ARTICLE

Comparative Analysis of the Linguistic and Philological Contributions of Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida

Araily Bakitovna Balaeva [1] [iD] *, Zhazira Issakyzy Issayeva* [2*] [iD] *, Lyazzat Turgynovna Alimtayeva* [3] [iD] *, Marzhan Darkhanovna Taldybayeva* [2] [iD] *, Magzhan Saule Magzhankyzy* [2] [iD] *, Sholpan Pernekulovna Karsybekova* [2]

[1]*Faculty of Philology, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan*

[2]*Department of Kazakh Philology, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkistan 161200, Kazakhstan*

[3]*Department of Kazakh Linguistics Named after A. Baitursynov, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan*

ABSTRACT

In the context of modern linguistics and teaching methods, studying the continuity of scientific approaches by outstanding linguists remains highly relevant. This article presents a comparative analysis of the theories and methodologies of two prominent scholars: American linguist Eugene Albert Nida and Kazakh linguist and educator Shamgali Kharesuly Sarybayev. For the first time, their works are analyzed in parallel to reveal common ideas and distinctive approaches in morphology, grammar, sociolinguistics, and language teaching methodology. Special attention is given to Nida's influence on translation theory and its impact on Kazakh linguistics, particularly through Sarybayev's methods for teaching the Kazakh language. The article highlights Sarybayev's multifaceted role as a scientist, educator, translator, methodologist, and collector of folklore, assessing the significance of his contributions in light of Nida's foundational work in descriptive linguistics, semantics, and intercultural communication. The aim of the article is to identify the theoretical and practical importance of both scholars' ideas in the context of current linguistic and pedagogical challenges. Key objectives include comparing their methodologies, outlining similarities and differences, and evaluating their impact on linguistics and language education. The study employs comparative historical analysis, descriptive and

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Zhazira Issakyzy Issayeva, Department of Kazakh Philology, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkistan 161200, Kazakhstan; Email: zhazira.isaeva@ayu.edu.kz

content analysis, along with elements of discourse and cognitive analysis. A systematic examination of Nida's and Sarybayev's legacies provides insights into their contributions to global and Kazakh linguistics and reveals essential trends in the development of linguistic science and pedagogy in the 21st century.

Keywords: Eugene Nida; Shamgali Sarybayev; Linguistic Heritage; Linguodidactics; Cultural Context

1. Introduction

Language serves not only as a medium for defining terms but also as a fundamental tool for conceptualizing and understanding complex phenomena [1]. Virtually every individual acquires the ability to speak upon reaching a certain stage of cognitive and social development. Consequently, people—regardless of their formal education—often retain deeply embedded, albeit sometimes simplistic or intuitive, views about the nature of language and its connection to thought [2].

Beyond its cognitive role, language constitutes a complex system of symbols that performs essential communicative functions within society. It also acts as a marker of power dynamics within communities, reflecting socio-political shifts. However, abrupt changes to a widely spoken language can undermine its stability and communicative efficiency.

Linguistics, as a branch of the humanities, occupies an interdisciplinary space that bridges the natural and social sciences. While its methodologies often parallel those of empirical disciplines, its subject matter—language communities—is inherently fluid and dynamic. These communities establish stable yet evolving systems of morphemes and phonemes, which function as responses to external stimuli and convey meaning through shared conventions [3].

The purpose of this study is to explore the continuity in the scientific and pedagogical contributions of Eugene Albert Nida and Shamgali Kharesuly Sarybayev. It aims to assess their respective impacts on the fields of linguistics and language pedagogy, with a particular focus on sociolinguistics, translation studies, and intercultural communication.

The central hypothesis is that, despite their differing cultural backgrounds and methodological orientations, Nida and Sarybayev share common theoretical ground in translation, linguistics, and education. Their complementary approaches may provide a foundation for innovative methodologies in Kazakh language instruction and foster deeper insights into intercultural linguistic interaction.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Professional Linguistic Worldview

The 1920s and 1930s marked a period of significant advancement in philology, linguistics, and education. During this time, global interest in language learning increased substantially, leading to the emergence of new scientific disciplines. Scholars focused on the origins and structures of languages, the standardization of writing systems, and the enhancement of education in multilingual contexts [4]. While American linguists concentrated on phonetic writing systems, Soviet linguists and Turkologists pursued ambitious language reforms.

Modern translation studies and comparative linguistics began to emerge as key tools for fostering intercultural communication. These fields emphasized that language transmission encompasses not only lexical content but also cultural and pragmatic meaning. Until the 1940s, linguistics in the United States was largely regarded as a theoretical discipline with limited practical application. However, the onset of World War II in 1941 marked a turning point. As part of American-Soviet scientific collaboration, and with support from the Linguistic Society of America, a comprehensive language training program was established.

In 1943, the Wartime Language Training Program was launched, enabling American linguists to engage in the systematic study and documentation of unfamiliar languages, including the development of grammars and instructional materials [5]. This initiative demonstrated the practical value of linguistics and stimulated the expansion of academic research, as evidenced by the founding of new scholarly journals such as Studies in Linguistics (1942) and the revival of the International Journal of American Linguistics in 1944.

2.2. Professional Features

The scientific contributions of Kazakh linguist Shamgali Sarybayev and American scholar Eugene Nida reflect two distinct yet complementary approaches rooted in a profound understanding of language and culture. Both scholars focused on issues of translation, linguistic equivalence, and the methodology of meaning transmission in language instruction.

Eugene Nida, a prominent American linguist, played a pivotal role in shaping modern translation theory through the development of the concept of dynamic (or functional) equivalence. He argued that effective translation must go beyond literal accuracy to encompass cultural context and emotional nuance. Nida's integration of linguistic theory with translation practice significantly expanded the theoretical and practical scope of the discipline. His concept of functional equivalence provided a practical framework for translators, encouraging culturally sensitive and communicatively effective translations. This approach continues to guide translation practices worldwide and has deeply influenced the evolution of translation studies [6].

Nida's major works include:

Language Structure and Language Use (1975)

Toward a Science of Translating (1964)

The Theory and Practice of Translation (1969, co-authored with Charles Taber)

These foundational texts have had a lasting impact on literary, scientific, and religious translation, and remain integral to contemporary translation studies and educational programs. Understanding the essence of Nida's theories is essential for producing high-quality, culturally attuned translations.

2.3. Professional Linguistic Consciousness

Kazakh linguistics began to take shape as a scientific discipline more than a century ago. Despite changes and numerous discussions, the founders of domestic linguistics, such as Shamgali Sarybayev, made an invaluable contribution to the development of science [7]. His works were aimed at improving the methodology of teaching the Kazakh language, studying terminology and issues of language equivalence [8]. He considered the Kazakh language not in isolation, but in the context of Turkic languages, using a comparative-historical approach. Sarybayev's scientific research was based on the works of A. Baitursynuly, and his methodology for teaching the Kazakh language laid the foundation for the further development of the discipline [9]. In his works, he analyzed in detail various aspects of linguistics, developed teaching aids and participated in the state language policy. His works had a significant influence on the formation of a scientific approach to the study of the Kazakh language, which contributed to the further deepening of the theoretical basis of domestic linguistics [10].

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Research Materials

The scientific heritage of Shamgali Kharesuly Sarybaev and Eugene Albert Nida is a valuable fund that has made a significant contribution to the development of world linguistics. Their works in the field of translation, spelling, grammar, morphology, methodology and literary criticism meet modern requirements for teaching and learning languages, demonstrating the systematicity, scientific validity and methodological significance of domestic and world linguistic science.

The main materials of the study were:

Linguistic and methodological works of Sarybaev and Nida, including their research in the field of spelling, grammar, morphology and methodological tools;

Scientific works in the field of translation, analyzing the features of language adaptation and interpretation;

Archival materials, manuscripts, documents characterizing the scientific heritage of scientists;

Modern methodological developments that complement the theoretical concepts of modern linguistics;

Research by the founders of Kazakh linguistics, such as A. Baitursynov, K. Zhubanov, S. Amanzholov, N. Sauranbayev, R. Syzdyk, K. Mukhamadyuly, as well as the works of representatives of American structural linguistics.

3.2. Research Procedure

The study included the following stages:

- Analysis of primary sources – study of scientific works, teaching aids, archival documents related to the scientific heritage of Sarybaev and Nida.

- Comparative analysis – comparison of the views of scientists on linguistic and methodological issues.
- Content analysis – identification of key ideas and principles laid down in their works.
- Historical and comparative analysis – study of the stages of formation of scientific concepts and their adaptation in modern linguistics.
- Assessment of the influence of the works of scientists on the development of scientific and theoretical schools of Kazakh linguistics and improvement of the methods of teaching the Kazakh language.

3.3. Research Methods

The following methods were used in the study:

Content analysis: a detailed analysis of the scientific works of Eugene Albert Nida and Shamgali Kharesuly Sarybaev in order to identify common and distinctive elements in their scientific approaches and methods.

Comparative analysis: a comparison of the theories and methodological concepts of scientists in the context of their contribution to various fields of linguistics and language teaching methods.

Historical and comparative method: an analysis of the stages of formation and development of scientific concepts of scientists, which made it possible to consider the evolution of their views and methodological approaches.

Text analysis: a study of the structure and content of scientific works of scientists, which made it possible to identify the main principles of their scientific concepts.

Descriptive method – systematization of linguistic and methodological issues considered in the works of scientists.

4. Results and Discussion

Intellectuals, poets, writers, and educators have long recognized that language is more than a means of communication—it is a vital component of cultural heritage and a key to preserving national identity. Language and national spirit are foundational pillars that sustain a people and reinforce their collective identity. Through language, individuals understand, feel, think, and interpret the world,

shaping their worldview. Where language exists, the nation persists. Even in cases where peoples lack territorial sovereignty, the preservation of their native language allows them to maintain a distinct cultural identity. In this sense, language serves as a primary marker that distinguishes one nation from another. The Kazakh language, in particular, is considered one of the richest and most expressive in the world.

Eugene Nida stands as one of the most influential translation theorists of the 20th century. His foremost contribution is the theory of functional (or dynamic) equivalence, which asserts that effective translation should retain not only the linguistic form of the source text but also its overall meaning and communicative impact [11]. Nida was a prolific and interdisciplinary scholar whose work spanned descriptive linguistics, semantics, intercultural communication, communication theory, translation studies, sociolinguistics, stylistics, discourse analysis, lexicography, and language pedagogy [12].

This study employed the historical-comparative method to examine the development of Sarybayev's and Nida's intellectual trajectories, focusing on the theoretical and methodological foundations of their research (**Table 1**). While Sarybayev and Nida emerged from distinct linguistic and cultural traditions, their works reveal notable parallels in approach and underlying principles.

Table 1. Comparative analysis of scientific approaches of Sh.Kh. Sarybaev and Eugene Nida.

Areas of Study	Sh.Kh. Sarybaev	Eugene Nida
Main area of research	Knowledge of the Kazakh language, methods of teaching the language, lexicography	Translation theory, translation of religious texts
Linguistic equivalence	Priority of semantic correspondence over literal translation	Developed the theory of functional equivalence.
The relationship between language and culture	The issue of preserving the national characteristics of the Kazakh language has been studied.	Suggested adaptation of the translation to the cultural context
General principles	Semantic accuracy, the importance of context in translation	Conveying the impression of the original while taking into account cultural differences

1. Research area: Sarybaev focuses on the native language and its teaching methods, while Nida focuses on the translation and interpretation of religious texts. This difference is due to the cultural and institutional context of their work.

2. Linguistic equivalence: Both scholars emphasize the importance of semantics, but with different emphases: Sarybaev pays attention to preserving the meaning in the context of national specifics, while Nida develops a universal approach - functional equivalence.

3. Language and culture: Both models emphasize the importance of cultural relevance, but in different forms: Sarybaev - as a means of preserving identity, Nida - as a way to achieve the effect of perception.

4. General principles: The principles of translation for both scholars are focused on accuracy and contextuality. At the same time, Sarybaev emphasizes semantic accuracy and adaptation, and Nida - on the reproduction of impressions and communicative function.

As can be seen from this comparative table, both scholars paid special attention to the issue of linguistic equivalence. While Sarybayev sought to improve the quality of translation by improving Kazakh terminology and teaching methods, Naida emphasized the need to consider translation not only from a linguistic but also from a cultural perspective [13,14]. Thus, the studies of the two scholars complemented each other and contributed to the formation of the foundations of modern translation studies.

Table 2 demonstrates important points of contact in the scientific and applied work of two outstanding linguists, Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida. Despite the differences in cultural and scientific contexts, their approaches demonstrate methodological and conceptual affinities, which allow us to talk about the possibility of constructing universal principles of applied linguistics based on intercultural dialogue.

Firstly, the systematization and classification of linguistic phenomena serves as a key element of their scientific methodology. Sarybaev, studying the Kazakh language, paid attention to territorial dialects and the terminological base, thereby forming the foundation of national applied linguistics. Nida used structural and semantic analysis as the basis of his theory of functional equivalence. This speaks of the similar desire of both scientists to create a structured and operationalizable description of the language system.

Secondly, both scientists considered language in a functional context. Sarybaev linked language with sociocultural identity, emphasizing the role of language as a mechanism that forms society. Nida, in turn, considered language as a communicative tool, especially in terms of interlingual interpretation. Thus, both approaches overcome the limitations of formal structuralism and emphasize the pragmatic and cultural aspects of language.

Table 2. Similarities in the works and creative activities of the two scientists.

The Main Similarities in Their Works and Scientific Activities	Sh.Kh. Sarybaev	Eugene Nida
Systematization and classification of linguistic phenomena	Sarybaev developed a systematic approach to the study of the Kazakh language, its dialects, functional styles and terminology ("Kazakh dialectology", "Kazakh terminology").	Nida developed a methodology for analyzing languages in terms of their structural and semantic features, which was reflected in his theory of dynamic equivalence.
Interest in language in its functional context	Sarybaev studied language not only as a grammatical system, but also as a means of communication, emphasizing its social and cultural function ("Til zhane kogam" – "Language and society").	Nida viewed language as a tool of communication, not just a system of rules, especially in the context of translation. His work Toward a Science of Translating emphasizes the importance of conveying meaning rather than literal correspondence.
Methodological rigor and innovation	Sarybaev introduced new methods of analyzing the Kazakh language, including dialectological studies and functional analysis of speech styles.	Nida developed translation principles that became the basis of modern translation linguistics, using structural and transformational analysis.
Practical application of scientific research	Sarybaev paid attention to educational aspects, developing methods for teaching the Kazakh language and literature.	Nida worked to improve the translation of the Bible, which made his works widely applicable in translation practice.

Thirdly, their works are clearly methodologically rigorous and innovative. Sarybaev introduced empirically based methods - from dialectological expeditions to the analysis of functional styles. Nida developed a transformational and structural methodology, which formed the basis of an entire direction in translation theory. Their methods complement each other: one is built on a national language base, the other - on the universals of linguistic mediation.

Finally, both Sarybaev and Nida sought to apply scientific results in practice. Sarybaev was engaged in the development of methods for teaching the Kazakh language, including textbooks and school programs. Nida, a practitioner in the religious and missionary sphere, has ensured the effective translation of biblical texts into various cultural contexts, which confirms the practical potential of his theoretical concepts.

An analysis of the works and activities of Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida shows that both scholars, despite differences in the cultural and linguistic context, made a significant contribution to the development of translation theory and linguistics. If Nida developed a systematic theoretical basis, most clearly represented by the concept of dynamic (functional) equivalence, then Sarybaev laid the foundations for the applied practice of translation in the multilingual Soviet space, where translation performed not only a linguistic but also an ideological and pedagogical function [15].

The work of the two scientists is also closely related to his translation activities. Sh.Kh. Sarybaev not only wrote in Kazakh, but also adapted poetry in other languages, especially the literature of the Turkic-speaking peoples, into Kazakh, seeking to unite national poetry and the national spirit in a single space [16].

One of the scientist's first translations was "Öt, kus!», made in 1920. Kazakh version of the Turkish poem "Saury, bird!" known as. This translation was specially written from the words of a man named Gaziz, who studied in Turkey [17]. The original poem is written in Turkish in Latin script, under it there is an inscription Sh.Kh. Sarybayev left the following comment:

"I wrote down this poem in Kazakh under the title "Song of the Bird" from Gaziz, who studied it in Turkey, and translated it into Kazakh." "I translated it into Kazakh in 1920, on April 19."

This translation is evidence of Sarybayev's spiritual connection with the Turkic world, demonstrating his linguistic sensitivity and artistic taste for translating poetry [18]. Thanks to such translations, he managed to turn national poetry into a connecting bridge between the Turkic peoples. In addition, the list of Turkic words and their Kazakh equivalents, preserved next to this poem, also demonstrates his lexicographic thinking.

Sh.Kh. Sarybaev not only mastered the language, but also turned it into an instrument of intercultural communication. Knowing Arabic, Turkish and Russian, he not only translated texts from these languages, but also adapted their stylistic and poetic nature to the laws of the Kazakh language. This is a task that can be performed not only by a professional linguist, but also by a person who has grown as a writer and has artistic intuition [19].

Sarybaev's translation activities were not limited to literary texts. He also worked on translating the official literature of that period of socio-pedagogical, professional and political content into Kazakh and made it accessible to Kazakh society. One of the specific works in this direction is the translation of L. Berezansky's book "Production Meeting" into Kazakh. Another special area of Sarybaev's work in the field of translation is the adaptation of children's socio-ideological literature into the Kazakh language. In this area, he worked on translations to convey to the younger generation the works of figures who played an important role in the Soviet period.

A striking example of this is the Translation of Krupskaya's autobiographical book "My Life". This work was first published in Russian in Moscow in 1930 and reprinted in Tashkent in 1933. Published in Kazakh with Sarybaev's translation. This book, published in a print run of 1,000 copies, was published for children and aimed at promoting Soviet ideology among the younger generation.

This translation work shows that Sarybaev paid attention not only to linguistic accuracy, but also to stylistic adaptation appropriate to the age and level of perception of the student [20]. Although the content of the book includes political and social aspects, the translation presents this information in an understandable, pedagogically oriented language. This is further evidence of the translator's artistic mastery and methodological abilities.

Researchers emphasize the importance of language

as a tool for shaping public opinion and managing audience emotions in a political context [21]. This approach can be applied to the analysis of the contributions of such eminent scholars as Shamgali Sarybayev and Edjun Nida, whose theories of translation and linguistics also take into account the importance of cultural adaptation and intercultural communication. According to Bilalov (2023), "language not only conveys information, but also shapes perception, influences decision-making, and supports national identity," which is similar to the principles proposed by Nida about preserving not only the form but also the meaning of the text in the translation process (Nida, 1964).

Sarybaev's translation legacy is not limited to fiction. He was also actively involved in translating Soviet ideological and administrative documents. This indicates that he is engaged in translation activities at the state level and is recognized as a reliable and qualified specialist.

Another study emphasizes that both researchers, Sarybaev and Nida, viewed language as the main tool for preserving national identity and developing intercultural communication. This comparison reveals interesting parallels with the study of the rhetorical strategies of two outstanding speechwriters, Abish Kekilbaev and Jonathan Edward Favreau [22].

Both works emphasize the importance of the sociocultural context in the use of language, however, in the context of the scientific work of Sarybaev and Nida, language is considered as a means of preserving and transmitting cultural features, and in the context of rhetoric - as a way to manipulate public perception and political influence. In both cases, there is an effort to convey a meaning that goes beyond purely lexical meaning, paying attention to cultural and pragmatic aspects.

For Sarybaev and Nida, the key aspect was maintaining the accuracy of the translation and adapting the text taking into account cultural and emotional contexts, which is also directly related to the analysis of the speech of Kekilbaev and Favreau.

In 1932, under the leadership of Seksenbaev, Sarybaev was part of a group that translated Stalin's collection of works, "Problems of Leninism," into the Karakalpak language. This is one of the most important political texts of that period. The translation of such documents required not only deep political literacy and linguistic accuracy, but also the ability to adapt ideologically.

The following year, 1933, another collection was published in Kazakh under the editorship of Seksenbaev - translations of orders and instructions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Central Asian Bureau. This group translation work was supported by Sh.Kh. A. Ilyaev and R. Zhantuganova participated together with Sarybaev. These documents contain a lot of administrative vocabulary, political concepts and Soviet terminology. Therefore, such translations played an important role in the formation of the political and administrative functional style of the Kazakh language. A unique aspect of Sarybaev's translation activity is his participation in the translation and scientific dissemination of archival historical documents. In this regard, his ability to understand the meaning, historical and contextual features of the documentary text, as well as knowledge of the language, is obvious. Translations into Russian of some documents written in Arabic script, stored in the Turkestan Regional State Archive, completed. These documents relate to the activities of the Chernyaev Commissariat in the field of public education, and Sarybaev is listed as the person who officially translated them and legally certified them.

Sarybaev's approach demonstrates an early form of functional translation, manifested in his desire to adapt the poetic and ideological content of foreign texts to the cultural and cognitive context of the Kazakh-speaking audience. His translation of children's ideological literature, in particular N.K. Krupskaya's autobiographical book "My Life", illustrates a pedagogical focus on the formation of national self-awareness. This echoes Nida's emphasis on communicative effectiveness and taking into account the readership in translation.

Both scholars can be considered as bearers of a proto-functional model of translation: Nida offers a formalized theoretical structure, while Sarybaev implements similar principles in the conditions of a specific socio-cultural and political environment. This allows us to put forward a theoretical position: Sarybaev's translation legacy is a non-Western analogue of the functionalist theory of translation, which arose in different conditions, but solves similar problems.

The methodological significance of the comparative analysis lies in demonstrating how translation practices

develop in parallel in different cultures, responding to different but intersecting needs – religious-intercultural (Nida) and ideological-national (Sarybaev). Sh.Kh. Sarybaev was not only an experienced translator, but also one of the first Kazakh researchers who attempted to explain the translation process in a scientific and journalistic context. This shows that he approached the work of translation from a theoretical point of view, understanding language not just as a tool, but as a complex structural and cultural phenomenon.

Moreover, the pedagogical value of Sarybaev's work can be seen in his attempts to lay the foundations for a methodology for teaching translation. His work "Reader and Translator" (1928) represents an early form of popular scientific presentation of translation techniques such as lexical substitution and paraphrase, and demonstrates an effort to explain the complexities of translation through concrete examples. This makes Sarybaev not only a practitioner, but also an early theorist and educator who contributed to the formation of translation as a professional activity in Kazakhstan.

This study thus not only preserves the linguistic legacy of the two scholars, but also offers a critical look at the formation of translation theory in Western and non-Western traditions. By placing Sarybaev in dialogue with Nida, the article contributes to the decolonization of translation studies and highlights its global, multipolar nature.

Several handwritten versions of the article "Student and Translator" have been preserved in the collection of the Leningrad Institute of Philology and the Peoples of the East (LIFiN). The first was written in 1928. This work is written in the form of a dialogue between a student and a translator, that is, it is presented to the reader in a popular science style in an easy and understandable form. The article examines specific grammatical and lexical transformations of translation, such techniques as word substitution and paraphrasing, and explains their meaning and application features. This work should be considered one of the first examples of a scientific approach to translation practice. In it, Sarybaev does not limit himself to listing the rules, but explains the difficulties of translation using specific examples. The article "Reader and Translator" is one of the first steps in forming a method for explaining translation problems adapted to the Kazakh-speaking environment. The goal here is to convey that translation is not a mechanical process, but an act of thinking, understanding and adaptation. This proves that Sarybaev was one of the first to initiate the formation of translation as an independent professional field.

Table 3 summarizes the key principles that guided Eugene Naida and Shamgali Sarybaev in their approaches to translation. Although Naida acted in the context of the American Protestant mission, and Sarybaev in the context of Soviet and post-Soviet language policy, their translation guidelines reveal deep methodological and conceptual points of intersection.

Table 3. Comparative analysis of the translation principles of Eugene Nida and Sh.Kh. Sarybaev.

Nida's Main Principles When Performing Translation Work	Sarybaev's Main Principles in Carrying out Translation Activities
Functional equivalence: When translating, it is important to preserve not only grammatical accuracy, but also the final meaning of the text.	Linguocultural approach: focusing on identifying and conveying culturally specific components of the text.
Target audience orientation: The translator must adapt the text to the culture and norms of the given language.	Semantic and pragmatic aspects: a detailed analysis of semantic and contextual nuances that influence translation.
The relationship between language and culture: The quality of a translation directly depends on how well it is adapted to the cultural context.	Ethnocultural context: necessary for accurate understanding and translation.
Experience in translating religious texts: Nida developed methods for translating the Bible and proposed ways to preserve the meaning of religious texts.	Sarybaev paid attention to the methods of teaching the Kazakh language and literature.

First, the central concept in Naida's approach is functional equivalence, i.e. the desire to convey not so much the literal structure of the original, but its effect and meaning for the reader of the target culture. Sarybaev, although he does not use this term directly, actually implements a similar approach through linguocultural and ethnocultural analysis, emphasizing the importance of conveying culturally specific meanings. Both approaches are aimed at adequate reception of the text by the audience, rather than formal compliance.

Second, orientation towards the target audience is

an important criterion for both Naida and Sarybaev. Naida argued that translation should be "natural" for the reader, and that is why he insisted on adapting the text to the norms of perception of the target culture. Sarybaev, in turn, emphasized the semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation, which involve a deep analysis of context and meaning. Thus, both scholars advocate a pragmatic approach to translation.

The third intersection is the recognition of the inextricable link between language and culture. Naida formalizes this within the framework of the analysis of "cultural components", while Sarybaev considers language as a bearer of ethnocultural identity, especially in the context of teaching and preserving the national language. Thus, cultural adaptation and consideration of national specifics act as an integral part of translation practice in both concepts.

An analysis of the works and activities of Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida shows that both scholars, despite differences in cultural and linguistic contexts, have made a significant contribution to the development of translation and linguistics. This comparative study of East and West is a rare and potentially valuable step towards decolonization of humanitarian knowledge.

Nida, as a representative of American structuralism, builds a strictly formalized model of translation based on syntactic, semantic and pragmatic principles. In contrast, Sarybaev develops translation as an instrument of cultural mediation in a multilingual and ideologically charged environment. His approach is largely empirical, but at the same time conceptually oriented towards adapting meaning to the socio-cultural reality of the target audience. This difference allows us to identify the methodological tension between the abstract universality of Western theories and the contextual specificity of non-Western practices.

Based on the differences and similarities identified, we can propose a cross-contextual framework in which translation is viewed not as an exclusively linguistic act, but as a form of cultural navigation between discursive systems. In this framework, Sarybaev and Nida act as representatives of two poles: one is theoretical, focused on functional models; the other is cultural and practical, developed in the context of linguistic diversity and political mobilization.

The proposed comparison allows us to move from a descriptive paradigm to an analytical one. Sarybaev's practice demonstrates a kind of «localized functionality», in which the effectiveness of translation is measured not so much by equivalence as by its ability to perform a cultural and political task. This opens up the prospect of developing comparative linguistics, which includes not only a comparison of formal language structures, but also an analysis of functional equivalents in various socio-cultural matrices.

Thus, the article not only preserves the linguistic heritage of the two scholars, but also offers a new theoretical understanding of their contribution through the prism of transregional analysis. This allows us to reconsider the foundations of comparative linguistics, expanding its methodological tools by including non-Western epistemologies and translation practices. In this context, Sarybaev appears as a figure whose legacy can serve as a basis for developing alternative models of translation and communication in the context of cultural diversity.

5. Conclusions

The study presents a comparative analysis of the scientific contributions and translation works of Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida. Despite their differing academic focuses and cultural contexts, significant parallels were identified in their approaches to issues such as linguistic equivalence, the preservation of national identity through language, and the intercultural adaptation of translation.

The findings of the study highlight the following key points:

- Shamgali Sarybaev made substantial contributions to Kazakh linguistics, terminology, and language pedagogy. He also played a pivotal role in shaping translation principles tailored to the cultural and linguistic context of Kazakhstan.
- Eugene Nida developed the theory of functional equivalence, which emphasizes the importance of conveying not only the literal meaning but also the cultural and contextual nuances of the original text during the translation process.
- Both scholars regarded language as more than just a system of signs; they recognized it as a vital tool for preserving national identity and fostering intercultural communication.

- The study of Sarybaev's translation practices revealed his influential role in the development of political, educational, and literary discourse in the Kazakh language.
- Analyzing the works of both researchers demonstrated that their respective approaches to translation and language adaptation are complementary. Together, these methodologies provide a robust foundation for advancing modern translation theory.

Thus, a comprehensive study of the legacies of Sarybaev and Nida enriches the field of translation studies and linguistics. Their contributions also support the development of contemporary approaches to intercultural communication, translation, and the preservation of national languages.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: A.B.B.; methodology: Z.I.I.; software: A.B.B.; validation: A.B.B.; formal analysis: M.D.T., M.S.M., and S.P.K.; investigation: A.B.B.; resources: A.B.B.; writing – original draft preparation: A.B.B.; writing – review and editing: Z.I.I., L.T.A.; visualization: A.B.B.; funding acquisition: A.B.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

This study does not involve experiments with human participants or the collection of personal data. However, in instances where expert opinions, interviews, or archival materials containing information about identifiable individuals were utilized, informed consent was obtained from the relevant individuals or institutions. All sources have been appropriately cited, and the research was conducted in accordance with established academic ethical standards.

Data Availability Statement

The data used in this study include scientific works, archival materials, manuscripts and publications of Shamgali Sarybaev and Eugene Nida, as well as studies by Kazakh and foreign scientists in the field of linguistics, pedagogy and literary studies.

Some of the data under study are presented in open sources (scientific articles, monographs, textbooks) accessible through academic databases and libraries. Archival materials and manuscripts were obtained from specialized funds, access to which is regulated by the relevant institutions.

Acknowledgments

Conflicts of Interest

The authors stated that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Woodward-Kron, R., 2008. More than just jargon – the nature and role of specialist language in learning disciplinary knowledge. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 7(4), 234–249. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.004

[2] Whorf, B.L., 1942. Language, Mind and Reality. Theosophist (Madras, India) . January and April issues. pp. 281–291. Available from: https://archive.org/details/whorf-1942-lmr/page/35/mode/2up

[3] Bloomfield, L., 1983. An introduction to the study of language . John Benjamins B.V.: Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

[4] Đỗ, V.H., 2021. The linguistic picture of the world – Cultural characteristics – Cognitive patterns of the language community. Scientific Journal of Tan Trao University. 3(6), 5–7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51453/2354-1431/2017/178

[5] Malyuga, E., Orlova, S., 2018. The theory of professional and business communication in contemporary linguistics. Springer: Cham , Switzerland. pp. 1–29. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68744-5_1

[6] Gao, Y., 2023. Analysis of Eugene Nida's Translation Theory. International Journal of Education and Humanities . 10(1), 203–206. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v10i1.11120

[7] Smanov, B., 2018. Shamgali Sarybayev - an outstanding educator, a perfect writer. Kazakh National Pedagogical University . Available from: https://www.kaznpu.kz/kz/5801/press (cited 12.2.2025).

[8] Assanova, D., 2023. Memoirs from the personal archive of Shamgali Sarybayev. Bulletin of Abai KazNPU. Series: History and Socio-Political Sciences. 4(79). DOI: https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2023.79.4.033

[9] Sarybayev, Sh.Kh., Ospanov, K., 1932. Emphasis: Alphabet book for the 1st grade of the 1st concentration of the FZS-KZh schools. 1st stage city-winter school. For the 1st grade . Uzbek SKR State Publishing House: Tashkent, Uzbekistan. 120p.

[10] Sarybayev, S.K., 1956. Some problems of the Kazakh language methodology: phonetics and morphology (verb): for teachers of seven-year schools and secondary schools and teachers and students of pedagogical colleges and institutes. Part 1 . Kazakh State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House: Alma-Ata, Kazakh SSR. 124p.

[11] Nida, E., 2019. Language and culture in Eugene Nida's work the dynamic equivalence. Critics and defenders. Journal of Modern Education Review . 9(5), 340–347. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15341/JMER(2155-7993)/05.09.2019/004

[12] Chang, N.F., 1996. Towards a better general theory of equivalent effect. Babel. 42(1), 1–17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/BABEL.42.1.02CHA

[13] Othman, A.O., 2015. Equivalence in translation: An investigation of the usefulness of formal and dynamic types of equivalence in the translation of some English idiomatic expressions into Arabic. Translation Studies Journal . 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37376/1570-000-002-010

[14] Alshammari, J.N.M., 2016. Examining Nida's translation theory in rendering Arabic proverbs into English: A comparative analysis study. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research . 3(1), 1–14. Available from: https://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/200

[15] Beibitshilikkyzy, A.G., 2024. Methods of applying the problems of national education and education in the works of the Kazakh intelligentsia in teaching history. Proceedings of the 6th International Scientific Conference «European Research Materials»; Amsterdam, The Netherlands; 30–31 May 2024. p. 71.

[16] Malbakov, M., Kobdenova, G., Kairat, A., 2024. A few words on the issues of the poetic corpus of the Kazakh language. *Habaršy - Al*-Farabi Atyndagy Ķazaķ *Memlekettik Ųlttyķ* Universiteti. *Filologiâ Seriâsy*. 195(3), 44–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26577/ejph.2024.v195.i3.ph05

[17] Sarybayev, S.K., 1940. The collapse of the accusative case. People's Teacher . 3, 64–66.

[18] Sarybayev, S.K., 1936. Against spelling diversity. Kazakh Literature (newspaper) .

[19] Sarybayev, S.K., 1959. Some problems of the Kazakh language methodology: spelling and word classes: for teachers of seven-year schools and secondary schools and teachers and students of pedagogical colleges and institutes. Part 2 . Kazakh State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House: Alma-Ata, Kazakh SSR. 99p.

[20] Sarybayev, S.K., 1936. Places of commas in the Kazakh sentence. In: Amanzholov, S. (ed.) Language Problems. Proceedings of the Kazakh National Research Institute . Book. 7, 51–53.

[21] Makhambetova, A., Khabiyeva, A., Rsaliyeva, N., et al., 2025. Cognitive and pragmatic potential of the language of political leaders. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(3), 522–535. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8518

[22] Makhambetova, A., Khabiyeva, A., Rsaliyeva, N., et al., 2025. Sociolinguistic analysis of speech: How speechwriters create persuasive texts: Kazakh speechwriter Abish Kekilbayev and American speechwriter Jonathan Edward Favreau. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(4), 78–97. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8614