

THE INFLUENCE OF BAYTURSYNULY, SAUSSURE, AND MARR ON THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH OF KUDAYBERGEN ZHUBANOV

KARABULUT F.¹, MURATBEK B.K.^{2*}

Karabulut Ferhat¹ – PhD, docent, Celal Bayar university, Manisa, Turkey

E-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580>

*Muratbek Bagila Kurmanbekkyzy² – Candidate of philological sciences, docent, K. Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan

E-mail: baglash@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4100-2534>

Abstract. This paper will re-evaluate the intellectual heritage of Kudaibergen Zhubanov, in relation to Ferdinand de Saussure and Nikolai Marr. Its main objective is to identify K. Zhubanov's contribution to linguistic thought at the beginning of the 20th century and investigate his application of synchronic-structural and diachronic methods to the Kazakh language. Applying the qualitative analysis of the text, we assign K. Zhubanov's theories concerning grammar, phonetics, morphology, syntax and lexis to linguistics and intellectual history. The study demonstrates that K. Zhubanov's method of grammatical characterization of the Kazakh language strongly conforms to F. de Saussurean structural synchronic linguistics through its meticulous organization. He at the same time assimilated N. Marr's method, which views language as a historical process shaped by development in phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary, reflecting a Marxist viewpoint. K. Zhubanov, than strictly opposing the synchronic and diachronic methods, established a dynamic analytical approach: he did not separate the structural features of the Kazakh language from the historical processes of its development. Through constant observation of the etymological nature, phonetic changes and transformations in lexis, he demonstrated that a thorough knowledge of etymology is crucial for a systematic explanation of the currently functioning language system.

Apart from its purely academic value, K. Zhubanov's work is culturally important: it contributes to the definition of the Kazakh linguistic nation's identity both during and after a difficult period of cultural disruption. By drawing on the depth of Kazakh vocabulary and its phonetic structure, he gave a new meaning to the research in this area: the development of linguistic identity and national cultural consciousness and revival. His theory is a synthetic type, combining F. de Saussurean structural linguistic analysis with an understanding of the historical-materialistic genesis of language. This direction in linguistics paved the way for the development of socio-historical and functional linguistics in Kazakhstan, highlighting the enduring relevance of K. Zhubanov's scientific activity in issues of language, national language and culture.

Key words: K. Zhubanov, F. de Saussure, N. Marr, structural linguistics, diachronic linguistics, Kazakh language, linguistic historiography, national linguistic identity.

Introduction

Having learned from the works of F. de Saussure and N. Mar, the aim of this study is to trace and determine how closely, extensively and profoundly the works of Akhmet Baitursynuly, Ferdinand de Saussure and Nikolay Yakovlevich Marr had affected Kudaibergen Zhubanov's worldview and research views and in what way they manifested themselves.

In his book «Research on the Kazakh Language» (2010), K. Zhubanov acknowledges a long tradition of scholarly exchange with the Kazakh language and the broader Turkic language family. He divides his predecessors into two categories: foreign orientalists and Turkologists. The first category of scholars studied Turkic languages abroad for the administrative needs of the tsarist government, the ideological needs of the Soviet Union, or for missionary purposes. These include N. Ilminsky, P. Melioransky, A. Terentyev, D. Laptev, V. Katarinsky, V. Radlov, and E. Polivanov. The second category of these academics are Kazakhs, concentrating on the native language of the people and are known as 'Kazakhsts' and as linguists working to reform the language and increase the number of speakers

This group includes Akhmet Baitursynuly, Koshke Kemengeruly, Eldes Omaruly, Telzhan Shonanuly, Khalel Dosmukhameduly, Nazir Torekululy, Kazim Basimuly, and Sarsen Amanzhol. More broadly, K. Zhubanov's research was based on a rich literature: he paid particular attention to the works of Bodulan de Courtner, H. Stantal, V. Betrin, N. Ilminsky, P. Meliolansky, V. Radlov, A. Bogoroditsky, E. Polivanov, R. Samoilovich, B. Chobanzada, K. Yudakhin, A. Peshkovsky, F.

Fortunatov, A. Shapiro, M. Petersen, S. Kaltsevsky, N. Mar, V. Bazold, S. Malov, and others [1, 52].

In the area of research where K. Zhubanov's interests were concentrated, he was inspired by the work of Ferdinand de Saussure, Nikolai Mar, Terzan Shonanuli and Akhmet Baitursynuly. He recognized Akhmet Baitursynuly as the founder and highest theoretical luminary of Kazakh linguistics, but rejected A. Baitursynuly's findings without reservations. He criticized A. Baitursynuly for imposing Russian grammatical models onto Kazakh linguistic phenomena, believing this to be a wrong and fundamentally improper methodological decision. He also took issue with his phonology system, the structure of a syllable, spelling and its entire analytical framework. According to K. Zhubanov, A. Baitursynuly was correct in seeing it as preliminary and lamented the fact that linguistics had progressed too slowly, he needed much more in-depth and objective research in the area of Kazakh studies. K. Zhubanov criticized A. Baitursynuly because, on account of his goal to capture the average reader's attention, he arbitrarily and simplified and curtailed his description of Kazakh grammar. K. Zhubanov emphasized the urgent need to establish a modern phonology based on an adequate description of the Kazakh phonological system [2, 35-37].

K. Zhubanov considered A. Baitursynuly's contribution to the Russian grammatical tradition fundamental but also methodologically limited, so he sought inspiration from other theories. Among his theoretical circle, the most prominent figures were the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (considered a bourgeois intellectual by Soviet critics) and the Russian scholar Nikolai Maar. K. Zhubanov examined the entire field of grammatical theory, identifying three competing schools of thought, each with its own distinct understanding of the nature of grammar. Drawing on the views of N. Maar, A. Shapiro, A. Peshkovsky, M. Petersen, F. Fortunatov, and F. de Saussure, he described these approaches as follows. The first approach posits that grammar consists solely of morphology and syntax; K. Zhubanov attributes this view to F. de Saussure in the West and Academician Fortunatov in Russia, with M. Petersen and A. Peshkovsky being their intellectual successors whom K. Zhubanov collectively calls «formalists». The second school embraces both grammar and phonetics; K. Zhubanov associates this view with Bogoroditsky, calling him «an Indo-European linguist and proponent of psychological processes in grammar". In his «General Theory of the Russian Language», Bogoroditsky defines grammar as a branch of linguistics consisting of three parts: phonetics, morphology, and syntax a position that, according to K. Zhubanov, «psychologists» should occupy. The third school, although generally accepting the triadic division into morphology, syntax, and lexicology, differs from F. de Saussure's formalist conception. It insists that the lexical dimension of language is itself a formal dimension, and therefore lexicology must belong to the recognized branch of grammar [3, 85].

Materials and methods of research

The methodological approach taken in this paper is based on qualitative text analysis-that serves as the initial trigger to review the works of K. Zhubanov, as well as dialogue with the principles of linguistic thought laid down by A. Baitursynuly, F. de Saussure and N. Marr. The analysis follows the techniques of accepted historical comparative methods, it also uses interpretative (hermeneutic) method within historical linguistics. K. Zhubanov's works in grammatical, phonetic, morphologic, syntax and lexicology fields serve as primary texts. The works describing the process of developing modern linguistic theories based on structural and historic linguistics provide secondary texts. The study aims to reveal convergences and discrepancies in both approaches as well as determine the overall direction in which this scientific development of K. Zhubanov moves.

Results and its discussion

K. Zhubanov discusses many linguistic concept categories and gives his view. N. Marr vigorously criticized the idea of isolating morphological facts from syntactic ones. N. Marr believed F. de Saussure wrongly detached morph from syntax. For example, N. Marr pointed out that morphology is used to differentiate between grammatical words and lexical words.

In K. Zhubanov's summary, N. Marr argues that, from an analytical perspective, it is impossible to separate word change from syntax because morphological operations themselves have no purpose they are tools serving syntactic goals, while syntax is essentially the act of connecting words together [2, 83]. Despite the profound theoretical differences between F. De Saussure and N. Marr, their positions converge on a fundamental point: language is not a material object that can be studied using natural science methods, but a cognitive phenomenon. F. De Saussure attempted to establish a strictly defined object of study language itself as a system while N. Marr focused his critique on the selective and normative treatment of linguistic data, which confined nineteenth-century linguistics within the existing framework of categorical assumptions. However, both scholars shared a common theoretical position: they both acknowledged the fundamental relationality of language development, opposed any view of the independent or fixed origin of language, emphasized the relationality of linguistic signs, and jointly opposed the concept of language as a whole, a self-sufficient organism [4, 104]. We believe that F. De Saussure's influence on K. Zhubanov is most evident in the latter's methodology for studying Kazakh phonetics and phonological organization, particularly in the identification and analysis of its morphological and syntactic structures. Although F. De Saussure primarily focused on structure, he argued that language operates through a contrastive system, with phonemes playing a central role in this system from a semantic perspective. Concepts such as binary branching, minimal opposition, and allomorphy are central to phonological theory, and the distinction between phonemes and allomorphisms was particularly beneficial to K. Zhubanov's analytical work. In his phonetic writings, K. Zhubanov systematically studied the phonetic characteristics of Kazakh speech including its physical and articulatory features as well as its phonological dimensions: the functional roles of speech, patterns of speech transitions, and the factors driving these changes. In this process, he followed the research paths of phonologists such as Baudrillard de Kurtney and structuralists such as F. de Saussure. F. de Saussure's other task, perhaps more important, was to understand the holistic nature of grammar: in his view, language must be understood as a system in which the value of each element derives from its relationship with other elements; that is, the phonetic system, morphological structure, and syntactic organization cannot be viewed in isolation. K. Zhubanov also openly used this relational concept when discussing the relationship between discourse and phonetics [3, 80-81].

Regarding the question of whether phonetics belongs to the realm of grammar, K. Zhubanov points out that comparative Indo-European linguists were the first to exclude phonetics from grammatical studies, making it an independent discipline, thus regarding morphology and syntax as the two most important branches of grammar. He summarizes A. Peshkovsky's view: morphology is the branch of grammar that studies the form of individual words, while syntax studies the form of phrases [3, 81]. K. Zhubanov points out that this division is also reflected in Soviet higher education textbooks, which follow F. de Saussure's theoretical structure, regard phonetics and phonology as disciplines independent of grammar, and define grammar itself as a branch of morphology and syntax [3, 81-82]. According to K. Zhubanov, «His mistake stems from the idea that language is a fixed entity that never changes» [3, 88]. Within this framework, phonetic science is considered, to some extent, a subject of grammar, whereas phonology, which examines sound changes and the functional roles of sounds, is regarded as lying outside the domain of grammar. K. Zhubanov, who largely adhered to F. de Saussure's synchronic and structural approach, aimed to produce a synchronic grammar of the Kazakh language. For this reason, he began his studies with phonetics and continued with sections on morphology and syntax.

Saussure's desire to reflect the state of language in a particular period naturally extended to the lexical level: for him, vocabulary was a legitimate object of linguistic research and a corresponding component of grammar. This belief significantly influenced K. Zhubanov, who placed particular emphasis on the analysis of Kazakh dictionaries in his scientific research. As K. Zhubanov himself pointed out, F. de Saussure introduced lexicology into the field of grammar based on the idea that language describes the general state of the world, and words are the means of describing this state [5, 129-131]. F. de Saussure divided grammar into three parts based on

morphology and syntax, with lexicology considered the third branch, excluding phonetics based on the grammatical study of all the features of language on the same time scale [3, 82-83]. However, it was precisely this framework that created an inherent tension, which K. Zhubanov quickly realized: F. de Saussure's attempt to separate morphological phenomena from syntactic phenomena was, in K. Zhubanov's view, impossible analytically, because the process of word change itself has a syntactic nature [3, 83]. For K. Zhubanov, the broader context exacerbated this contradiction formalists excluded phonetics and introduced lexicology into grammar, resulting in an unsolvable conceptual confusion. He openly acknowledged this impasse: grammar, according to traditional theoretical formulations, was difficult to fully understand, and the question of its proper scope remained unanswered (February 12, 1937). However, it remained clear that he had defined grammar as his domain in this regard when he asked the rhetorical question: «Why do we call it grammar? (It includes necessarily phonetic structure, form and syntax)» [3, 84] and K. Zhubanov thought it constitutive, not even essential. Although K. Zhubanov, similar to F. de Saussure, analyzed principally the contemporary Kazakh state, he did not ignore historical linguistics, frequently he analyzed how the early Kazakh state was developing and even, similar to N. Marr, how the earlier stages of the Turkic family of languages, such as archaic and early modern Kazakh (also analyzed in *A History of the Early Kazakhs* and later summarized in a short work in Soviet Kazakhstan in 1948 and 1950, where even this small sample could, N. Marr and A. Chikobava argued, be only understood by historical materialism, which was not an idealism as K. Vossler's, it was not Meyer's sociological positivism that arose post Durkheim, it was not F. de Saussure's *linguolinguo* linguistics as a part of the social sciences, he even said that by linguistics as part of philosophy, it has no meaning [6, 5].

Prior to these theoretical pressures, K. Zhubanov had already ventured into historical linguistics, consistently employing a comparative perspective in his historical research: he juxtaposed Kazakh with other Turkic dialects and, where necessary, compared it with languages outside the Turkic family. It was this comparative approach that distinguished him from F. de Saussure. For example, research into alphabets and orthography led K. Zhubanov to examine the historical development of Kazakh and related languages, resulting in observations such as the asymmetry in vowel length between Kazakh and Kyrgyz [3, 346], and the possibility that ancient Altaic languages may not have been able to distinguish vowels by their hardness or softness a feature reflected in the use of the same letter for «p» and «b», and «k» and «g» in the Uyghur alphabet [3, 499].

F. de Saussure viewed diachronic and comparative studies as distractions, arguing that past events are irrelevant and offer no insight into the present linguistic reality. K. Zhubanov, however, held the opposite view. He believed that the current state of Kazakh is the result of its historical development, and therefore any proper description of Kazakh must be traced back to its earlier stages the period requiring analysis. This view reveals a second equally important aspect of K. Zhubanov's academic identity: he was both a historical comparative linguist and a structuralist linguist, with a fruitful tension between the two. K. Zhubanov describes F. de Saussure's overall concept of linguistics as an artificially constrained form of research, which he calls «standard» or static linguistics. In his view, the concept of «static» implies stagnation, meaning that linguistic reality is frozen at a specific moment. Under this model, language research should adopt a horizontal synchronous, linear while vertical diachronic analysis is considered unacceptable. For example, verb categories can be studied along the timeline of tense differences, which constitutes a true diachronic study; however, F. de Saussure only considered synchronic relations to be the real problem of grammar. K. Zhubanov's concept is more comprehensive: his understanding of grammar.

F. de Saussure's definition of the scope of grammar ultimately includes phonetics to a certain extent as well as morphology, syntax, and lexicology. For him, the ambiguity between morphology and syntax is not a theoretical flaw but a structural reality: morphological categories can be included in syntactic categories and vice versa. K. Zhubanov, citing the Kazakh sentence «Men oqushymym» («I am a student») as an example, shows that the first morpheme (men) can occur

alone, and the second morpheme (-myn) can occur alone F. de Saussure theorizes this connection as sentence structure and calls the combination of such elements a «sentence chain» [5, 338].

K. Zhubanov draws a sharp conclusion from this example: when linguists artificially separate morphological features from syntactic features, they are taking a purely analytical approach to elements such as «men-mın». Form and meaning, as independent units, both belong to the field of morphology, but they are simultaneously included in a network of positive and negative syntactic relations, the meaning of which is determined by syntax. More precisely, the suffix «-mın» connects the predicate with the predicate - this is the syntactic connection between verbs and nouns. Therefore, to consider form and meaning as separable is tantamount to slipping into formalism. According to K. Zhubanov, F. de Saussure's basis is precisely this: this is not a dynamic description of the movement of language, but a static dogma. K. Zhubanov's understanding of dynamism presupposes change - it belongs to the logic of process and transformation, not to the frozen section suggested by F. de Saussure's synchronic model.

If F. de Saussure's influence on K. Zhubanov is manifested mainly at the methodological level, then Nikolai Marr formed his deeper conceptual orientation. The intellectual connection between the two scientists is reflected not only in their ideas, but also in their personal experiences. In the fall of 1930, K. Zhubanov returned to Leningrad and entered the postgraduate course at the Yafitan Seminar of the Institute of Linguistics and Thought (now the Institute of Linguistics) of the USSR Academy of Sciences. It was during his postgraduate studies that his academic achievements truly began to accumulate. According to Academician Akhmet Zhubanov, it was during this period that Kudaibergen Kuanuly wrote an article entitled «Marxism and Marxism» and submitted it to I. Alimov («Kazakh Literature», December 5, 1957, No. 49) [3, 18].

Studying various grammatical theories, Zhubanov summarized Marx's views: although Marx never systematically explained grammatical theory, he left behind many scattered but profound insights covering many areas. He believed that «grammar solves the language problem» and proposed the concept of «grammatical structure». Within this framework, morphology serves as a syntactic method, phonetics forms the material basis of morphology, syntax performs the main communicative function, and morphology plays its structural role - phonetics performs a similar function at a lower level of abstraction. In Marr's concept, these three components are deeply and inextricably linked; Marr argues that the long-standing academic view of considering them as separate fields has obscured their internal unity, since phonetics is limited to the narrow field of phonetic science [3, 89].

K. Zhubanov's own concept of language is closely aligned with this integrated model. Therefore, we can say that while Saussure provided K. Zhubanov with the main methodological tools, N. Marr provided the main conceptual framework. F. de Saussure defined grammar as a structural system focused on morphology, syntax, and lexicology, with phonetics serving only as an auxiliary factor; On the contrary, N. Marr breaks down the strict boundaries between these fields, considering morphology as a function of syntax and phonetics as a component of morphology, the three mutually limiting each other to form a single functional whole.

In this sense, N. Marr's theoretical framework is close to K. Zhubanov's concrete analytical practice. K. Zhubanov never excluded phonetics or phonology in his grammatical studies - both were considered inseparable, not complementary. In particular, phonology has its own historical dimension, while K. Zhubanov's approach to language emphasizes dynamism: language is constantly changing, and it is impossible to create an appropriate modern grammar without first identifying the evolutionary process that gave rise to the modern language. N. Marr's research is focused on the emergence and long-term evolution of language systems, and also emphasizes diachronic research – K. Zhubanov also follows this idea, returning several times to the early historical periods of the Turkic languages, especially in the phonetic and phonological analysis of the Kazakh language. K. Zhubanov's use of N. Marr's theory is also reflected.

K. Zhubanov claims that traces of this semiotic hybridity still exist in modern lexical structures. For example, the Russian word *zovut* («they call»), derived from the root *zov* («call» or «utterance»), shows that verbal action was historically a source of lexical semantics. This

perspective theoretically undermines synchronic models that treat language as a system of independent and internally coherent properties. Indeed, for K. Zhubanov's engagement with N. Marr, language emerges as a historically layered structure rather than a dynamic form understood only through diachronic reconstruction.

K. Zhubanov believes that the formation of vocabulary, the evolution of phonetics, and differences in grammar are abstract processes inseparable from their historical contexts a belief that firmly anchors him in the tradition of linguistic historicism. He adheres to a lineage of scholars who, while also emphasizing the nature of language as an ever-developing phenomenon molded by societal history, give this view much greater depth by proposing, in a manner distinct from W. Labov, a relational ontology of language. Indeed, he takes the relational aspect even further: linguistic units and grammatical phenomena are not in a vacuum. Linguistic categories emerge on the basis of their relationship to other parts of the system. This means that verb forms are implicitly based on noun forms and that the difference between singular and plural is also determined by this relational framework, this broad logic of class is itself historically conditioned. Thus, the Kazakh proverb that K. Zhubanov cites, «Where the horse lies, the feather remains», shows the historical fixing of a linguistic form. The proverb is presented as a metaphor to express the idea that ancient linguistic words are, as if time capsule locked forever, immortal. So the phonetic or morphological forms are like archive repositories: they still have, for modern linguistics, evidence of archaic linguisms, long dead now and unused. It is impossible for synchronic analysis to explain this development unless it considers this «historical heritage». This is where K. Zhubanov advocates integrating both the synchronic and the diachronic without wanting to exclude the one or the other. This framework is, essentially, a silent alternative to F. de Saussurian structuralism, which imposes tight limitations on the timescale over which language can be investigated. Unlike F. de Saussure, who views language as a static system related to its elements by fixed relations and boundaries, K. Zhubanov sees in language the element of change and variation, the interaction between and the superposition of histories. In support of this stance, N. Marr (1864-1934) provided a comprehensive model of the internal arrangement of language: morphology includes three levels of vocabulary, sounds and syntax and phonetics operates at three levels: syntax, vocabulary and morphology [3, 89]. Hence, language is considered not as a hierarchically arranged system with fixed boundaries and neatly separated subsystems, but as a process network. One of the early precursors of modern functional and interactive perspectives in linguistics, N. Marr's typology drew attention to interrelationships and the continuities among linguistic systems. A major difference in theory between N. Marr and F. de Saussure arises in the status of lexical analysis. F. de Saussure brought words into grammar as parts of a system and grammatical-structural, while N. Marr opposed the idea of seeing vocabulary not as one more component of a grammatical field, but as «a collection historically gathered» [3, 245]. K. Zhubanov places his thesis somewhere between those two traditions.

He fully recognizes the analytical value of lexical data in grammatical research and makes natural use of historical and contemporary Kazakh lexical data. However, he does not give lexicology the same structural status as phonetics, morphology, and syntax. His approach suggests a subtle understanding of the relationship between language structure and linguistic materials. Following N. Marr's approach, K. Zhubanov describes vocabulary as a repository of available linguistic resources rather than an internally organized grammatical subsystem [3, 86]. In his view, grammar is not about counting ready-made lexical units, but rather how these units are organized into communicative structures. For K. Zhubanov, the proper object of grammatical analysis is not word counting, but word-formation methods and structural organization [3, 90]. From this perspective, the raw materials of language phonemes, syllables, lexical elements, and affixes constitute a resource of available symbols that language users can mobilize in organized communicative agreements. Morphology governs word-formation processes and structural configurations, serving lexical and syntactic purposes, while phonetics provides the material basis for morphological, syntactic, and lexical distinctions. K. Zhubanov explains this relationship with characteristic conciseness, citing the smallest phonetic contrasts in the Kazakh language, for

example, «az-as» and «at-et», where one phonetic difference simultaneously determines morphological, syntactic and semantic results [3, 90]. At a broad theoretical level, K. Zhubanov's linguistic model fundamentally rejects the strict internal branch divisions of early structuralism. Instead, he proposes a comprehensive linguistic model.

Conclusion

It would be a fundamental misunderstanding to limit K. Zhubanov's academic legacy to the absorption of F. de Saussure's structuralism or N. Marr's historicism. Rather, his work should be understood as a theoretically complex study and an epistemological consultative study formed at the intersection of diverse, even contradictory, linguistic ideas. F. de Saussure's framework, based on synchronic structural analysis, views language as a self-contained, self-regulating system, the internal logic of which is completely independent of historical development. K. Zhubanov found methodological precision and analytical coherence in this model and rigorously applied it to the systematization of Kazakh grammar. At the same time, his understanding of language never turned into a strict structural determinism. N. Marr's fruitful study of the philosophy of language introduces historically integrated adjustments to the static view of natural language from a structural perspective. F. de Saussure separated language from time, while N. Marr insisted on a deterministic connection between phonetics, morphology, syntax, and the development of vocabulary - a phenomenon that is far from a self-regulating formal system, but is rich in historical and social connotations. K. Zhubanov's constant focus on the historical continuity of linguistic forms reflects a broader epistemological shift - a departure from structuralism's preference for stability in favor of acknowledging the intrinsically dynamic nature of language. In this sense, his theoretical contribution to linguistics can be understood as a continuous effort to fruitfully synthesize methodological structuralism and historical materialism, rather than treating them as mutually exclusive oppositions. This integrative approach effectively eliminates one of the most deeply rooted contradictions in early 20th-century linguistic thought: the absolute division between synchronic and diachronic analysis.

By exploring both dimensions together, K. Zhubanov allows for a model where the study is flexible, time-bound, it respects that present language has remnants of history, so etymology, phonological drift, lexical carryover, etc., are central topics of linguistic inquiry. Limiting K. Zhubanov research merely on a science level misses the point. While the formulation of a grammar language may have appeared to be a solely intellectual task, it was also an attempt in identity-building. Bringing forth the complexity of the structure and the vast history embedded within the Kazakh tongue gave impetus for linguistic consciousness of the Kazakh language-a consciousness where academic inquiry is intertwined with the flourishing of its own cultural expression. With this tension between two competing needs - modernity for an ever-shifting societal reality, alongside the need for the language to embody cultural history - is one where K. Zhubanov's research resonates more deeply with the times. Here, science does not stand opposite to the humanities, but complement one another, a careful reading of K. Zhubanov's research shows him engaged in discussion with F. de Saussure, with N. Marr. Through «What does grammar study? What does it consist of?», «What is grammar?», «F. de Saussure's linguistic method», «N. Marr and grammar», «Who wrote the grammar? And how was it written?» and «The basic and grammatical meanings of words», he establishes a model that embraces linguistic pluralism, based on the premise that this pluralism comes about not from an easy, imitative borrowing of others' ways of doing things, but through the critical joining of ideas and experiences with the material already present and passed down to him-here, in the Turks, in particular with the structure of the Kazakh tongue. K. Zhubanov's work was revolutionary, against those that viewed grammar in narrow, reductionist views during early 20th-century linguistics. K. Zhubanov did not treat accurate structure and the depth of time in history to be contradictory disciplines, for him, structural and temporal analysis were related tools needed to provide an accurate representation of language and its history-an understanding foreshadowing sociohistorical linguists or functionalist linguists, fields where both the structure of a language and how it is used over time about social aspects of culture and life take focus. Consequently, his contribution goes far beyond grammatization of the language, in creating

References

1. Malbaqov M. Qūdaibergen Jūbanov // Ūly dala tūlǵalary / jalpy red. basqarǵan M. Malbaqov. – Almaty: A. Baitūrsynūly atyndaǵy Tıl bılımy instituty, 2013. – 448 b.
2. Jūbanov Q. Qazaq tılı jōnindeǵı zertteuler. – Almaty: Ğylym, 1966. – 362 b.
3. Jūbanov Q. Qazaq tılı jōnindeǵı zertteuler / jauapty syǵaruşy E. B. Jūbanova. – Őñd., 3-bas. – Almaty: Atamūra, 2010. – 608 b. – <https://zhubanov.edu.kz/media/uploads/tkuanyshev/2024/10/31/enbekteri-men-zharialanymdary.pdf> (jūgingen kūni: 14.03.2026).
4. Gasparov B. M. Marr i Sossyur: sto let spustya // Voprosy yazykoznanıya. – 2021. – No. 1. – s. 104–120. [DOI:10.31857/0373-658X.2021.1.104-120](https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2021.1.104-120)
5. Sossyur F. de. Kurs obshchej lingvistiki / red. SH. Balli, A. Seshe ; per. s fr. A. Suhotina; pod obshch. red. M. E. Rut. – Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta, 1999. – 432 s. <https://www.philol.msu.ru/~discours/images/stories/speckurs/saussure1.pdf> (data obrashcheniya: 14.03.2026).
6. CHikobava A. Novyj put' sovetskogo yazykoznanıya // Bol'shevik. – 1951. – No. 12. – s. 28–39. <https://crecleco.seriotech.net/textes/Chikobava51.htm> (data obrashcheniya: 14.03.2026).

Әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Малбақов М. Құдайберген Жұбанов // Ұлы дала тұлғалары / жалпы ред. басқарған М. Малбақов. – Алматы: А. Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты, 2013. – 448 б.
2. Жұбанов Қ. Қазақ тілі жөніндегі зерттеулер. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1966. – 362 б.
3. Жұбанов Қ. Қазақ тілі жөніндегі зерттеулер / жауапты шығарушы Е. Б. Жұбанова. – Өңд., 3-бас. – Алматы: Атамұра, 2010. – 608 б. – <https://zhubanov.edu.kz/media/uploads/tkuanyshev/2024/10/31/enbekteri-men-zharialanymdary.pdf> (жүтінген күні: 14.03.2026).
4. Гаспаров Б. М. Марр и Соссюр: сто лет спустя // Вопросы языкознания. – 2021. – No. 1. – с. 104–120. – [DOI: 10.31857/0373-658X.2021.1.104-120](https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2021.1.104-120)
5. Соссюр Ф. де. Курс общей лингвистики / ред. Ш. Балли, А. Сеше ; пер. с фр. А. Сухотина; под общ. ред. М. Э. Рут. – Екатеринбург: Издательство Уральского университета, 1999. – 432 с. – <https://www.philol.msu.ru/~discours/images/stories/speckurs/saussure1.pdf> (дата обращения: 14.03.2026).
6. Чикобава А. Новый путь советского языкознания // Большевик. – 1951. – No. 12. – с. 28–39. – <https://crecleco.seriotech.net/textes/Chikobava51.htm> (дата обращения: 14.03.2026).

ҚҰДАЙБЕРГЕН ЖҰБАНОВТЫҢ ҒЫЛЫМИ КӨЗҚАРАСЫНА БАЙТҰРСЫНҰЛЫ, СОССЮР ЖӘНЕ МАРРДЫҢ ӘСЕРІ

КАРАБУЛУТ Ф.¹, МҰРАТБЕК Б.Қ.^{2*}

Карабулут Ферхат¹ – PhD, доцент, Джелал Баяр университеті, Маниса қ., Түркия

E-mail: ferhat.karabulut@cbu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580>

*Мұратбек Бағила Құрманбекқызы² – Филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, Қ. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Ақтөбе қ., Қазақстан

E-mail: baglash@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4100-2534>

Аңдатпа. Бұл зерттеу Фердинанд де Соссюр мен Николай Маррдың зияткерлік ықпалдарын салыстырмалы және теориялық талдау арқылы Құдайберген Жұбановтың тілтанымдық көзқарасын қарастырады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – Қ. Жұбановтың XX ғасырдың басындағы тіл біліміндегі ғылыми пікірталастардағы орнын айқындау және қазақ тілін талдауда құрылымдық және тарихи тәсілдерді қалай ұштастырғанын бағалау. Жұмыс Қ. Жұбановтың грамматика, фонетика, морфология, синтаксис және лексика мәселелеріне арналған теориялық еңбектерін сапалық мәтіндік талдау әдісі арқылы зерттеуге негізделіп, оның еңбектерін кеңірек тілтанымдық және зияткерлік дәстүрлер аясында қарастырады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері Қ. Жұбановтың қазақ тілінің жүйелі грамматикалық сипаттамасын қалыптастыруда Ф. де Соссюрдің синхрондық және құрылымдық моделінен әдіснамалық тұрғыдан ықпалын көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар Қ. Жұбанов фонетика, морфология, синтаксис және лексикалық дамудың өзара байланысын атап көрсететін Н. Маррдың тарихи негізделген әрі интегративті тіл түсінігін де қабылдаған. Қ. Жұбанов синхрондық және диахрондық талдаудың қатаң жігін жоққа шығарып, тілдік құрылымдардың тарихи сабақтастығын мойындайтын динамикалық тілтанымдық тұжырымдама ұсынды. Оның этимологияға, фонетикалық өзгерістерге және лексикалық эволюцияға ерекше назар аударуы қазіргі тіл жүйелерін түсінуде тарихи реконструкцияның маңыздылығын айқындайды.

Зерттеу Қ. Жұбановтың тілтанымдық жобасы тек ғылыми мақсаттармен шектелмей, мәдени трансформация кезеңінде қазақтың тілдік бірегейлігінің зияткерлік қалыптасуына үлес қосқанын дәлелдейді. Ол қазақ тілінің құрылымдық күрделілігі мен тарихи тереңдігін көрсету арқылы тілтанымдық зерттеуді мәдени өзін-өзі таныту мен жаңғырудың құралы ретінде қарастырды. Қорытындылай келе, Қ. Жұбановтың еңбектері құрылымдық тіл білімін тарихи-материалистік көзқарастармен үйлестіретін гибриді теориялық үлгіні білдіреді. Оның интегративті әдіснамасы кейінгі әлеуметтік-тарихи және функционалдық тілтаным бағыттарының дамуын алдын ала болжаған және тіл, тарих және мәдени бірегейлік мәселелерін зерттеуде өзектілігін сақтап отыр.

Түйін сөздер: Қ. Жұбанов, Ф. де Соссюр, Н. Марр, құрылымдық тіл білімі, диахрондық тіл білімі, қазақ тілі, тіл білімінің тарихнамасы, ұлттық тілдік бірегейлік.

ВЛИЯНИЕ БАЙТУРСЫНУЛЫ, Ф. ДЕ СОССЮРА И Н. МАРРА НА НАУЧНЫЙ ПОДХОД КУДАЙБЕГЕНА ЖУБАНОВА

КАРАБУЛУТ Ф.¹, МУРАТБЕК Б.Қ.^{2*}

Карабулут Ферхат¹ – PhD, доцент, Университет Джелал Баяр, г. Маниса, Турция

E-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580>

*Муратбек Багила Құрманбекқызы² – Кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, г. Ақтөбе, Казахстан

E-mail: baglash@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4100-2534>

Аннотация. В данном исследовании рассматривается лингвистический подход Кудайбергенов Жубанова посредством сравнительного и теоретического анализа интеллектуального влияния Фердинанда де Соссюра и Николая Марра. Цель исследования – определить место Жубанова в научных дискуссиях в области лингвистики начала XX века и оценить, как он сочетал структурный и исторический подходы при анализе казахского языка. Работа основана на изучении теоретических трудов К. Жубанова по грамматике, фонетике, морфологии, синтаксису и лексике с использованием метода качественного текстового анализа и рассматривает работы в рамках более широких лингвистических и интеллектуальных традиций.

По результатам исследования К. Жубанов, особенно в своих усилиях по формированию систематического грамматического описания казахского языка, методологически применял синхронно-структурной модели Ф. де Соссюра. К. Жубанов также принял исторически обоснованную и интегративную концепцию языка Н. Марра, которая подчеркивает взаимосвязь фонетики, морфологии, синтаксиса и лексического развития. К. Жубанов отверг строгие рамки синхронного и диахронного анализа и предложил динамическую лингвистическую концепцию, признающую историческую преемственность языковых структур. Его особый интерес к этимологии, фонетическим изменениям и лексической эволюции подчеркивает важность исторической реконструкции для понимания современных языковых систем.

Исследование также доказывает, что лингвистический проект К. Жубанова не ограничивался научными целями, а способствовал интеллектуальному формированию казахской языковой идентичности в период культурных преобразований. Демонстрируя структурную сложность и историческую глубину казахского языка, рассматривал лингвистические исследования как инструмент культурного самовыражения и обновления. В заключение, работы К. Жубанова представляют собой гибридную теоретическую модель, сочетающую структурную лингвистику с историко-материалистическими подходами. Его интегративная методология предвосхитила развитие последующих социально-исторических и функциональных направлений лингвистики и остается актуальной в изучении языка, истории и культурной идентичности.

Ключевые слова: К. Жубанов, Ф. де Соссюр, Н. Марр, структурная лингвистика, диахроническая лингвистика, казахский язык, историография лингвистики, национальная языковая идентичность.