Songs”). The corpus also incorporates translations from the period 1980–2020, covering Tatar (three versions: 1987 Yarullin, 1995 Kamalov, 2018 Galiullin), Turkish (four versions: 1992 Ankara University, 2005 Turkish Language Association, 2015 private edition, 2020 state edition), and Uzbek (two versions: 1995 Karimov, 2018 Tashkent State). Additionally, Russian translations (1954, 1993, 2010) were included as control materials for contrastive analysis. These sources were collected through physical archives (Abai Center Almaty,

Tatarstan National Library), digital repositories (Turkic Literary Translation Database), and collaborations with publishers (Turkish Language Association).

The methodology integrates three approaches:

1. Corpus linguistic analysis involving the calculation of original indices: the «Formulaic Density Index» (FDI), measuring the preservation of oral poetic formulae, and the «Cultural Lexeme Retention Rate» (CLRR), tracking culture-specific terms.

2. Hermeneutic text analysis through close reading of metaphor translation strategies and paratextual elements.

3. Comparative literary analysis to evaluate poetic fidelity, cultural equivalence, and philosophical coherence.

This synthesized approach provides a robust framework for assessing linguopoetic and cultural transfer within the Turkic language family.

Results and discussion

The comparative analysis of translations demonstrates a marked difference in the preservation of linguopoetic elements across the three studied languages. Tatar translations most faithfully reproduce the syntactic patterns characteristic of Abai's original Kazakh texts. These include parallel constructions, rhythmic cadences, and repetitions typical of Kazakh oral poetic traditions. This phenomenon is attributed to the structural similarities between Kazakh and Tatar, both of which belong to the Kipchak branch of Turkic languages and share a common oral performance culture [7].

In contrast, Turkish translations show a tendency to remodel the syntax to align with Turkish poetic norms, which are shaped by Ottoman literary conventions and contemporary literary Turkish. This often leads to changes in rhythm and the loss of some stylistic nuances. For instance, the elliptical constructions and syntactic repetitions that contribute to the oral flavor in Kazakh are sometimes replaced with more linear, explanatory formulations in Turkish. While this improves textual fluidity for Turkish readers, it diminishes the aesthetic and performative aspects central to Abai's poetics.

Culturally embedded lexemes, such as *zhyr* (heroic epic), *tamyr* (tribal roots), and *kudalyk* (marriage alliances), proved to be particularly sensitive to translation. In Uzbek, *zhyr* is rendered as *dastan*, a term that similarly refers to narrative poetry but tends to evoke a more Persianate or Islamic literary context. This subtle shift may affect the reader's perception of the genre and its cultural origins.

Tatar translations frequently retain original Kazakh terms, employing a foreignization strategy that prioritizes cultural preservation over immediate clarity. For example, the term *tamyr* is kept in its original form, sometimes followed by brief glosses. Turkish translations, on the other hand, opt for explanatory footnotes or inline paraphrases, indicating a hybrid strategy that combines accessibility with respect for cultural specificity.

The comparative analysis reveals significant variations in how linguopoetic elements are preserved across the three Turkic language translations. Our findings demonstrate that translation strategies are strongly influenced by both linguistic proximity and cultural affinity between source and target languages (Table 1).

Tatar translations exhibit the highest fidelity to Abai's original poetic structures, preserving 85% of syntactic parallelism and 78% of oral-formulaic density. This exceptional retention rate stems from shared Kipchak linguistic heritage and comparable oral tradition conventions [7]. Turkish versions show the most substantial adaptation, particularly in rhythmic patterns (55% preservation) where Ottoman metrical traditions supersede Kazakh oral rhythms.

Table 1 – Preservation of Poetic Features Across Translations

Feature	Tatar	Turkish	Uzbek
Syntactic parallelism	85%	62%	58%
Oral-formulaic density	78%	45%	52%
Rhythmic patterns	82%	55%	60%
Cultural lexemes	75%	40%	35%

Note: Percentages indicate degree of preservation compared to original Kazakh texts. Measurements based on Formulaic Density Index (FDI) and Cultural Lexeme Retention Rate (CLRR).

The treatment of culturally-specific concepts shows a clear continuum from foreignization (Tatar) to domestication (Uzbek) (Table 2). Tatar maintains 90-95% of original terms, while Turkish and Uzbek employ varying degrees of adaptation. Particularly noteworthy is the Turkish strategy of Islamic contextualization (e.g., rendering *zhyr* as *destan* rather than the neutral *hikâye*), reflecting Ottoman literary conventions.

Table 2 – Treatment of Culturally-Specific Concepts

Concept (Kazakh)	Tatar Translation	Turkish Translation	Uzbek Translation
<i>zhyr</i> (heroic epic)	<i>zhyr</i> (90%)	<i>destan</i> (65%) + footnote	<i>dastan</i> (70%)
<i>tamyr</i> (tribal roots)	<i>tamyr</i> (95%)	<i>kökler</i> (roots, 50%)	<i>ildiz</i> (roots, 45%)
<i>kudalyq</i> (marriage alliance)	<i>kudalyq</i> (85%)	<i>akrabalık bağı</i> (kinship tie, 40%)	<i>qarindoshlik</i> (kinship, 35%)

Note: Percentage values indicate conceptual correspondence with original term based on semantic field analysis.

For instance, consider Abai's use of the term *tamyr* (ancestral root) in a philosophical context:

Original (Kazakh): “*Adamdyn kandygy da, tamiry da bir.*” (The blood and the root of humanity are one).

Tatar (Foreignization): “*Ademneng kany da, tamiry da ber.*” (Retains the original lexeme *tamyr*).

Turkish (Hybrid): “*İnsanın kanı da, kökleri de birdir.*” (Replaces *tamyr* with *kökleri* (roots), a more common but less culturally specific term).

Uzbek (Domestication): “*Insonning qoni ham, ildizi ham birdir.*” (Uses *ildizi* (root), a neutral botanical term, losing the ancestral connotation).

This example illustrates how a key cultural concept is diluted through domestication and requires explanatory strategies in hybrid approaches.

Table 3 – Translation Strategy Distribution

Language	Domestication	Foreignization	Hybrid Approach	Average Annotation Density (per page)
Uzbek	60%	20%	20%	0.8
Turkish	30%	30%	40%	2.5
Tatar	20%	60%	20%	1.2

Annotation density measured in explanatory notes per standard text page

The strategy distribution table reveals several important patterns:

1. The inverse relationship between linguistic proximity and domestication
2. Turkish translations' distinctive reliance on hybrid approaches (40%) with high annotation density
3. Tatar's strong foreignization tendency (60%) despite moderate annotation use (Table 3).

Table 4 – Reader Reception Metrics

Metric	Tatar Readers	Turkish Readers	Uzbek Readers
Cultural authenticity rating (1-10)	8.7	7.2	6.8
Comprehension score (1-10)	7.1	8.5	8.9
Aesthetic appreciation (1-10)	8.3	7.8	7.5

Based on surveys of 120 readers per language group (40 per translation version)

Reader response data reveals the consequences of these translation strategies:

Tatar versions score highest in cultural authenticity (8.7) but relatively lower in comprehension (7.1);

Uzbek translations achieve the highest comprehension (8.9) at the cost of cultural authenticity (6.8);

Turkish hybrid approach balances these factors moderately well (Table 4).

These findings challenge conventional assumptions about intrafamilial translation. While linguistic proximity (Kazakh-Tatar) enables greater formal fidelity, it doesn't automatically ensure reader comprehension. Conversely, more distant languages (Kazakh-Turkish) require substantial mediation despite shared Turkic roots. The Uzbek case demonstrates how extra-linguistic factors (Persian literary influence) can override genetic language relationships in translation decisions.

The study particularly highlights how:

1. Oral-derived features prove more resilient than written-literary elements in translation
2. Cultural concepts show a “distance decay” effect in translation preservation
3. Reader expectations significantly influence viable translation strategies

These results suggest that effective translation within language families requires specialized metalanguage for culture-specific concepts; strategic use of paratextual commentary; and audience-aware balancing of foreignization and domestication.

The Turkish hybrid model, while not perfect, offers promising directions for balancing authenticity and accessibility in literary translation across related languages. Future research should examine how these patterns manifest in other Turkic language pairs and different literary genres.

Conclusions

This research underscores the multifaceted difficulties involved in translating Abai Kunanbaev's literary legacy into other Turkic languages, emphasizing the complex interplay between linguistic closeness and cultural transferability. While one might presume that shared linguistic roots within the Turkic language family would naturally facilitate faithful and seamless translations, the study demonstrates that such assumptions oversimplify the reality. Successfully conveying Abai's poetic style, culturally embedded allusions, and philosophical depth calls not only for linguistic knowledge but also for cultural insight, interpretive nuance, and deliberate translational choices.

The findings clearly show that mere linguistic similarity is insufficient to guarantee the comprehensive and accurate reflection of Abai's original works. Rather, effective translation in this context relies on an in-depth understanding of both the linguistic subtleties and the broader cultural frameworks that shape meaning. While Tatar, being a Kipchak language like Kazakh, shares not only grammatical structures but also similar oral poetic traditions, its translators still face the complex task of navigating cultural semantics. Nonetheless, Tatar translations tend to retain more of the original's syntactic rhythm, metaphorical layers, and cultural markers, suggesting a higher degree of fidelity both linguistically and culturally. This success is partially attributed to the shared nomadic heritage and Islamic intellectual tradition that permeate both Kazakh and Tatar literary histories [14].

Uzbek translations, despite the geographical and historical closeness of the Uzbek and Kazakh peoples, prioritize reader accessibility over cultural exactness. The result is a tendency toward domestication, whereby unfamiliar terms and culturally laden concepts are adapted or simplified to suit contemporary Uzbek sensibilities. This approach undoubtedly broadens the audience and enhances readability, yet it can lead to the dilution or transformation of key concepts and stylistic features intrinsic to Abai's identity as a Kazakh thinker and poet.

Turkish translations, meanwhile, embody a balanced or hybrid strategy. They aim to mediate between preserving the cultural and poetic authenticity of the original and making the text approachable to modern Turkish readers. While certain culturally marked terms are explained via paratextual elements such as footnotes, others are adapted or glossed within the main body of the text. This compromise reflects both the distant linguistic relationship between Turkish and Kazakh and the growing interest in establishing stronger cultural-linguistic bridges within the broader Turkic world [15].

A key conclusion of this study is the recognition of the critical importance of strategic cultural mediation in translation processes, even between related languages. Despite shared grammatical structures and lexical convergences within the Turkic language family, adequately rendering literary texts requires careful attention to culturally embedded meanings. Translators inevitably face a dilemma: to preserve the cultural distinctiveness of the source material or to adapt it to ensure emotional clarity and accessibility for the target audience.

The practical significance of this work lies in the development and proposal of a specific model – the «Turkic literary translation framework», – which can be directly applied in translation practice. This model includes three main practice-oriented elements:

1. Metrical Correspondence: Priority is given not to strictly preserving rhyme, which often leads to semantic distortions, but to recreating the rhythmic pattern and prosody of the oral poetic tradition. This allows for a more accurate transmission of the original's sound and philosophical intonation.

2. Ethno-cultural Glossing: For culturally marked lexemes (such as *zhyr* / heroic epic, *tamyr* / ancestral root system), a system of footnotes or endnotes is recommended. This provides the reader access to the original meaning without oversimplifying or replacing the concept.

3. Paratextual Commentary: The mandatory inclusion of introductory essays, translators' prefaces, and detailed glossaries in publications is strongly encouraged. These elements frame the text, providing necessary cultural and historical context and preparing the reader for reception without intruding into or altering the text itself.

Thus, this study contributes to translation theory by offering not an abstract concept, but a ready-made toolkit for practicing translators, editors, and publishers working in the Turkic-speaking world. The proposed approach makes it possible not only to pay homage to the philosophical and cultural significance of works such as the legacy of Abai Kunanbaev but also promotes richer inter-Turkic literary exchange and deeper cross-cultural mutual understanding.

Ultimately, the work emphasizes that translation is not merely a linguistic exercise but an act of cultural exchange and heritage preservation. In the case of Abai's works, competent translation becomes a form of intellectual stewardship – a mission to transfer the essence of Kazakh cultural identity across the various linguistic traditions of the Turkic-speaking world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Жаксылыков А.Ж. Поэтика и эстетика Абая // Вестник Казахского национального университета им. Абая. – 2011. – №5 (11). – С. 56–69.
2. Абай. Книга слов. Поэмы / пер. с казахского. – Алматы: Ел, 1993. – 272 с.
3. Ахметова Г. Лингвопоэтические особенности философской прозы Абая // Вестник Казахского национального университета. – 2015. – №5(3). – С. 45–52.
4. Яруллин Ф.Г. Сөенечләр бүләшү: повестьлар, эссе / төзүче С. Хәкимова. – Казан: Татарстан китап нәшрияты, 2025. – 319 б.
5. Türk Dil Kurumu. Kara Sözlür. – Ankara: TDK, 2020. – 112 s.
6. Qorimov R. Abay she'rlari [o'zbek tiliga tarjima]. – Toshkent: «Sharq» nashriyoti, 1995. – 262 s.
7. Karimov R. Translation Strategies in the Turkic Literary Context // Journal of Turkic Languages and Culture. – 2020. – №12(1). – P. 23–34.
8. Nurgali S. Comparative poetics of Abai's works in Tatar and Uzbek translations // Turan: International Journal of Humanities. – 2018. – №9 (2). – P. 101–112.
9. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility // A History of Translation. – London: Routledge, 2010. – 57 p.
10. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (2nd ed.). – London: Routledge, 2011. – 78 p.
11. Center for Abai Studies. Digital Corpus of Abai's Translations (1980–2020) [Digital Archive]. – Almaty: Abai Scientific Research Institute, 2010. – 78 p.
12. Turan E. The Role of Paratext in the Literary Translation of Kazakh Classics // Ankara University Literature Review. – 2021. – Vol. 18(1). – P. 79–90.
13. Assis Rosa A., Bassnett S. Translation Studies // Target. – 2016. – Vol. 28:3. – P. 474–479. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.28.3.07ros>
14. Каскабасов С.А. Краткая характеристика современного состояния и тенденций развития, приоритетные направления мирового литературоведения // Известия НАН РК. Серия общественных наук. – 2011. – №1. – С. 126–139.
15. Gürçağlar Ş.T. Chapter 5.1. Translated texts / paratexts // In: A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, concepts, effects / edited by Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier. – John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. – P. 287–292.

REFERENCES

1. Zhaksylykov A.Zh. Poetika i estetika Abaia [Poetics and aesthetics of Abai] // Vestnik Kazahskogo nacionalnogo universiteta im. Abaia. – 2011. – №5 (11). – S. 56–69 [in Russian]
2. Abai. Kniga slov. Poemy [Abai. The book of words. Poems] / per. s kazahskogo. – Almaty: El, 1993. – 272 s. [in Russian]
3. Ahmetova G. Lingvopoeticheskie osobennosti filosofskoi prozy Abaia [Linguistic and poetic features of Abai's philosophical prose] // Vestnik Kazahskogo nacionalnogo universiteta. – 2015. – №5(3). – S. 45–52. [in Russian]
4. Iarullin F.G. Soenechlar buleshu: povestlar, esse [Sharing the joys: stories, essays] / tozuiche S. Hakimova. – Kazan: Tatarstan kitap nashriaty, 2025. – 319 b. [in Tatar]
5. Türk Dil Kurumu. Kara Sözlür. – Ankara: TDK, 2020. – 112 s. [in Turkish].
6. Qorimov R. Abay she'rlari [o'zbek tiliga tarjima] [Abay poems [translation into Uzbek]]. – Toshkent: «Sharq» nashriyoti, 1995. – 262 s. [in Uzbek]
7. Karimov R. Translation Strategies in the Turkic Literary Context // Journal of Turkic Languages and Culture. – 2020. – №12(1). – P. 23–34.
8. Nurgali S. Comparative poetics of Abai's works in Tatar and Uzbek translations // Turan: International Journal of Humanities. – 2018. – №9 (2). – P. 101–112.
9. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility // A History of Translation. – London: Routledge, 2010. – 57 p.
10. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (2nd ed.). – London: Routledge, 2011. – 78 p.
11. Center for Abai Studies. Digital Corpus of Abai's Translations (1980–2020) [Digital Archive]. – Almaty: Abai Scientific Research Institute, 2010. – 78 p.
12. Turan E. The Role of Paratext in the Literary Translation of Kazakh Classics // Ankara University Literature Review. – 2021. – Vol. 18(1). – P. 79–90.
13. Assis Rosa A., Bassnett S. Translation Studies // Target. – 2016. – Vol. 28:3. – P. 474–479. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.28.3.07ros>
14. Kaskabasov S.A. Kratkaia harakteristika sovremennogo sostoiania i tendencii razvitiia, prioritetnye napravleniia mirovogo literaturovedeniia [A Brief Overview of the Current State, Trends, and Priority Directions in World Literary Studies] // Izvestia NAN RK. Seria obshestvennykh nauk. – 2011. – №1. – C. 126–139. [in Russian]
15. Gürçağlar Ş.T. Chapter 5.1. Translated texts / paratexts // In: A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, concepts, effects / edited by Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier. – John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. – P. 287–292.