

PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSFORMATION OF TURKIC-KAZAKH POETRY IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

N.B. Manapbayev¹, E.D. Yerzhanov¹, Ş. Yilmaz², A. Seisenbayeva³

ABSTRACT

This article examines how philosophical meanings in Turkic-Kazakh poetry are preserved, revised and repositioned under the conditions of globalization. The term 'Turkic-Kazakh' is used as a genealogical and analytical designation for the relationship between selected early Turkic texts and later Kazakh poetic traditions; it does not imply an uninterrupted lineage or represent all Turkic literatures. The study applies qualitative comparative interpretation to a purposively selected corpus comprising the Orkhon-Yenisey inscriptions, the Korkyt tradition, Kutadgu Bilig, the hikmets of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi, the zhyrau anthology, and works by Abai, Shakarim, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Olzhas Suleimenov and Tynyshtykbek Abdykakimuly. Lotman's concept of the semiosphere provides the principal framework, while Heidegger's account of poetic language and the approaches of Damrosch and Casanova to literary circulation serve as auxiliary perspectives. The analysis identifies three mechanisms of transformation: retention of recurrent philosophical categories, resemanticization of inherited images in response to new historical questions, and circulatory remediation through publication, translation and altered reading contexts. The findings indicate that continuity resides less in an unchanged national essence than in the changing functions assigned to memory, ethical agency, mortality, language and collective belonging. Globalization is therefore treated as a mediated context of interpretation and circulation rather than as the single cause of poetic change.

Keywords: Turkic-Kazakh Poetry, Globalization, Philosophical Transformation, Semiosphere, Cultural Memory, Resemanticization, Literary Circulation, Poetic Language.

¹Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

³Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Corresponding author:
N. Manapbayev, nur.ak.80@mail.ru

Citation:
Manapbayev N.B., Yerzhanov E.D., Yilmaz Ş., Seisenbayeva A. Philosophical Transformation of Turkic-Kazakh Poetry in the Context of Globalization // Adam Alemi. – 2026. – Vol. 28. – No. 3 (109). – P. 71–80. – DOI: 10.48010/20nas522

Open Access
© The Author(s), 2026
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: 07/08/2026
Accepted: 15/09/2026
Published online: 30/09/2026

Жаһандану контексіндегі түркі-қазақ поэзиясының философиялық трансформациясы

Аңдатпа. Мақалада жаһандану жағдайында түркі-қазақ поэзиясындағы философиялық мағыналардың қалай сақталатыны, қайта түсіндірілетіні және жаңа айналым кеңістігіне орналастырылатыны зерттеледі. «Түркі-қазақ» ұғымы іріктелген ерте түркі мәтіндері мен кейінгі қазақ поэзиялық дәстүрлері арасындағы байланысты білдіретін генеалогиялық әрі талдамалық атау ретінде қолданылады; ол үздіксіз тарихи сабақтастықты немесе барлық түркі әдебиетін толық қамтуды білдірмейді. Зерттеуде Орхон-Енисей жазбалары, Қорқыт дәстүрі, «Құтты білік», Қожа Ахмет Ясауидің хикметтері, жыраулар поэзиясы, сондай-ақ Абай, Шәкәрім, Мағжан Жұмабаев, Олжас Сүлейменов және Тыныштықбек Әбдікәкімұлы шығармаларынан мақсатты түрде құрастырылған корпусқа сапалық-салыстырмалы түсіндіру әдісі қолданылды. Негізгі теориялық негіз - Ю. Лотманның семиосфера тұжырымдамасы; М. Хайдеггердің поэтикалық тіл туралы пайымы және Д. Дамрош пен П. Казанованың әдеби айналым жөніндегі тәсілдері қосымша перспектива ретінде пайдаланылды. Талдау трансформацияның үш механизмін анықтады: қайталанатын философиялық категорияларды сақтау, мұраланған бейнелерді жаңа тарихи сұрақтарға сәйкес қайта мағыналандыру және жариялау, аудару мен оқу контексінің өзгеруі арқылы айналымдық ремедиация. Нәтижелер сабақтастықтың өзгермейтін ұлттық мәненен гөрі жадыға, этикалық әрекетке, өлімге, тілге және ұжымдық тиесілікке жүктелетін қызметтердің өзгеруінен көрінетінін көрсетті. Сондықтан жаһандану поэтикалық өзгерістің жалғыз себебі емес, түсіндіру мен әдеби айналымның жаңама контексті ретінде қарастырылады.

Түйін сөздер: түркі-қазақ поэзиясы; жаһандану; философиялық трансформация; семиосфера; мәдени жады; қайта мағыналандыру; әдеби айналым; поэтикалық тіл.

Философская трансформация тюрко-казахской поэзии в контексте глобализации

Аннотация. В статье исследуется, как в условиях глобализации сохраняются, переосмысляются и перемещаются в новые контексты философские значения тюрко-казахской поэзии. Понятие «тюрко-казахская»

используется как генеалогическое и аналитическое обозначение связи между избранными раннетюркскими текстами и позднейшими казахскими поэтическими традициями; оно не предполагает непрерывной линии преемственности и не представляет все тюркские литературы. Метод качественной сравнительной интерпретации применен к целенаправленно сформированному корпусу, включающему орхоно-енисейские надписи, традицию Коркыта, «Кутадгу билиг», хикметы Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави, антологию жырау, а также произведения Абая, Шакарима, Магжана Жумабаева, Олжаса Сулейменова и Тыныштыкбека Абдыкакимұлы. Основной теоретической рамкой служит концепция семиосферы Ю. Лотмана; идеи М. Хайдеггера о поэтическом языке и подходы Д. Дамроша и П. Казановы к литературной циркуляции используются как вспомогательные перспективы. Анализ выявил три механизма трансформации: сохранение повторяющихся философских категорий, ресемантизацию унаследованных образов в ответ на новые исторические вопросы и циркуляционную ремедиацию через публикацию, перевод и изменение контекстов чтения. Результаты показывают, что преемственность заключается не столько в неизменной национальной сущности, сколько в изменяющихся функциях памяти, этической субъектности, смертности, языка и коллективной принадлежности. Поэтому глобализация рассматривается не как единственная причина поэтических изменений, а как опосредованный контекст интерпретации и литературной циркуляции.

Ключевые слова: тюрко-казахская поэзия; глобализация; философская трансформация; семиосфера; культурная память; ресемантизация; литературная циркуляция; поэтический язык.

Introduction

Globalization changes the social conditions in which literary texts are written, published, translated and interpreted. Robertson describes the process through the increasing interdependence of the world and the intensified awareness of that interdependence, while Giddens emphasizes its effects on institutions and everyday experience [1; 2]. Bauman draws attention to the unequal human consequences of global mobility and cultural openness [3]. These approaches are relevant to poetry because poetic change occurs through more than the direct adoption of foreign themes or forms. It also depends on publishing institutions, translation, education, linguistic hierarchy and the changing expectations of readers.

Kazakh scholarship has addressed the preservation of spiritual values, the effects of globalization on national literature, and the development of modernist and postmodernist forms [4, pp. 68–74; 5, pp. 68–77; 6, p. 5]. Research has also situated the poetry of Kazakhstan within a wider field of interaction among Turkic-speaking communities [7, pp. 290–301]. These studies establish that poetic traditions respond to historical and cultural change. Within the literature reviewed for the present article, however, two questions remain insufficiently connected: which philosophical elements persist across different textual periods, and through which textual and institutional mechanisms do their functions change under post-Soviet and global conditions?

The expression “Turkic-Kazakh poetry” requires a precise limitation. In this study it refers to an analytical genealogy linking selected early Turkic memorial, didactic and mystical texts with later Kazakh poetic discourse. It

does not name a homogeneous literary system and does not claim that contemporary Kazakh poetry descends from early Turkic texts through an uninterrupted channel. Islamization, the formation of the Kazakh khanate, Russian imperial rule, Soviet cultural policy and independence each altered the languages, genres and institutions through which earlier materials could be remembered. Continuity is consequently approached as a historical act of selection and reinterpretation.

“Philosophical transformation” is defined here as a change in the textual relations among the poetic subject, community, time, mortality, ethical responsibility and transcendence. This definition directs attention to the function of an image or category within a particular work. An ancestral figure, for example, may support political legitimacy in one context and become a figure of cultural memory in another. The sign can remain recognizable while its philosophical work changes. Lotman’s semiosphere offers the main vocabulary for examining this process because it treats cultural boundaries as sites of translation and recoding [8].

The international movement of literature adds a second dimension. Damrosch understands world literature as a mode of circulation and reading beyond a work’s culture of origin, while Casanova shows that such circulation takes place in a literary space marked by unequal recognition and access [9; 10]. Their approaches make it possible to distinguish textual transformation from the transformation of a text’s conditions of reception. A poem may retain its wording but acquire a different position when it is translated, anthologized or addressed to a transnational readership.

Against this background, the article asks how recurrent philosophical categories acquire

different textual functions across historical periods and new settings of circulation. It traces persistence, internal reworking, and changes in publication or translation through the terms retention, resemanticization and circulatory remediation. These terms specify what changes and at which level, replacing the loose claim that globalization simply "transforms poetry." Because the evidence comes from close reading of a selected corpus, the conclusions concern textual function rather than the frequency of motifs across Kazakh poetry as a whole.

Methodology

The research uses a qualitative, comparative and philosophical-hermeneutic design. Its corpus is purposive rather than statistically representative. It consists of eleven primary-source clusters available in the editions cited in the bibliography: the Orkhon-Yenisey materials presented by M. Zholdasbekov [11]; *The Book of Korkyt* [12]; Yusuf Balasaguni's *Kutadgu Bilig* [13]; Khoja Ahmed Yasawi's hikmets [14]; the zhynrau texts collected in *Five Centuries of Song* [15]; Abai Kunanbayev's poems and prose reflections [16]; Shakarim Qudaiberdiev's works [17]; Magzhan Zhumabayev's works [18]; Olzhas Suleimenov's *Clay Book* [19]; and Tynyshkybek Abdykakimuly's *Evening Letters* [20] and *Yrauan* [21]. The 2019 English-language *Contemporary Kazakh Literature: Poetry* [22] is examined as evidence of organized circulation and translation, not as proof that every included poem underwent the same philosophical change.

Texts were selected according to four criteria: their recognized place in accounts of Turkic or Kazakh literary history; the presence of questions concerning authority, mortality, knowledge, conscience, historical memory or belonging; their usefulness for comparison across periods; and their availability in identifiable published editions. The unit of analysis is a thematically coherent passage, poetic image or configuration of the speaking voice. The corpus does not support claims about the numerical prevalence of a motif or the views of all contemporary poets.

Lotman's concept of the semiosphere is the principal analytical framework. It directs attention to the movement of signs across cultural boundaries, the coexistence of different codes and the production of meaning through translation. Heidegger's account of poetic lan-

guage is used more narrowly to consider how a poem discloses a relation to being, time and dwelling; it is not treated as evidence of a fixed national ontology [23, pp. 192, 259–273]. Damosch and Casanova provide auxiliary concepts for separating a poem's internal organization from its movement through translation, anthology publication and unequal literary institutions.

The analysis followed four steps. First, each source cluster was placed in its historical and generic context so that memorial inscription, didactic poem, mystical verse, oral counsel and modern lyric were not treated as equivalent forms. Second, recurrent philosophical categories and signs were identified, including collective authority, mortality, knowledge, conscience, land and memory. Third, the function of each category was compared across periods by examining the position of the speaking voice, the temporal horizon of the text and the relation between individual and community. Fourth, changes associated with publication and translation were considered separately from changes within poetic language. Cross-period findings were then organized according to these three processes.

The corpus and method impose several limits. Some early works survive through later editions or translations, while contemporary poetry is represented by fewer texts than the historical material. Neither digital corpus analysis nor reader-reception data is used. The article consequently offers a conceptual interpretation of the cited works and institutions; it cannot estimate globalization's causal effect on Kazakh poetry.

Main part

1. Early textual formations: authority, mortality and ethical order

The earliest sources in the corpus establish a repertoire of questions that later Kazakh authors could recognize and reinterpret. They should not, however, be grouped under a modern definition of lyric poetry. The Orkhon-Yenisey inscriptions are commemorative and political monuments. Their elevated language joins rulership, collective memory and the continuity of the polity within a cosmological order [11, pp. 43–67]. Authority is presented through obligations toward the people and through remembrance of actions that either strengthened or endangered collective unity.

The speaking position is public rather than private. Its temporal movement connects ancestral precedent, present responsibility and the future survival of the community.

This configuration is philosophically important because existence is articulated as a relation rather than as an isolated individual state. A person occupies a place among ancestors, rulers, people, land and a higher order. Memory performs a political function: it preserves the distinction between conduct that sustains the community and conduct that places it at risk. The inscription therefore supplies a symbolic repertoire of collective authority and historical accountability. Later poetry does not reproduce this repertoire unchanged, but the relation among word, memory and collective endurance remains available for reinterpretation.

The Korkyt tradition shifts the emphasis from political continuity to mortality and symbolic survival [12, pp. 8–11]. Its textual history is complex, and Korkyt should not be treated as the expression of a single recoverable historical consciousness. Within the received corpus, however, his association with music, wisdom and the limits of life provides a durable structure for thinking about finitude. Mortality is not resolved through a theoretical proof. It is approached through narrative, sound and communal remembrance. The philosophical significance lies in the movement from biological limitation to cultural duration: the individual remains finite, while story and music can be renewed in collective memory.

Kutadgu Bilig brings political thought into a dramatic exchange among personified concepts. Justice, knowledge, good fortune and rulership become positions that answer and test one another [13, pp. 42, 69, 519–532]. The dialogic form links the ruler's conduct to the order of government and gives knowledge public value through judgment and responsibility. Although the work precedes the introspective subject of later Kazakh lyric poetry, it establishes a vocabulary in which cultivated human capacities bear directly on the quality of rule.

Yasawi's hikmets move the centre of reflection toward spiritual discipline, moral self-examination and the relation between finite life and divine truth [14, pp. 25–29]. Their accessible poetic form joins metaphysical aspiration with instruction addressed to a community. The speaking self becomes more visible, yet it does not claim autonomy from tradition. It ex-

amines itself within an ethical and sacred horizon. This combination of inward scrutiny and communal address later becomes important for the moral language of Kazakh poetry.

The zhyrau corpus recontextualizes these categories within the political and social conditions of nomadic life [15, pp. 32, 38, 53, 58–62, 73]. The zhyrau voice advises, warns, remembers and judges. Time is experienced through instability, conflict, migration and the vulnerability of worldly power. Its authority depends partly on proximity to collective experience and partly on the capacity to articulate consequences before a ruler or community. The genre preserves the public orientation of earlier memorial discourse while making counsel more situational and performative.

Across these early formations, continuity lies in the recurrence of philosophical problems, not in the survival of one unchanged doctrine. Memorial inscription binds memory to political accountability; the Korkyt tradition approaches mortality through narrative and music; didactic dialogue joins knowledge to rule; mystical verse turns ethical scrutiny inward; and zhyrau counsel interprets unstable historical situations. The genres differ in speaker, audience and social use. Their shared repertoire therefore supports a qualified claim of retention without implying direct or uninterrupted transmission.

2. Abai, Shakarim and Magzhan: resemantization of the poetic subject

The works of Abai mark a major reorganization of this inherited repertoire. Earlier public and didactic functions remain visible, but the grounds of ethical judgment move increasingly into reflective self-examination [16, vol. 1, p. 60; 24, pp. 30–31, 263]. Abai addresses conduct, education, labour, knowledge, desire and responsibility as connected features of human formation. The individual is accountable to a community, yet social renewal depends on the capacity to examine habit, ignorance and self-interest. The poem and the prose reflection thus become instruments of ethical diagnosis.

This change should not be described as a simple transition from a collective worldview to Western individualism. Abai's reflective subject remains situated within language, faith, social relations and the problems of the steppe community. The transformation concerns the function of voice. Counsel is no longer authorized mainly by proximity to a ruler or by the

performance of inherited wisdom. It is also authorized by critical reflection and by the speaker's willingness to include the self within the object of criticism. Ethical agency becomes a problem to be cultivated, not a quality that can be assumed from status or inheritance.

Shakarim intensifies this movement through his sustained attention to soul, truth and the relation between faith and reason [17, pp. 139, 250–251, 265]. His philosophical writing and poetry examine how a person may justify moral conduct when inherited authority and modern knowledge no longer appear as an uncomplicated unity. Moral judgment depends on an internal criterion that remains connected to metaphysical responsibility. The resulting subject is neither independent of communal tradition nor fully secured by it. Ethical agency requires inquiry, doubt and disciplined choice.

Abai and Shakarim rework inherited categories rather than merely repeat them. Didactic and spiritual concepts retain recognizable ethical content, but their role within the text changes. Knowledge becomes a means of personal and social self-correction, while spiritual discipline enters into dialogue with rational inquiry. Poetry retains a public purpose, now grounded more firmly in the formation of a reflective and responsible person.

Magzhan Zhumabayev's work reorganizes the relation among self, history and collective belonging in another direction [18, pp. 65–67; 25, pp. 52–67]. The lyric subject carries national aspiration, vulnerability and historical uncertainty with greater emotional intensity. Figures associated with Alash historical memory, heroism and fate enter the modern lyric as resources for interpreting a threatened or unfinished political future. Past and present are drawn together through desire and loss rather than through the relatively stable authority of memorial inscription or didactic counsel.

Magzhan's lyric position differs sharply from the public authority of the early texts. Collective belonging is inseparable from the instability of a modern subject who experiences the past through aspiration, absence and rupture. National history becomes an imaginative horizon from which the present can be judged, rather than an antiquarian object or a complete political programme.

The sequence from Abai to Shakarim and Magzhan reveals two connected changes. First, inherited ethical categories are reorgan-

ized around reflective agency. Second, historical belonging becomes an experience that must be articulated by a modern lyric subject rather than received as a settled order. These changes arose within colonial modernity, educational reform, translation and emerging print culture. They cannot be attributed retrospectively to contemporary globalization. They do, however, establish the forms of self-reflection and cross-cultural mediation through which later poetry could respond to a wider literary world.

3. Soviet and independence-period re-contextualization

The Soviet period introduced another institutional and ideological break. Publishing, education and literary recognition were reorganized, while expressions of religion, political memory and national autonomy were constrained in changing ways. The present corpus is too limited to reconstruct the full range of Soviet Kazakh poetry. It nevertheless allows one transition to be identified: inherited materials could be preserved through historical image, metaphor and formally indirect reflection even when their earlier political or sacred functions could not be stated in the same terms.

Olzhas Suleimenov's *Clay Book* is relevant to this transition because it places ancient imagery within a twentieth-century horizon of historical inquiry and civilizational danger [19, pp. 92, 113]. The archaic is not restored as an intact origin; its encounter with modern knowledge, technological power and possible collective destruction gives the old images a new critical function. Historical depth becomes a way of questioning the confidence of modern civilization. The past functions critically rather than ceremonially.

Independence altered the conditions under which suppressed or restricted memories could enter public discourse. Philosophical discussions of national renewal emphasized the relationship between reason, historical memory and cultural values [26, pp. 9–16]. Poetry participated in this wider reconsideration, although the scale and direction of change varied among authors. A return to historical subjects did not automatically restore an earlier worldview. Authors wrote after Soviet modernization, urbanization, mass education and major linguistic change. Recovered signs therefore entered a different social and semantic environment.

Tynyshtykbek Abdykakimuly's *Evening Letters* gives this altered environment a deliberately difficult poetic form without standing for all writing of the independence period [20, pp. 16, 102]. Compressed images and unexpected verbal connections interrupt the expectation of direct public counsel. Readers have to relate bodily, natural, historical and inward registers for themselves. The voice remains forceful, but interpretive authority no longer rests with the speaker alone.

This formal difficulty can be understood as a response to historical discontinuity. The poetic subject inherits several vocabularies that do not fit together without tension: sacred memory, Soviet experience, national recovery and the language of modern individual consciousness. A fragmented or semantically compressed form can hold these vocabularies in relation without resolving them into a declarative statement. Such poetry extends the reflective turn associated with Abai and Shakarim, while changing the conditions under which reflection occurs. Ethical and metaphysical questions are presented through ambiguity and semantic labour.

Studies of contemporary Kazakh poetry have identified experimentation with free verse, intertextuality, mixed forms and non-linear organization [6, p. 5]. These observations support a cautious interpretation of the selected independence-period works. They do not justify a universal claim that Kazakh poetry as a whole has become postmodern. In the selected poems, inherited images acquire a different authority when they enter non-linear or semantically unstable forms. The reader must negotiate among meanings rather than receive a single inherited code.

The wider Turkic environment of Kazakhstan also complicates the category of national poetic development. Burkitbaeva shows that poetry by Turkic-speaking communities in Kazakhstan combines shared historical resources with distinct literary traditions [7, pp. 290–301]. This context supports comparison and dialogue, but it should not be used to merge different literatures into one undifferentiated tradition. For the present study, it confirms that cultural boundaries are zones of contact in Lotman's sense. It does not expand the corpus beyond the Kazakh-centred genealogy defined in the introduction.

Inherited images therefore perform new work under changed institutions and poetic

conventions. In Suleimenov, the archaic becomes a means of questioning modern civilizational confidence; in independence-period writing, historical memory may register rupture, while textual difficulty gives readers a larger interpretive role. This is resemanticization in a restricted, textually observable sense. Since the conclusion rests on selected works, a larger corpus is needed before it can be generalized.

4. Retention, resemanticization and circulatory remediation

Retention names the continued availability of a philosophical question within the cultural repertoire. A category need not keep the same wording or doctrine to remain legible: mortality, ethical responsibility, knowledge, memory and collective belonging recur in texts separated by genre and period. What matters is whether the problem still organizes relations within a work.

Resemanticization refers to a change in that organizing function. Collective memory supports political accountability in the Orkhon materials, confronts mortality in the Korkyt tradition, shapes national imagination in Magzhan and registers rupture in selected independence-period poems. Ethical knowledge likewise passes from just rule in *Kutadgu Bilig* to spiritual self-discipline in Yasawi, critical self-formation in Abai, and inquiry into soul and reason in Shakarim. Recurrence is analytically useful only when these differences remain visible.

Circulatory remediation concerns a different level: the material, linguistic and institutional routes by which poetry reaches readers. The 2019 English-language *Contemporary Kazakh Literature: Poetry* documents movement beyond a single-language national readership [22]. Translation enlarges access, but it also selects works, supplies introductions, places poems under editorial categories and interprets culturally dense images. Damrosch helps explain the resulting change in reading context; Casanova draws attention to the unequal resources that govern recognition in international literary space.

These processes must remain distinct. Translation can alter a poem's framing and comparative setting without changing its wording, while an author may rework an inherited image in a text that circulates mainly within a national readership. In the present corpus,

globalization is documented most securely through publication, translation and reading context. A claim about its direct effects on po-

etic form would require a larger corpus organized chronologically.

Table 1- Analytical synthesis of philosophical transformation

Textual formation	Dominant philosophical relation	Main function of poetic language	Mechanism identified
Orkhon-Yenisey memorial discourse	Authority, memory and collective continuity	Public commemoration and political accountability	Retention of collective memory
Korkyt, Balasaguni and Yasawi	Mortality, ethical order and spiritual discipline	Narrative mediation, didactic dialogue and inward instruction	Retention with genre-specific resemanticization
Abai and Shakarim	Knowledge, moral judgment and ethical agency	Reflective criticism and self-formation	Resemanticization of the moral subject
Magzhan and selected twentieth-century writing	History, loss and collective belonging	Lyrical interpretation of historical uncertainty and civilizational critique	Resemanticization under modern institutional change
Independence-period works and translated anthologies	Plural memory, interpretive instability and transnational reception	Reader participation, editorial selection and translation	Resemanticization plus circulatory remediation

The table summarizes an interpretive sequence rather than a linear theory of progress. Later forms do not supersede earlier ones, and several functions may coexist within the same period. The value of the model lies in separating persistence from change and textual change from changes in circulation. It also provides criteria that can be examined in a broader corpus: whether a philosophical category remains identifiable, whether its textual role changes, and whether its audience or framing is altered through new institutions of publication and translation.

Discussion

The comparison shows why “transformation” is too broad when it describes a single passage from tradition to modernity. Across the corpus, a philosophical problem may persist, take on a different function within a poem, or enter a new frame through publication and translation. Treating these as distinct operations makes it possible to identify the level at which change occurs. That distinction, rather than a claim of uniform development, is the article’s main conceptual contribution.

Lotman’s semiosphere explains how continuity can coexist with change. A sign remains intelligible through its relations with other signs, genres and memories, yet crossing a historical or linguistic boundary requires translation into a new configuration [8]. The Orkhon materials bind memory to public authority,

whereas later lyric poetry turns it toward uncertainty and loss. Similar shifts connect didactic knowledge with reflective criticism and archaic imagery with modern civilizational questions. Boundaries are productive here because they make reinterpretation unavoidable.

The familiar image of a stable national “code” is too rigid for this evidence. Recurrent signs do not form a closed essence shared by every text or reader; they constitute a historically available repertoire that poets may preserve, contest, combine or redirect. Continuity becomes visible in particular acts of use, not in the mere presence of an old motif. This account also avoids presenting national identity as timeless or internally uniform.

Heidegger’s approach clarifies why these changes have philosophical significance. Poetic language can disclose ways of inhabiting time, mortality and place rather than merely report opinions about them [23, pp. 192, 259–273]. The selected works position the human subject differently: within a cosmological-political order, before the limit of death, within a discipline of conscience, under the pressure of historical loss, or amid competing vocabularies of memory. The analysis does not convert these positions into a single national ontology. It uses them to show how poetic form organizes relations that philosophical prose may formulate as separate concepts.

Damrosch and Casanova draw attention to an issue that textual interpretation alone cannot resolve. A literary work changes status

when it travels beyond its original linguistic setting [9; 10]. The English-language anthology considered here creates a new frame in which Kazakh poems can be compared with other literatures and read by audiences who may not share their cultural presuppositions. At the same time, selection and translation are institutional acts. They can increase visibility while narrowing the range of works through which a literature is represented. International circulation should therefore be analysed as an opportunity structured by unequal access, not as automatic recognition.

The results partially support earlier Kazakh scholarship on the pressure of globalization and the renewal of traditional values. They add a distinction between the presence of a familiar symbol and the function it performs. A historical image does not establish continuity by appearance alone. Its speaker, audience, temporal orientation and ethical purpose must also be considered. This distinction explains why the return of older motifs after independence may express recovery in one work, critical distance in another, and unresolved rupture in a third.

Globalization is only one part of the explanation. Colonial modernization, Soviet institutions, language policy, nation-building after independence and ordinary changes of genre also shaped the corpus; print culture and translation had influenced Kazakh poetry long before the contemporary global phase. The evidence most clearly links current conditions to intensified cross-language circulation and wider comparative framing. Formal and philosophical changes within poems still have to be explained case by case.

The empirical base remains limited. Canonical works outweigh recent poetry, published editions are not compared line by line with variants or translations, and no interviews, reception study or publication data establish how readers understand the categories identified here. Editions and anthologies document circulation, but they do not reveal its effects on interpretation. A larger project should therefore combine close reading with a defined contemporary corpus, translation comparison and reader research.

Even within these limits, the distinction among textual persistence, changed poetic function and altered conditions of circulation remains useful. It permits comparison across a discontinuous history without treating that history as either pure preservation or inevita-

ble loss. Future applications should state explicitly which level a claim addresses.

Conclusion

Across the selected genealogy, continuity appears as renewed engagement with recurring questions rather than preservation of an unchanged cultural essence. Early Turkic and Kazakh texts repeatedly address memory, mortality, knowledge, conscience and collective belonging, yet they assign these problems to different speakers, audiences and historical purposes. Authors and readers sustain the repertoire by placing its questions in new relations.

The comparison distinguishes three kinds of change. Some philosophical problems remain available across periods; within particular works, their ethical or political function is recast; publication and translation may then alter the linguistic and institutional frame of reading. These are the processes described here as retention, resemanticization and circulatory remediation. They can overlap, but evidence for one cannot simply be used to prove another.

Globalization is most visible in the third process, where translation and anthology publication widen circulation and reset frames of comparison. The evidence does not attribute modern Kazakh poetry's formal or philosophical changes to globalization alone. Colonial and Soviet histories, independence, language policy and genre development remain indispensable to the explanation.

Testing these distinctions will require a chronologically defined corpus of post-independence poetry. Comparison of Kazakh originals with translations can show which philosophical relations survive, diminish or change in circulation, while reception research can establish whether different reader groups recognize the meanings identified through close reading. Used together, these approaches would test the model without erasing the historical specificity of the texts.

References

- 1 Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. SAGE Publications.
- 2 Гидденс, Э. (2004). *Ускользающий мир = Runaway world: Как глобализация меняет нашу жизнь* (М. Л. Коробочкина, Пер.). Весь Мир.
- 3 Бауман, З. (2004). *Глобализация: Последствия для человека и общества* (М. Л. Коробочкина, Пер.; Е. В. Яновская, Ред.). Весь Мир.

- 4 Ысқақұлы, Д. (2012). Жаһандану жағдайындағы әдебиет. *Ақиқат*, (7), 68–74.
- 5 Абдуллина, Н., & Абишева, А. (2018). Трансформация духовных ценностей казахской культуры: От традиции к современности. *Вестник КазНУ. Серия философии, культурологии и политологии*, 66(4), 68–77.
- 6 Майтанов, Б. (2011). Қазіргі қазақ поэзиясы және постмодернизм. *Қазақ әдебиеті*, (41), 5.
- 7 Бүркітбаева, Ш. Д. (2022). Қазақстандағы түркі халықтары поэзиясы – Қазақстан халқы әдебиетінің бір саласы. *Абылай хан атындағы ҚазХҚжӘТУ Хабаршысы. Филология ғылымдары сериясы*, 64(1), 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2022.64.1.023>
- 8 Лотман, Ю. М. (2000). *Семіосфера: Культура и взрыв; Внутри мыслящих миров; Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968–1992)* (М. Ю. Лотман, Сост.). Искусство-СПБ.
- 9 Damrosch, D. (2003). *What is world literature?* Princeton University Press.
- 10 Casanova, P. (2004). *The world republic of letters* (M. B. DeBevoise, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- 11 Жолдасбеков, М. (1990). *Асыл арналар: Әдеби мақалалар* (Б. Ақбұзауова, Ред.). Жазушы.
- 12 *Қорқыт ата кітабы* (Б. Ысқақов, Ауд.). (1994). Жазушы.
- 13 Баласағұн, Ж. (1986). *Құтты білік* (А. Қ. Егеубаев, Ауд., Алғы сөз және түсініктер). Жазушы.
- 14 Иасауи, Қ. А. (1998). *Хикмет жинақ: Даналық сыр* (М. Жармұхамедұлы, М. Шафиғи, & С. Дәуітұлы, Ауд.). Жалын.
- 15 *Бес ғасыр жырлайды: XV ғасырдан XX ғасырдың бас кезіне дейінгі қазақ ақын-жырауларының шығармалары* (М. Мағауин & М. Байділдаев, Құраст.; Т. 1). (1984). Жазушы.
- 16 Абай Құнанбайұлы. (2005). *Шығармаларының екі томдық толық жинағы* (Т. 1–2). Жазушы.
- 17 Құдайбердиев, Ш. (1988). *Шығармалары: Өлеңдер, дастандар, қара сөздер* (М. Жармұхамедов, С. Дәуітов, & А. Құдайбердиев, Құраст.). Жазушы.
- 18 Жұмабаев, М. (1989). *Шығармалары: Өлеңдер, поэмалар, қара сөздер* (Х. Абдуллин, Б. Дәрімбетов, & З. Жұмабаева, Құраст.; Ә. Тәжібаев, Алғы сөз). Жазушы.
- 19 Сулейменов, О. О. (1969). *Глиняная книга: Стихи*. Жазушы.
- 20 Әбдікәкімов, Т. (1993). *Ақшам хаттары: Өлеңдер, балладалар, толғаулар*. Жалын.
- 21 Әбдікәкімов, Т. (2000). *Ырауан: Өлеңдер, балладалар, толғаулар*. Атамұра.
- 22 *Contemporary Kazakh literature: Poetry*. (2019). Public Foundation National Bureau of Translations; Cambridge University Press.
- 23 Хайдеггер, М. (1993). *Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления* (В. В. Бибихин, Сост., Пер. с нем. и Коммент.). Республика.
- 24 Ысмағұлов, Ж. (1994). *Абай: Ақындық тағылымы: Өмір шындығы – ақын көзімен*. Ғылым.
- 25 Ысқақұлы, Д. (2018). Мағжанның әдеби эстетикасы. *Ақиқат*, (4), 52–67.
- 26 Нысанбаев, Ә. (2006). Тәуелсіздік философиясы. *Адам әлемі = Мир человека*, (3), 9–16.

Transliteration

- 1 Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. SAGE Publications.
- 2 Giddens, E. (2004). *Uskol'zayushchiy mir = Runaway world: Kak globalizatsiya menyaet nashu zhizn'* [Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives] (M. L. Korobochkina, Trans.). Ves' Mir. (In Russian)
- 3 Bauman, Z. (2004). *Globalizatsiya: Posledstviya dlya cheloveka i obshchestva* [Globalization: The human consequences] (M. L. Korobochkina, Trans.; E. V. Yanovskaya, Ed.). Ves' Mir. (In Russian)
- 4 Ysqaquly, D. (2012). Jaһandanu jaғdayyndaғy әdebiет [Literature in the context of globalization]. *Aqіqat*, (7), 68–74. (In Kazakh)
- 5 Abdullina, N., & Abisheva, A. (2018). Transformatsiya dukhovnykh tsennostey kazakhskoy kul'tury: Ot traditsii k sovremennosti [Transformation of the spiritual values of Kazakh culture: From tradition to modernity]. *Vestnik KazNU. Seriya filosofii, kul'turologii i politologii*, 66(4), 68–77. (In Russian)
- 6 Maytanov, B. (2011). Qazirgi qazaq poeziyasy jәne postmodernizm [Contemporary Kazakh poetry and postmodernism]. *Qazaq әdebiyeti*, (41), 5. (In Kazakh)
- 7 Bürkitbaeva, Sh. D. (2022). Qazaqstandaғy türki halyqtary poeziyasy – Qazaqstan halqy әdebiетiniñ bir salasy [Poetry of Turkic peoples in Kazakhstan as a branch of the literature of the people of Kazakhstan]. *Abylay khan atyndaғy QazHQ jәne ÄTU Khabarshysy. Filologiya ғылымдары seriyasy*, 64(1), 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2022.64.1.023> (In Kazakh)
- 8 Lotman, Yu. M. (2000). *Semiosfera: Kul'tura i vzryv; Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov; Stat'i. Issledovaniya. Zametki (1968–1992)* [The semiosphere: Culture and explosion; Inside thinking worlds; Articles, studies, notes (1968–1992)] (M. Yu. Lotman, Comp.). Iskusstvo-SPB. (In Russian)
- 9 Damrosch, D. (2003). *What is world literature?* Princeton University Press.
- 10 Casanova, P. (2004). *The world republic of letters* (M. B. DeBevoise, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- 11 Zholdasbekov, M. (1990). *Asyl arnalar: Ädebi maqalalar* [Noble sources: Literary articles] (B. Aqbuzaüova, Ed.). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)
- 12 *Qorqyt ata kitaby* [The Book of Dede Korkut] (B. Ysqaqov, Trans.). (1994). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)
- 13 Balasaғun, Zh. (1986). *Qutty bilik* [The wisdom of happiness] (A. Q. Egeubaev, Trans., Foreword, & Notes). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)
- 14 Iasau, Q. A. (1998). *Hikmet jinaq: Danalyq syr* [Collection of hikmets: The secret of wisdom] (M. Jarmühamedüly, M. Shafigi, & S. Däuitüly, Trans.). Jalyn. (In Kazakh)
- 15 *Bes ғасыр jырlaidy: XV ғасырдан XX ғасырдың бас kezine deiingi qazaq aqын-jyраularyның шығармалары* [Five centuries of poetry: Works of Kazakh poets and jiraus from the 15th to the beginning of the 20th century] (M. Maғauin & M. Baidydaev, Comps.; Vol. 1). (1984). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)
- 16 Abai Qunanbäiuly. (2005). *Shyғarmalarynyñ eki tomdyq tolyq jinaғy* [Complete two-volume collection of works] (Vols. 1–2). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)
- 17 Qūdaiberdiyev, Sh. (1988). *Shyғarmalary: Öleñder, dastandar, qara sözder* [Works: Poems, epics,

and prose] (M. Jarmühamedov, S. Däuitov, & A. Qūdai-berdiyev, Comps.). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)

18 Jūmabaev, M. (1989). *Shyǵarmalary: Öleñder, poemalar, qara sözder* [Works: Poems, narrative poems, and prose] (Kh. Abdullin, B. Därimbetov, & Z. Jūmabaeva, Comps.; Ä. Täjibaev, Foreword). Jazushy. (In Kazakh)

19 Suleimenov, O. O. (1969). *Glinyanaya kniga: Stikhi* [The clay book: Poems]. Jazushy. (In Russian)

20 Äbdikäkimov, T. (1993). *Aqşam hattary: Öleñder, balladalar, tolǵaular* [Evening letters: Poems, ballads, and tolgaу poems]. Jalyn. (In Kazakh)

21 Äbdikäkimov, T. (2000). *Yrauan: Öleñder, balladalar, tolǵaular* [Yrauan: Poems, ballads, and tolgaу poems]. Atamūra. (In Kazakh)

22 *Contemporary Kazakh literature: Poetry*. (2019). Public Foundation National Bureau of Translations; Cambridge University Press.

23 Heidegger, M. (1993). *Vremya i bytie: Stat'i i vystupleniya* [Time and being: Articles and speeches] (V. V. Bibikhin, Comp., Trans. from German, & Comment.). Respublika. (In Russian)

24 Ysmagūlov, Zh. (1994). *Abai: Aqyndyq taǵylymy: Ömir şyndyǵy – aqyn közimen* [Abai: Literary lessons: Reality of life through the poet's eyes]. Gylym. (In Kazakh)

25 Ysqaqūly, D. (2018). Maǵjannyñ ädebi estetikasy [Magzhan's literary aesthetics]. *Aqiqat*, (4), 52–67. (In Kazakh)

26 Nysanbaev, Ä. (2006). Täuelsizdik filosofiyasy [Philosophy of independence]. *Adam älemi = Mir cheloveka*, (3), 9–16. (In Kazakh)

Author Contributions

N.B. Manapbayev – developed the research concept, conducted the investigation and prepared the initial draft. *E.D. Yerzhanov* – designed the methodology, carried out the philosophical analysis and revised the manuscript. *Ş. Yilmaz* – undertook the comparative interpretation and validation and contributed to revision. *A. Seisenbayeva* – reviewed the literature, curated the source materials and contributed to revision.

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

<i>Nurbolat Manapbayev</i>	Senior Lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: Nur.ak.80@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0009-0009-6682-820X
<i>Yerkebulan Yerzhanov</i>	Senior Lecturer, PhD, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: erke7330@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8022-4490
<i>Şirin Yilmaz</i>	Associate Professor, PhD, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey, email: sirinyo@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6038-0971
<i>Akbota Seisenbayeva</i>	Acting Associate Professor, PhD, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: s.akbota@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2955-9257
<i>Нұрболат Манапбаев</i>	аға оқытушы, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, email: Nur.ak.80@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0009-0009-6682-820X
<i>Еркебұлан Ержанов</i>	аға оқытушы, PhD, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, email: erke7330@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8022-4490
<i>Шырын Илмаз</i>	қауымдастырылған профессор, PhD, Хаджетеппе университеті, Анкара, Түркия, email: sirinyo@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6038-0971
<i>Ақбота Сейсенбаева</i>	қауымдастырылған профессор міндетін атқарушы, PhD, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, email: s.akbota@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2955-9257
<i>Нурболат Манапбаев</i>	старший преподаватель, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан, email: Nur.ak.80@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0009-0009-6682-820X
<i>Еркебұлан Ержанов</i>	старший преподаватель, PhD, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан, email: erke7330@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8022-4490
<i>Шырын Илмаз</i>	ассоциированный профессор, PhD, Университет Хаджетеппе, Анкара, Турция, email: sirinyo@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6038-0971
<i>Ақбота Сейсенбаева</i>	и.о. ассоциированного профессора, PhD, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан, email: s.akbota@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2955-9257.