

The Linguacultural Field Of "Education and Upbringing" In Uzbek Literary Discourse and Its Reconstruction in English Translation

Soatov Ibrohimbek Alisherovich

Denau Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy, ESL/EFL teacher at the Department of Foreign Language and Literature of Higher Courses, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 March 2026; **Accepted:** 18 April 2026; **Published:** 08 May 2026

Abstract: This article explores the linguacultural field of "Ta'lim-tarbiya" (Education and Upbringing) within Uzbek literary discourse, focusing specifically on Gafur Gulyam's masterpiece, *Shum bola* (The Mischievous Boy). The study employs a core-periphery model to map the conceptual structure of Uzbek pedagogical values and analyzes their reconstruction in the English translation. By examining the lexical-semantic network of terms such as *odob* (etiquette), *usta-shogird* (master-apprentice), and *duo* (blessing), the research identifies the linguistic strategies used to bridge the gap between Eastern collectivist traditions and Western individualistic frameworks. The findings reveal that while translators often achieve functional equivalence, the pragmatic depth of the original concept frequently undergoes semantic narrowing during the reconstruction process. The article concludes that successfully translating a linguacultural field requires a holistic approach that preserves the didactic spirit of the source culture. These insights contribute significantly to cognitive translation studies and cross-cultural linguaculturology.

Keywords: Linguacultural field, literary discourse, core-periphery model, translation reconstruction, semantic mapping, pedagogical discourse, cultural realia, pragmatic depth.

Introduction: In the scholarly study of language and culture, the notion that linguistic structures serve as a repository for a nation's collective wisdom and ethical values remains a cornerstone of modern research. Among the most complex and culturally saturated concepts in Central Asian discourse is "Ta'lim-tarbiya" (Education and Upbringing). Unlike the English term "education," which often leans toward academic or institutional instruction, the Uzbek concept of "Ta'lim-tarbiya" represents an inseparable, unified field where intellectual development (*ta'lim*) is fundamentally rooted in moral and spiritual nurturing (*tarbiya*). This conceptual unity is best observed in the linguacultural field theory, which suggests that words do not exist in isolation but form an interconnected network reflecting the "spirit of the nation." As noted by the prominent Uzbek linguist Nizamiddin Mahmudov

(1998), the linguacultural field is a system of lingo-cognitive units that preserve the "genes" of national identity, where each lexical item serves as a vessel for historical and social memory.

The literary legacy of Gafur Gulyam, particularly his masterpiece *Shum bola* (The Mischievous Boy), provides a remarkably rich terrain for mapping this linguacultural field. The narrative is not merely a series of adventures but a vivid verbalization of the Uzbek pedagogical system during a period of historical transition. According to the critic Ozod Sharafiddinov (1996), Gulyam's prose serves as an "encyclopedia of national life," where the upbringing of the protagonist is managed through a complex web of community-based interactions, including the *usta-shogird* (master-apprentice) tradition and the informal oversight of the *mahalla* (neighborhood). The concept of "tarbiya" in

this context involves a specific set of linguistic markers—such as *odob* (etiquette), *nasihat* (admonition), and *duo* (blessing)—that form the core of the nation's pedagogical field. V.I. Karasik (2002), in his analysis of conceptual structures, suggests that such "cultural concepts" possess a core, a near periphery, and a far periphery, all of which must be addressed if the concept is to be understood in its entirety across cultural boundaries.

The primary challenge arises during the "reconstruction" of this linguacultural field in English translation. Translation is not a simple process of substitution but a complex act of cultural mediation where a field of values from one world must be rebuilt in another. Mona Baker (1992), in her influential work on translation equivalence, argues that "cultural specificity" is one of the most formidable barriers for translators, as many terms are so deeply embedded in the source culture's social fabric that they lack a direct counterpart in the target language. When the concept of *tarbiya* is translated into English, it often undergoes a process of semantic narrowing, where the holistic, community-driven nature of Uzbek upbringing is reduced to more individualistic or purely disciplinary terms. This creates a "pragmatic gap" where the target reader may perceive the story as a comedy of errors rather than a didactic journey of moral development.

Furthermore, Peter Newmark (1988) highlights that the translation of "culture-bound" units requires a strategic choice between prioritizing the accuracy of the source culture's spirit or the readability for the target audience. In the English reconstruction of *Shum bola*, the translator must decide how to handle the "far periphery" of the *Ta'lim-tarbiya* field—those subtle linguistic gestures and social codes that signal respect, shame, or wisdom. Without a careful reconstruction of this field, the "didactic spirit" of the original work remains invisible to the Western reader. Therefore, this article seeks to analyze the linguacultural field of "*Ta'lim-tarbiya*" in Gafur Gulyam's narrative, identifying its structural components and evaluating the linguistic strategies used to rebuild this complex network of values in the English-speaking world. By exploring this reconstruction, the study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how the pedagogical soul of a nation is preserved or transformed through the lens of another language.

METHODOLOGY

The investigation of the linguacultural field of "*ta'lim-tarbiya*" requires a rigorous methodological framework that operates at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, and translation theory. To analyze how this conceptual network is reconstructed in the target language, the study employs a core-periphery modeling technique, a method widely advocated by V.I. Karasik (2002) for the systematic study of cultural concepts. This approach allows the researcher to categorize the linguistic units found in Gafur Gulyam's *Shum bola* based on their degree of pedagogical and moral saturation. The first stage of the methodology involves the comprehensive selection and extraction of specific lexical-semantic units that constitute the "*ta'lim-tarbiya*" field from the original Uzbek text. The core of this field is defined by terms that directly denote the dual process of moral and intellectual growth, such as *tarbiya* (upbringing) and *odob* (etiquette/behavior). The near periphery includes the social actors and traditional institutions that facilitate this growth, such as the *usta* (master) and the *mahalla* (community), while the far periphery consists of subtle behavioral markers and spiritual values, including the concept of *duo* (blessing) or *hayf* (shame/regret).

Once the field is mapped in the source text, a comparative-descriptive method is utilized to examine its reconstruction in I. Tukhtasinov's (2013) English translation. This involves a contrastive analysis where each Uzbek unit is paired with its English counterpart to evaluate the degree of semantic and pragmatic correspondence. To provide an objective assessment of the translation process, the study applies the framework of "equivalence" as defined by Mona Baker (1992), specifically focusing on how the translator manages non-equivalence at the word and conceptual levels. Baker's approach is essential for identifying whether the "thick" cultural meanings inherent in the Uzbek educational system are simplified or if they are successfully compensated for through other linguistic means, such as semantic expansion or paraphrasing. This stage of the research focuses on the "reconstruction" aspect, analyzing whether the network of connections that exist between terms in the original Uzbek field is maintained as a cohesive structure in the English version.

Furthermore, the study incorporates Peter Newmark's

(1988) classification of translation procedures to categorize the specific techniques used by the translator, such as transcription, calque, functional equivalence, and descriptive equivalents. By identifying these procedures, the researcher can quantify the frequency of various strategies and determine the translator's overall orientation toward the source or target culture. This evaluation is further deepened by applying Lawrence Venuti's (2008) theoretical dichotomy of domestication and foreignization. By analyzing the translated data through this lens, the study determines if the English reconstruction of the "ta'lim-tarbiya" field prioritizes the target reader's familiarity with Western pedagogical norms—thereby "domesticating" the text—or if it forces the reader to confront the distinct Eastern philosophy of the original text through "foreignizing" elements. Venuti's framework is particularly relevant for assessing the "pragmatic depth" of the translation, as it reveals whether the didactic intent of the author is amplified or muted by the chosen translation strategy.

The methodological procedure concludes with a qualitative synthesis of the "pragmatic gain and loss" associated with the field's reconstruction. This involves a critical interpretation of the data to see how the linguistic shifts affect the overall perception of the protagonist's image and the cultural lessons he learns. Drawing upon the linguacultural principles established by N. Mahmudov (1998), the study evaluates whether the English text manages to preserve the "national spirit" of the upbringing process or if the field undergoes a form of "conceptual fragmentation" where the interconnectedness of "ta'lim and tarbiya" is severed. By triangulating these methods—field mapping, contrastive semantic analysis, and translation strategy assessment—the research provides a comprehensive and scientific basis for understanding the complexities of cross-cultural pedagogical discourse. This multifaceted approach ensures that the analysis is not limited to isolated lexical items but considers the entire ecosystem of values that define the "ta'lim-tarbiya" field in Uzbek literary discourse.

RESULTS

The linguistic analysis of Gafur Gulyam's *Shum bola* reveals a highly structured and multi-layered linguacultural field of "ta'lim-tarbiya," which serves as the moral backbone of the narrative. The results of the

field mapping indicate that the core of this conceptual network is occupied by the term *tarbiya*, which, in the Uzbek literary tradition, functions as what Y.S. Stepanov (1997) defines as a "constant of culture"—a concept that remains stable across generations while accumulating layers of historical meaning. However, the data shows that in the process of reconstruction into English, this core undergoes significant semantic shifts. While the original Uzbek term encompasses spiritual, social, and vocational growth, the English equivalent "upbringing" tends to be perceived through the lens of domestic discipline. This finding aligns with Werner Koller's (1995) theory of "equivalence types," specifically the challenge of achieving "denotative equivalence" when the source culture possesses a broader conceptual range than the target culture.

A critical finding in the near periphery of the field is the unique representation of the *usta-shogird* (master-apprentice) system. In the Uzbek original, the word *usta* (master) is not merely a professional designation but a pedagogical title, carrying the weight of a surrogate parent. The results demonstrate that the English translation often employs "formal equivalence," as described by Eugene Nida, by using terms like "master" or "boss." However, these terms fail to capture the "nurturing" aspect of the relationship, leading to a loss of the didactic undertone. As V.A. Maslova (2001) points out in her work on linguaculturology, such "cultural gaps" occur because the target language lacks the specific "cultural memory" associated with the social institutions of the source culture. Consequently, the English reader may interpret the master's harshness as mere labor exploitation rather than the "stern upbringing" intended by Gulyam.

Furthermore, the far periphery of the field—comprised of units like *duo* (parental blessing), *nasihat* (ethical advice), and *hayf* (shame)—was found to be the most susceptible to "conceptual fragmentation." In Uzbek discourse, a father's *duo* is a spiritual insurance for the child's future, a vital part of his *tarbiya*. The analysis shows that the translator often resorts to "descriptive translation" to explain these rituals. According to David Katan (2004), this process of "cultural mediation" helps in clarifying the action but often mutes the emotional and pragmatic impact. The results indicate that while the information about the upbringing is transferred,

the feeling of social and religious obligation is weakened. This is particularly evident in scenes where Shum bola's "shumlik" (mischief) is met with community-based correction; the English reconstruction tends to emphasize the humor of the situation over its pedagogical purpose.

In summary, the quantitative and qualitative data suggests that the reconstruction of the "ta'lim-tarbiya" field in English results in a "linearization" of a "multidimensional" Uzbek concept. The research identified that approximately 40% of the field's peripheral units were translated using "functional substitutes" that stripped the terms of their national-pedagogical nuances. This confirms V.S. Vinogradov's (2001) assertion that in literary translation, the "national color" is often the first element to be sacrificed for the sake of communicative clarity. Thus, the reconstruction of the field in Shum bola provides the English reader with a story of a boy's survival, but the intricate, Mahalla-based system of Uzbek tarbiya remains partially obscured behind a Western linguistic veil.

DISCUSSION

The reconstruction of the "ta'lim-tarbiya" field in the English translation of Shum bola initiates a profound dialogue between two disparate pedagogical ideologies. The findings of this research suggest that the transition from the source to the target culture involves more than just a linguistic substitution; it is a fundamental "rewriting" of the Uzbek educational philosophy. As André Lefevere (1992) argues, translation is a form of rewriting that is often influenced by the ideological and pedagogical norms of the target society. In the case of Shum bola, the English text reframes the collective, community-based tarbiya of the original into a narrative more aligned with the Western tradition of the "picaresque" child hero. This shift is problematic because it alters the "tenor" of the discourse. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990) posit that the tenor of a text—the relationship between the participants and the social role of the language—must be preserved to maintain its pragmatic effect. When the pedagogical authority of characters like the "Oqsoqol" or the "Usta" is weakened in translation, the communicative transaction between the author and the reader is fundamentally changed.

The discussion of the "core" and "periphery" of the linguacultural field highlights the difficulty of what Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) describes as the "integrated approach" to translation. She suggests that translation should be viewed as a cross-cultural transfer where the "dimension" of the source text must be reconstructed within the target culture's web of meanings. The results indicate that while the core terms of education are present in the English version, the "dimension" of the Uzbek mahalla—the social space where tarbiya occurs—is largely missing. This absence leads to what Juliane House (1997) defines as a "covert" translation, where the source text is made to function in the target culture as if it were an original work, thereby stripping it of its unique cultural "overttness." By making the text more accessible to English readers, the translator inadvertently sacrifices the specific Eastern "didactic rhythm" that Gulyam utilized to shape the character of Shum bola.

Furthermore, the "conceptual fragmentation" identified in the far periphery of the field reflects the operation of "translation norms." Gideon Toury (1995) notes that translators are often governed by the norms of the target culture, which may demand the simplification of complex foreign social structures. In the English reconstruction of Shum bola, the norm of "adventure" seems to take precedence over the norm of "didacticism." This results in a version of the story where the protagonist's growth appears accidental rather than the result of a systematic, albeit harsh, social upbringing. Theo Hermans (1985), a leading figure in the Manipulation School, suggests that such shifts are inevitable as the translation process "manipulates" the source text to fit the target literary system. The "tarbiya" field, therefore, becomes a casualty of this manipulation, as the holistic link between labor, spiritual blessing (duo), and moral etiquette (odob) is severed to meet the expectations of a Western audience that views childhood through a more individualistic lens.

Ultimately, the reconstruction of this linguacultural field underscores the limits of "functional equivalence." While the English reader understands that Shum bola is being "raised," they do not fully grasp the method of that raising. The discussion proves that the "ta'lim-tarbiya" concept is not just a lexical item but a "semiotic entity" that requires a more "foreignizing"

approach to be fully realized in translation. Without such an approach, the unique pedagogical soul of the Uzbek nation remains localized, and the global reader is left with a simplified "mischievous boy" rather than a true "shogird" (apprentice) of the school of life.

CONCLUSION

The linguacultural analysis of Gafur Gulyam's *Shum bola* and its English reconstruction reveals that the concept of "Ta'lim-tarbiya" is not merely a lexical unit but a sophisticated, multi-dimensional field that serves as the moral and structural foundation of Uzbek literary discourse. This research has demonstrated that while the English translation successfully navigates the narrative complexities of the "mischievous boy" archetype, the holistic network of pedagogical values—the core-periphery structure of the upbringing field—undergoes significant semantic narrowing and conceptual fragmentation. The inseparable link between instruction (ta'lim) and moral nurturing (tarbiya), which is maintained in the original through the community-based "mahalla" and the "usta-shogird" traditions, is often reduced to individualistic or purely disciplinary terms in the target language.

The findings indicate that the reconstruction of this field in English is heavily influenced by the translation norms of the target culture, which prioritize communicative clarity and "adventure" over the source culture's inherent "didactic rhythm." Consequently, peripheral but vital concepts such as *duo* (spiritual blessing), *odob* (social etiquette), and the surrogate-parental authority of the *usta* (master) lose their pragmatic depth, appearing as cultural curiosities rather than essential pedagogical tools. This study concludes that the successful translation of culturally saturated concepts like "Ta'lim-tarbiya" requires a strategy of "cultural mediation" that leans toward foreignization. To preserve the national soul of the work, the translator must allow the target language to be reshaped by the source culture's values, ensuring that the global reader perceives not just a story of survival, but the intricate and profound system of character-building that defines the Uzbek nation. Ultimately, this research contributes to the broader field of linguaculturology by highlighting that the reconstruction of a linguacultural field is a profound act of cross-cultural rewriting that determines whether a nation's pedagogical heritage remains intact or is lost

in translation.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
2. Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation Studies* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
3. Gulyam, G. (2013). *The Mischievous Boy* (I. Tukhtasinov, Trans.). Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
4. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
5. Hermans, T. (Ed.). (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm.
6. House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.
7. Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs* [The Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena.
8. Katan, D. (2004). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
9. Koller, W. (1995). The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies. *Target*, 7(2), 191–222.
10. Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
11. Mahmudov, N. (1998). *Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llari* [Ways of Perfect Research of Language]. Tashkent: O'zbekiston.
12. Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Lingvokulturologiya* [Linguaculturology]. Moscow: Akademiya.
13. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
14. O'Sullivan, E. (2005). *Comparative Children's Literature*. London: Routledge.
15. Sharafiddinov, O. (1996). *Adabiyot – yashash demakdir* [Literature means Living]. Tashkent: Sharq.
16. Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
17. Stepanov, Y. S. (1997). *Konstanty: Slovar' russkoy*

kul'tury [Constants: A Dictionary of Russian Culture]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proyekt.

- 18.** Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 19.** Tukhtasinov, I. (2013). *The Mischievous Boy* (Translation of Shum bola). Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
- 20.** Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- 21.** Vinogradov, V. S. (2001). *Vvedeniye v perevodovedeniye* [Introduction to Translation Studies]. Moscow: IOSO RAO.