

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Translating Kazakh Values: Analyzing the Concept of “Bauyr” in D. Issabekov’s “Gaukhartas” and Translation Strategies

Meiramkul B. Tleulinova¹ , Saule D. Seidenova¹ , Aigul Y. Alpysbayeva^{1*} , Dincay Koksalt² , Gulzhazira A. Koitasova³ , Alima S. Orazbayeva³ , Zhanar A. Abitzhanova⁴ , Gulshat Anuar¹ 

¹ Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050057, Republic of Kazakhstan

² Faculty of Education, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale 17000, Turkiye

³ Department of Foreign Languages, Al-Farabi Kazakh national University, Almaty 050057, Republic of Kazakhstan

⁴ Department of Department of Kazakh linguistics Named after A. Baytursinuly, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050057, Republic of Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

This study delves into the complexities of translating the Kazakh cultural concept ‘bauyr’ (liver) from Dulat Issabekov’s ‘Gaukhartas’ (Precious stone) into English and Russian. The research highlights the importance of preserving cultural nuances in translation to maintain the integrity of the original work and facilitate cross-cultural understanding. That is why we aim to study the ‘bauyr’ concept and identify the translation strategies used to translate it into other languages. Through analyzing ‘bauyr’s’ representation in translations, the paper sheds light on broader issues of cultural transfer and adaptation in literary translation. In addition, the research reveals some crucial ideas on translation of the novel from D. Issabekov himself. He believes that culture-specific vocabulary demands particular attention in literary translation. The translators frequently omitted such terms in the Russian text, which consequently led to analogous omissions in the English version. This highlights the implications of translating through an intermediary language. Thus, this study has shown that the difficulties of translating the concept of *bauyr* in literary works lie not only in the lack of ethno-cultural background

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Aigul Y. Alpysbayeva, Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050057, Republic of Kazakhstan; Email: Alpysbayeva.Aigul@kaznu.kz

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 13 January 2025 | Revised: 20 February 2025 | Accepted: 26 February 2025 | Published Online: 1 March 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8393>

CITATION

Tleulinova, M.B., Seidenova, S.D., Alpysbayeva, A.Y., et al., 2025. Translating Kazakh Values: Analyzing the Concept of “Bauyr” in D. Issabekov’s “Gaukhartas” and Translation Strategies. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(3): 277–287. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8393>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

knowledge, but also in the insufficient emphasis on the moments of ordinary life, casually reflecting the traditions and mentality of the Kazakh people. To be sure, no single concept conveys a holistic national mentality, but the role of concepts in the formation of a national character is difficult to underestimate.

Keywords: Literary Translation; Foreignization and Domestication; Kazakh Culture; Cross-Cultural Understanding; ‘Bauyr’ Concept

1. Introduction

The present study examines the culture-specific concept of *bauyr* as it appears in D. Issabekov’s novel *Gaukhartas*^[1], originally written in Kazakh (a Turkic language), and analyzes its representation in English and Russian literary translations. Specifically, the English translation by Katherine Judelson^[2] and the Russian translations by Vladlen Berdennikov and Lena Kosmukhamedova^[3] are explored for their treatment of this concept. It is important to highlight that the English translation was rendered through an intermediary language, Russian. These particular translations were selected as they constitute the only available translations in their respective languages.

D. Issabekov is regarded as one of the prominent Kazakh Soviet writers, whose literary works provide a profound reflection of the cultural life of the local populace. His writings seek to depict the social and moral issues of his time, offering a realistic portrayal of the society in which he lived. As such, his contributions are of significant value to national literature and continue to be translated into various foreign languages, with fourteen translations completed to date^[4]. The use of the culture-specific concept of *bauyr* constitutes a significant characteristic of his works, while simultaneously presenting a challenge for translators.

The culture-specific concept of *bauyr* appears six times in the novel *Gaukhartas* and plays a pivotal role in conveying the author’s and characters’ profound ties to their homeland and familial bonds. In all six cases *bauyr* is employed metaphorically. As Eric Cheyfitz articulates in the *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from “The Tempest” to “Tarzan,”* “Metaphor occupies the place of both the foreign and the domestic, the savage and civilized, it occupies the place of both nature and culture; it is at once, the most natural of languages or language in its most natural state and the most cultivated or cultured. Metaphor is nature; metaphor translates nature into culture” (^[5], p. 121).

In the Turkic languages, the word *bauyr* (liver) has several meanings: 1) human organ; 2) heart; and 3) related, consanguineous (^[6], p. 121). The term is used both positively and negatively, depending on the language. In Altaic languages, *liver* means an instrument of doing good^[6]; in Hebrew the word *liver* has a homonym that means *honor*^[7]; in the Zulu language the word *liver* corresponds to *brave*^[8]. In Russian, the *liver* personifies the concentration of feelings and emotions, intuition: get into the liver (deeply hurt) and smell the liver (feelings)^[9]. In the Kazakh language, the term *bauyr* holds significant cultural and linguistic importance. It symbolizes the body, particularly as a vessel in which a person’s emotions and feelings are concentrated. The homonym *bauyr* also denotes a blood relationship, specifically referring to a blood relative, with particular emphasis on a blood brother. In the Kazakh kinship system, *bauyr* is considered the closest familial bond, typically referring to a paternal blood relative. Additionally, the term *bauyrym* is employed as a term of endearment or address, signifying a close or cherished individual.

Plato regarded the liver as the organ responsible for the generation of negative emotions such as lust, greed and desire^[10]. In biblical texts, the liver is symbolically linked to profound emotional states, particularly those of deep sorrow, sin, and sacrifice^[11].

In this regard, the cultural differences add more complexity [in translation] than the structures of the language system^[12, 13]. Recreating the culture-specific concept in its entirety in a literary translation is most difficult, but important. The cultural turn in translation, as articulated by Bassnett and Lefevere^[14] and later expanded upon by Bassnett^[15], prompted a comprehensive reevaluation of translation. This shift transcended the previous linguistic-centric approach, encompassing a broader understanding of the role of translation, its functions, and the significance of the translator’s identity. Bassnett’s metaphorical expression has gained widespread recognition, “In the same way that the surgeon, operating on

the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his or her peril" ([16], p. 25). 'Translating across cultures' and 'cultural proficiency' have become buzz words in translating and interpreting ([17], p. 10). Cronin discusses the crucial role of translation in saving linguistic and cultural diversity in the context of globalization^[18]. Therefore, "the need for translation nevertheless now lies more urgently in the culturally and linguistically diverse communities within and across national borders, where successful social inclusion is inseparable from the use of translation not as a weapon, but as a means of cooperation" ([19], p. 59). But what is meant by cooperation in translation? It is the translator's efforts to adapt the text so that there are no misunderstandings between cultures (domestication) or to introduce the target audience to a foreign culture, trying to preserve the national flavor of the original in the translation (foreignization). We will try to examine this issue using the example of translating the culture-specific concept *bauyr* in this study.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Study of the Concept of Bauyr

A small number of scientific publications have been devoted to the study of the concept *bauyr*. U.R. Kadyrova's article "Literary archetype liver (*bauyr*)" examines Ashyk Umer's love poetry. It reveals that in Crimean Tatar culture, literature, and folklore, "liver" is often synonymous with "soul". This archetype's use in Umer's work highlights its folklore roots and subtly incorporates Sufi symbolism.

The "liver" archetype in poetic lyrics is also analyzed in detail in three aspects: a description of the liver by lovers as one of the suffering organs; an explication of the state of the liver affected by the actions of the beloved; and a depiction of the state of the liver from the influence of wine ([20], pp. 178–190). In the article "The concept of *bauyr* 'liver' in the Turkic picture of the world" A. Zh. Sharip explores the lexeme "liver" in Turkic languages. This research delves into its ethno-linguistic, cultural-mental, and social aspects, offering insights into its significance in Turkic cultures. The scholar believes that in their traditional worldviews, some ethnic groups use the somatism "liver" instead of the word "heart" to express related and emotional feelings in the example of the poetic texts of the great Kazakh poet and philosopher,

Abai Kunanbayev ([21], pp. 234–240).

Regarding the Russian language, the researcher N.V. Dikun also studied the metaphorical field of the liver as a "somatic concept" ([22], pp. 27–31). The scientist gives examples of the use of somatic metaphorical expressions related to the liver. Firstly, in the pre-scientific, folk-language view of the world, there is a clear awareness of the importance of the liver for the human body, damage to which can lead to quite serious consequences, as evidenced by metaphorical and metonymic transformations. The next group of phrases represents the perception of the liver as a place of concentration of sensory-mental activity and a source of intuition. Thirdly, it can be used colloquially in a negative sense to express strong irritation, anger, gloom, or annoyance. The source of these negative emotions can be explained by popular ideas about the secreted liver bile. However, there is no connection between the liver and the family, as is found in Kazakh tradition.

2.2. The Research Approach: Theoretical Framework for the Current Study

2.2.1. The Meaning of the Concept Bauyr in Kazakh Culture and Its Derivatives

The term *bauyr* (translated as "liver" in English) carries multiple meanings, one of which refers to a term denoting kinship. In Kazakh culture, individuals born to the same parents, who are regarded as close grandchildren or relatives, are termed *bauyr*. The plural form of this term is *bauyrlar*, which is commonly used in a figurative sense to denote individuals with a strong familial bond. More specifically, *bauyrlar* refers to biological siblings who share the same mother and father. In some contexts, even great-grandchildren or individuals from the same tribe may address one another as *bauyr*, reflecting the broader cultural significance of close kinship ties within the community.

The Kazakh language ascribes a variety of emotional and expressive connotations to the term *bauyr*. A prominent Kazakh proverb asserts, "a child is a *bauyr* (liver) of a person," underscoring the profound emotional and symbolic value of a child as the most cherished and integral part of an individual's life. As a result, *bauyr* is closely linked to concepts of well-being and health within Kazakh culture. Additionally, it is customary for Kazakhs to express their sorrow and bid farewell to deceased loved ones with the phrase

“Oy, bauryr,” which further reflects the deep emotional significance of the term.

The word *bauryr* also encapsulates a person’s emotional state and moral character. The adjective *bauryrmal*, when paired with the noun *brotherhood*, evokes a range of associated values, including respect, dignity, intimacy, kinship, warmth, care, charity, love, compassion, and kindness.

2.2.2. Translation Principles of Culture-Specific Concepts: Foreignization and Domestication

In translation studies there have been many discussions and attempts to cope with culture-specific concepts. As Davies notes:

...discussing alternative treatments for culture-specific items (CSIs) often invoke the distinction between two basic goals of translation: that of preserving the characteristics of the source text as far as possible, even where this yields an exotic or strange effect, and that of adapting it to produce a target text which seems normal, familiar and accessible to the target audience ([23], p. 69).

Actually, a number of scholars have discussed and named these notions (foreignization and domestication). F. Schleirmacher names them *naturalizing* and *alienating* ([24], p. 48). S. Hervey and I. Higgins adopt the term *exoticism* to express these opposites (cultural references are brought to the target culture with minimum adaptation or change) ([25], p. 84); this is referred to as *cultural transplantation* (substituting CSIs from source language (SL) into the CSIs of the target language (TL). L. Venuti introduces the corresponding terms *domestication* and *foreignization*. They can be described as “...deliberately domesticating in their handling of the foreign text, while the others can be described as foreignizing, motivated by an impulse to preserve linguistic and cultural differences by deviating from prevailing domestic values” ([26], pp. 240–244). According to Hatim and Mason, domestication is “a translation in which transparent fluent style is adopted to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text”; whereas foreignization is “a translation which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the strangeness of the foreign text” ([27], pp. 229–230).

As De Pedro states, “none of the extremes is preferable

in translation and less drastic alternatives are preferred” ([28], p. 321). Important information may come to light depending on the translator’s choice to stay closer to foreignization or domestication. Baker^[14] believes that the decision of the translator is based on how much license is given to him/her and on the purpose of the translation. Baker also states, “On a more general level, the decision will also reflect, to some extent, the norms of translation prevailing in a given community.

Linguistic communities vary in the extent to which they tolerate strategies that involve significant departure from the prepositional meaning of the text” ([29], p. 31). The tendency to foreignize the CSIs of the dominant culture allows readers to become more familiar with foreign culture and accept foreignization as a norm ([28], p. 322). Davies notes that the usage of a particular principle, i.e., domestication or foreignization, may be determined by “various factors in different cultures and different periods” ([23], p. 69). The scholar provides several reasons that determine the choice of a particular principle: text type, the nature of the target audience, and the relationship between the source and target languages and cultures.

The most recent studies call into question the principle of foreignization and domestication in general. M. Cussel contends that “Venuti’s concept of foreignization does not sufficiently address the nuances of translation readership” ([30], p. 18). The scholar argues for a more empirical approach to understanding who reads translations, where, and how, as this would enable the portrayal of new social and political relationships between diverse groups that extend beyond the confines of national readerships. This approach, according to scientist’s suggestion, is necessary to truly transcend the national boundaries often inherent in translation. Therefore, the researcher believes that we must rethink and expand the possibilities of positionality with respect to literary translations and the different points of relation between the actors involved. However, in our research we examine the nuances of translating the culture-specific concept *bauryr* with a focus on preserving its unique ethnic characteristics.

2.2.3. Translation Procedures to Deal with Culture-Specific Concepts

M. Tymoczko reminds us what all translators know: “[there] will always be a one-to-many operation and that there can be no single correct or “positive way” to trans-

late” ([31], p. 30). In our research we have made translation analysis, according to Davies’ [23] translation procedures (preservation, addition, omission, globalisation, localisation, transformation, and creation) alongside Venuti’s principles of *foreignization and domestication* (2001), where preservation and addition falls under foreignization, and “others fall under domestication respectively” ([26], pp. 72–89). That will help us determine whether the cultural feature, in our case, *bauyr*, was preserved in the translation or not. According to Davies:

1. Preservation: “an entity which has no close equivalent in the target culture, a translator may simply decide to maintain the source text term in the translation.”
2. Addition: “the translator may decide to keep the original item but supplement the text with whatever information is judged necessary.”
3. Omission: “A third procedure is to omit a problematic CSI (culture-specific item) altogether, so that no trace of it is found in the translation.”
4. Globalization: “By this term is meant the process of replacing culture-specific references with ones which are more neutral or general, in the sense that they are accessible to audiences from a wider range of cultural backgrounds.”
5. Localization: “translators may try to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience”.
6. Transformations. It means the modifications of CSI could be seen as an alteration or distortion of the original.
7. Creation: “translators have actually created CSIs not present in the original text” ([23], pp. 72–89).

Obviously, there are scholarly approaches that could have been adopted to translate culture-specific concepts. Newmark proposes five strategies for dealing with Culture-Specific Items (CSIs): transference, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, componential analysis, and transonym ([32], pp. 176–177). Another attempt to provide a list of translation procedures for dealing with CSIs is made by Shäffner and Wieserman, who name four translation strategies: loanword, calque, substitution, explanation ([33], p. 33). Graedler puts forth some procedures of translating culture-specific concepts (CSCs): “making up a new word, explaining the meaning of the source language (SL) expression in lieu of translating it, preserving the SL term intact, or opting for a word in the target language (TL)” ([34], p. 3). Finally, Harvey

puts forward the following four major techniques for translating CSCs: functional equivalence, formal equivalence or “linguistic equivalence”, transcription or “borrowing” ([35], pp. 2–6).

3. Results

The challenge of representing the concept of *bauyr* in translations into Russian and English lies in the inherent ambiguity of the terms used to express this concept, as well as in the complexities associated with the development and transmission of specialized knowledge. A common means of verbalizing the concept includes not only the word itself but also phraseological units, phrases, paremias, texts, and sentence block diagrams.

Among these, it is primarily phraseological units that can function as a representation of the concept. This is because, firstly, they possess cultural significance that demands contextual and discursive support; secondly, they are characterized by their ability to indirectly, figuratively, and expressively convey aspects of a person’s social and mental life, often providing either a positive or negative evaluation of these attributes; and thirdly, they embody phraseological knowledge and carry value in tandem with cultural and cognitive structures.

The *bauyr* concept, expressed through language, consists of various elements, including: 1) primary (actual) characteristics; 2) secondary (passive, historical) features; 3) internal (often subconscious) aspects; and conceptual, figurative, significant, perceptual, informational, and value-based components. These elements encompass cognitive metaphors, etymological associations, and factors that define the concept’s position within a language’s lexical and grammatical system. Additionally, they involve mental images, concepts, cognitive implications, pragmatics, and cultural-linguistic aspects.

A multilevel comparison of the concepts of the original message with the concepts hidden behind the forms of the target language, formed in the receiving culture, allows the translator to build a new system of meanings, more or less similar to that created by the author of the original speech work, then wrapping it in a new text form, as a result of which an indispensable analogy is established. But most often, translators do not find such analogies.

Culture-specific concepts unite representatives of a certain linguistic culture and provide the basis for mutual understanding between them. Each individual concept demonstrates the existence of a certain value in a particular ethnic culture. Different linguistic cultures have their own unique ways of thinking and perceiving reality. This can lead to misunderstandings when people try to comprehend a foreign culture using their own cultural concepts. When comparing the culture-specific concept *bauyr*, one can notice the asymmetry in the representation of units in the compared cultures.

Each nation has its own cultural traits, including societal norms, manners, rituals, customs, ceremonies, and gestures. These also extend to the way emotions, experiences, and attitudes towards events and objects are expressed. These cultural elements can vary significantly and are often reflected in translations. The accurate transfer of such situations in translation is one of the ways to preserve national components within a work while creating an authentic translation, so that the reader can understand the essence of such expressions. While everyone observes the world, speakers of different languages with distinct national identities may perceive it uniquely, shaped by their language's inherent features.

4. Discussion

In this section, we will examine the 'translational operation' of the culture-specific concept *bauyr* (бауыр) in its metaphorical and figurative form. An illustrative example can be drawn from the following excerpt from the original text: “Сондықтан, көкпар хабары сонәу Қазығұрттың бауырынан шықса да, Ыбыштың баруын әкем іштей тілеп отырады” ([1], p. 6):

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Sondyqtan, kökpar habary sonau Qazyqūrttyñ bauyrynan şyqsa da, Ybyştyñ baruyn äkem iştei tilep otyrady”.

The literal English translation is as follows: “That’s why, even though the news of kökpar comes from Qazyqūrt’s *slope* [directly from Kazakh: *liver*], my father wishes for Ibysh to go” (authors’ translation).

In this passage, the figurative metaphor Qazyqūrttyñ bauyry, which literally translates to “slope of Mount Kazykurt,” was omitted in the Russian translation by L. Kosmukhamedova and V. Berdennikov. The English translation, rendered by Katherine Judelson through Russian as an in-

termediary language, also omits this metaphor. The phrase functions figuratively to denote a geographical location, symbolizing the ‘liver of the mountain’. From a pragmatic perspective, the translator may have determined that omitting this metaphor would not significantly affect the Russian-speaking audience, as it does not carry a substantial cultural implication for them. However, within the context of Kazakh culture, the metaphor carries considerable significance, as it reflects Ybysh’s father’s wish for his son to participate in the national game of kökpar, even from a remote location like Mount Kazykurt. This participation would bring both fame and pride to the son and his family. The omission of this metaphor in translation removes the underlying theme of generational continuity and the latent desire for paternal pride, a central cultural element in the original text. In other words, it is a ‘minimizing of the strangeness of the foreign text’^[27] or naturalizing^[24].

Another passage from the novel states: “Қаратұмсықтың арғы бауырына түсіп, малды отқа жабамын да, бірауық Аршабайдың көз жетпес көк аспанынан көз алмай шалқалап бір жатамын” ([1], p. 15):

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Qaratūmsyqtyñ arğy bauyryna tūsip, maldy otqa jabamyn da, birauyq Arşabaidyñ köz jetpes kök aspanynan köz almaı şalqalap bır jatamyn”.

English translation by authors: “I will get on the other side [directly from Kazakh: *liver*] of the mountain Karatum-syk and put the cattle on the grass, then I will lie on my back looking at the endless blue sky of Arshabai”.

The translated excerpt into Russian by Leila Kosmukhamedova and Vladimir Berdennikov reads: “Я забирался за самый Каратумсык, пуская овец пастись, а сам, опрокинувшись на спину, не отводил глаз от безмятежно-голубого неба над Аршабаем” ([3], p. 85).

Transliteration into Latin from Russian: “Ya zabiralsya za samiy Karatumsyk, puskaya ovec pastis, a sam, oprokinuvshys na spinu, ne otvodyl glaz ot bezmyatezhno-golubogo neba nad Arshabayem”.

The text, translated literally from Russian into English by the authors, reads: “I climbed *over Karatumsyk itself*, letting the sheep graze, and myself, tipping over on my back, did not take my eyes off the serene blue sky over Arshabay”.

In the Russian translation, the figurative metaphor

‘*Qaratūmsyqtyñ arǵy bauyry*’ was rendered as ‘over Karatumsyk itself,’ thereby substituting the metaphor with a direct, literal meaning. In the English version, this metaphor was consequently missed and translated as *Karatumsyk hill*: “I even climbed Karatumsyk hill, leaving the sheep to get on with their grazing, while I threw myself down on the grass with my eyes glued to the cloudless blue sky above the Arshabai river” ([2], p. 21). This translation technique would be globalization according to Davis and falls under the strategy of domestication. Globalization refers to the process of substituting culture-specific references with those that are more neutral or generalized, such that they are accessible to audiences from a broader range of cultural backgrounds. Hill is considered ‘normal, familiar, and accessible to the target reader’ [23]; however, it lacks expressiveness and originality.

Another excerpt from the original text states: “Сәлден соң Ыбыш біздің қасымызға келіп: «Ақыры келуін келдің, түйені сен жетекте, мен ат суарайын, таң атқалы су ішкен жоқ» - деп қара нардың бұйдасын маған ұстатты да өзі сонау Қаратұмсықтың бергі бауырында тұсаулы жүрген қасқасына қарай кетті” ([1], p. 20):

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Sälden soñ Ybyş bızdñ qasymyzǵa kelip: “Aqyry kелuи keldñ, tüieni sen jetekte, men at suaraiyn, tañ atqaly su işkenjoq”, -dep qara nardyñ būidasyn maǵan ūstatty da özi sonau Qaratūmsyqtyñ bergi bauyrynda tūsauly жүrgen күreñ qasqasyна qarai ketti”.

This passage is literally translated as follows: “After a while, Ybysh came to us and said: “Finally, as you have come, you lead the camel, I’ll water the horse, they did not drink water until dawn” and handed me a black leash and walked towards his tangled horse with a white mark on his forehead, which was grazing on this slope [directly from Kazakh: *liver*] of Karatumsyk” (authors’ translation).

Kosmukhamedova and Berdennikov translate this passage into Russian as follows: “Раз уж здесь ты, - сказал мне Тастан, - иди к верблюду, а я пойду коня напою” ([3], p. 89).

Transliteration into Latin from Russian: “Raz uzh zdes’ ty, - skazal mne Tastan, -idi k verblyudu, a ya poydu konya napoyu...” which literally means: “Since you are here, - Tastan told me, - go to the camel, and I will go and water the horse ...” (translation by authors). And English translation by Judelson: “Now that you’re here,” said Tastan, turning to me,” go and see to the camel and I’ll go and water the horse

...” ([2], p. 26).

The metaphorical expression ‘*Qaratūmsyqtyñ bergi bauyry*’ is absent in both translations. Moreover, it is evident that not only the phrase but the entire segment of the sentence has been omitted. It can be inferred that the translators deemed it unnecessary to emphasize the geographical location of the animals’ destination. That is omission by Davies and falls under domestication. This approach involves completely omitting a problematic culture-specific item (CSI) to ensure that no trace of it appears in the translation.

The following excerpt, which pertains to bauyr as a geographical place, is: “Мен қорада қалып қойған бес-алты арық-тұрық малды Қаратұмсықтың бауырына айдап апарып келдім де, үйге кірдім” ([1], p. 23).

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Men qorada qalyp qoiǵan bes-alty aryq-tūryqmaldy Qaratūmsyqtyñ bauyryna aidap aparyp qaityp keldim de üige kirdim,” which can be literally translated as: “I drove five or six skinny cattle left in the barn to *Karatumsyk’s slope* [directly from Kazakh: *liver*], returned and entered the house” (authors’ translation).

The Russian version reads as follows: “Я гоню оставшихся во дворе овец к Каратумсуку и около полудня возвращаюсь домой” ([3], p. 91).

Transliteration into Latin from Russian: “Ya gonyu-ostavshikhsya vo dvore ovec k Karatumsyku i okolo poludnya vozvrashayus’ domoi” which literally translated as: “I drive the sheep left in the yard to Karatumsyk and return home around noon” (authors’ translation). In this instance, it can be observed that the metaphor ‘*Qaratūmsyqtyñ bauyryna*’ was translated into Russian solely as the name of the hill ‘Karatumsyk,’ rather than through the use of a figurative expression. That is globalization technique which leads to domestication of the original text.

The English translation by Judelson is the same: “I took out the sheep which had been left behind as far as Karatumsyk hill and returned home at about midday” ([2], p. 28).

The following passage warrants analytical attention: “Бауыр еті жалғыз інісі алысқа кетіп бара жатқанда қайтіп қана ұйықтайды екен – деп, анда-санда қапалана сөйлеп қояды” ([1], p. 7):

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Bauyr eti-jalǵyz ınısı alysqa ketip bara jatqanda qaitıp qana üiyqtaidy eken -dep, anda- sanda qapalana söilep qoiady”.

Literally, this sentence means “How does he go to sleep

when his the closest (directly: “liver meat”) only brother is going far away?” - he says, occasionally speaking anxiously” (translation by authors).

In this context, the figurative metaphor ‘*Bauyr et jalğyz ımsı*’ translates to ‘the closest single brother’ and reflects the emphasis on moral values and the strong familial bonds within the Kazakh community. The singular brother is portrayed as profoundly cherished, to the extent that he is symbolically linked to a vital organ, such as the liver. In contrast, Russian culture often uses the expression ‘sitting in the liver’ to describe an unpleasant individual. Therefore, the metaphor *Bauyr et jalğyz ımsı* lacks direct analogues in either Russian or English. However, other metaphorical expressions exist in these languages that may convey a similar sentiment, and translators could effectively render this meaning using the phrase ‘flesh and blood’ in an artistic manner:

The Russian translation reads: “И разве есть у них жалость? Своя кровинка, родной сынок на чужую сторону ететін, а они- один мотається где-то, а другой- спит” ([3], p. 76).

Transliteration into Latin from Russian: “I razve est’ u nih zhalost’? Svoya krovinka, rodnoj synok na chuzhuyu storonu etetin, a oni- odin motaetsya gde-to, a drugoj- spit”, which is literally translated as “And do they have any pity? Their own flesh and blood, their own son, is sent to a foreign land, and they - one is wandering around somewhere, and the other is sleeping” (authors’ translation).

The English translation by Judelson reads, “Have they no pity? Their own flesh and blood, our very own son sets off far, far away and one of them goes off somewhere, while the other just sleeps!” ([2], p. 10). Here we see the localization technique, where the translator employs the phraseological unit with the same pragmatic function in the target text. And localization leads to domestication strategy in translation. This phenomenon is referred to as cultural transplantation, which involves substituting cultural-specific items (CSIs) from the source language (SL) with those of the target language (TL) [25].

The concept *bauyr*, which reflects the emotional state of the protagonist, is evident in the following passage: “Ыбышты көріп өн бойым шымырлап кетті. Демек, келіншегінің өлімі оған оңай тимеген екен ғой, оның да қабырғасын қақыратып, бауырын жаншып кеткен екен ғой” ([1], p. 65):

Transliteration into Latin from Kazakh: “Ybyşty körip öñ boıym şymyrlapketті. Demek, kelinşeginiñ ölümü oğan oñai timegen eken ğoi, onyñ da qabyrğasyn qaқыratyp, bauyryn janşyp ketken eken ğoi” which literally translated as “My face turned pale when I saw Ybysh. So, the death of his wife was not easy for him, it also broke his ribs and crushed his liver (by authors).

This is translated as follows into Russian: “Трудно передать, что я почувствовал, узнав его. И его согбенная, будто постаревшая фигура, и большие руки, бессильно брошенные на колени, и склоненная голова были полны такой жестокой тоски и страдания, что у меня невольно дрогнуло сердце” ([3], p. 127).

Transliteration into Latin from Russian: “Trudno perezdat’, chto ya pochuvstvoval, uznay yego.

I yego sogbennaya, budto postarevshaia figura, i bol’shiye ruki, bessil’no broshennyye na kole ni, i sklonennaya golova bylpolny takoy zhestokoy toske i stradaniya, chto u menya nevol’no drognulo serdtse”, which is literally translated as: “It is difficult to convey what I felt when I recognized him. And his bent, as if aged figure, and his large hands, helplessly thrown to his knees, and his bowed head were so full of such cruel anguish and suffering that my heart involuntarily trembled” (authors’ translation). The phrase ‘*bauyryn janşyp*’ meaning ‘weighs on the soul,’ does not have a direct equivalent in Russian, as Russian speakers typically associate feelings of sadness with the heart rather than the liver. Consequently, the translation into Russian often employs a functional analogue, such as ‘my heart involuntarily trembled’. A similar adaptation can be observed in the English translation: “It is difficult to put into words what I felt when I recognized Tastan. His bent figure was like that of an old man and his large hands were resting weakly on his knees: his bowed head was full of bitter longing and suffering. My heart shuddered within me” ([2], p. 70). That is again localization by Davies.

In conclusion, the analysis reveals that in all six instances, the translation of culture-specific concept of *bauyr* is categorized under domestication. Translators employed techniques such as omission, globalization, and localization, which are intended to adapt the original text for the target audience. However, these strategies result in a loss of the text’s national characteristics. The complete adaptation of the text facilitates ease of reading for the audience; however,

it limits the readers' ability to appreciate cultural differences and alternative perspectives.

5. Translation from the Author's Perspective

Before drawing conclusions, it is important to present additional insights regarding the translation of the novel *Gaukhartas* from the perspective of the author, D. Issabekov. Like many Soviet writers in Kazakhstan, Issabekov was proficient in Russian and actively participated in the translation of his own works. The artistic translation of *Gaukhartas* is no exception to this involvement. Issabekov shared that he maintained communication with Russian translators Vladlen Berdennikov and Lena Kosmukhamedova during the translation process. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the communication challenges that existed during the Soviet era, particularly the logistical barriers between the republics of the union. Factors such as time constraints, unreliable postal services, and the geographical separation of translators resulted in occasional reliance on literal translations in the Russian versions of his works. Issabekov emphasized that this issue remains a significant consideration for both researchers and translators (Interview with Dulat Issabekov, 25 May 2023).

Another important issue raised by the author pertains to the challenge of translating directly from the Kazakh language. Issabekov noted that, at the time, there was a lack of Kazakh translators, as Kazakh was considered a minority language. Consequently, translators working from languages such as French, Spanish, and German never translated directly from Kazakh. Instead, all translations were mediated through Russian. This practice, according to Issabekov, warrants a reexamination of all such translations from a contemporary perspective, with particular attention given to the additions and omissions inherent in these translations. Moreover, special care must be taken in the translation of culture-specific vocabulary.

6. Conclusions

The study demonstrated that cultural concepts manifest as clichéd units of national consciousness. This is particularly evident in idiomatic expressions and phraseological units,

such as the concept of *bauyr* (e.g., *taudyn bauyry*, *zhalgyz inisi bauyry*, *bauyrmal*, *bauyrym*, etc.). It was established that the semantic and grammatical structure of *bauyr* reflects culturally significant features that are functionally relevant to the Kazakh culture. A comprehensive understanding of any concept of cultural significance can only be achieved by analyzing its full range of meanings.

If we assume that the modeling of the world in the human mind is carried out with the help of concepts, the author of the story 'Gaukhartas' endows the world of his characters with associative and metaphorical images. The culturological basis of the concept *bauyr* in the text is formed by connotative-figurative and metaphorical expressions: "sonau Kazykurtyn bauyrynan", "Karatumysyktyn argy bauyryna", "Karatumysyktyn bergi bauyrynda", "Karatumysyktyn bauyryna aydap aparyp", "Bauyr eti zhalgyz inisi", "bauyryn zhanshyp ketken".

In the translated versions, the metaphorical imagery of the mountains Kazygurt and Karatumysyk, along with the concept of a brother (*bauyr*), was not effectively conveyed due to the challenges associated with transferring the ethnocultural nuances of the Kazakh worldview. Nonetheless, the translators succeeded in encapsulating the author's condensed meaning of the metaphorical passage, maintaining the primary message of the original text within its contextual framework. However, the full cultural potential of the concept of *bauyr* was not realized in the translations. It can be suggested that both Russian and English translators could recreate the concept of *bauyr* through direct translations accompanied by explanatory comments, in order to preserve the original ethnocultural context. Such an approach would contribute to fostering a deeper understanding and rapprochement between cultures, aiding in the comprehension of different mentalities. It is important to note, however, that this process is gradual, though promising. For example, the translation of the phraseological expression "zhalgyz inisi bauyry" does not always produce the same communicative effect as it does in the original text, revealing the complexity of representing the semantic content of *bauyr* in translation.

The examination of cultural concepts plays a significant role in identifying the ethnic characteristics of a community's cognitive framework, which serves as a representation of its culture and is considered a facet of spiritual culture. The

mentality of a people is particularly embodied through key cultural concepts, which enable an understanding of how speakers of a given linguistic culture perceive the world. However, the complete erasure of cultural elements in translation prompts a reevaluation of the role of translation and translators in bridging cultures while also preserving their distinctiveness. The findings further underscore the profound impact that the intermediary language can have on the translation process into other languages.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, dataset analysis, methodology, reviews, final version. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Acknowledgments

We would like to extend our sincere gratitude to the author, Dulat Issabekov, for graciously granting us the opportunity to conduct an interview and for sharing insights into the translation of his work from the Soviet era.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Issabekov, D., 1983. *Екі жиырма* [Two twenties]. Zhazushi Publishing House: Almaty, Kazakhstan.
- [2] Issabekov, D., 2014. *The little pearl and other stories*. Translated by Katherine Judelson, The Aitmatov Academy.
- [3] Issabekov, D., 2003. *Tranzitny passazhir*. “Russkaya kniga”: Moscow, Russia.
- [4] Mutanov, G.M., 2022. *Д. Исабеков. Өнегелі өмір* [D. Issabekov. Moral life]. Almaty: Akadem kitap.
- [5] Cheyfitz, E., 1997. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- [6] Bazarbayeva, A.S., 2021. Peculiarities of national specificity in the directional associative experiment. *KazNU Bulletin*. 2, 89–96.
- [7] Jonathan, A.B., 2016. *Hebrew Anatomy Part 3: The Liver*. Available from: <https://www.torahapologetics.com/language--word-studies/hebrew-anatomy-part-3-the-liver> (cited 2 December 2024).
- [8] John Nel, M., 2007. *THE ANCESTORS AND ZULU FAMILY TRANSITIONS: A BOWEN THEORY AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION* [Ph.D. Thesis]. Pretoria, South Africa: University of South Africa. Available from: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43165099.pdf> (cited 2 December 2024).
- [9] Maroshi, B.B., 2016. *К мифопоэтике печени в европейской и русской литературе* [On the mythopoeitics of the liver in European and Russian literature]. *Imagology and Comparative Studies*. (5), 128–152. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-mifopoetike-pecheni-v-evropeyskoy-i-russkoy-literature> (cited 10 December 2024).
- [10] Jowett, B., 1892. *The dialogues of Plato* (translated into English with analyses and introduction).
- [11] Riva, M.A., Valnegri, C., Invernizzi, P., 2024. The liver in Christian thought: Symbolism, morality, and spirituality. *Clinical Liver Disease*. 23(1), e0236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1097/CLD.0000000000000236>
- [12] Rakhmatulloeva, K.R., 2024. Similar Genres of Uzbek Wedding Songs and Lament Ceremonies: Problems of Translation. *CLTLS* [Internet]. 1(1), 11–17. Available from: <https://citrus.buxdu.uz/index.php/cltls/article/view/2> (cited 10 January 2024).
- [13] Widarwati, N.T., Nababan, M.R., Santosa, R., et al., 2021. Gender Discrimination in Indonesian Literature Works: A Case Study of Translation. *Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*. 6(2), 124–141.
- [14] Bassnett, S., Lefevere, A., 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. Printer Publishers: London, UK.

- [15] Bassnett, S., 2007. Culture and Translation. In: Kuhiwczak, P., Littau, K. (Eds). *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. pp. 13–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599583-003>
- [16] Bassnett, S., 2014. *Translation Studies*, 4th ed. Routledge: Abingdon, UK.
- [17] Katan, D., Taibi, M., 2021. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.
- [18] Cronin, M., 2003. *Translation and Globalization*. Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.
- [19] Pym, A., 2021. On recent nationalisms in translation studies. *IN Context: Studies in Translation and Interculturalism*. 1(1), 59–82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54754/incontext.v1i1.3>
- [20] Kadyrova, Uriye. R., 2018. Литературный архетип «печень» в любовном дискурсе крымскотатарского поэта Ашыка Умера [Literary archetype “liver” in the love discourse of the Crimean Tatar poet Ashyk Umer]. *Philology: scientific research*, 4, 178–190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0749.2018.4.27225>
- [21] Sharip, A.Z., 2019. Понятие «печень» в тюркской картине мира [The concept of “liver” in the Turkic picture of the world], *Altai linguistics: problems and Research. Proceedings of the All-Russian scientific-practical conference with international participation, dedicated to the 150th anniversary of the first “Grammar of the Altai language”*, Russia: Gorno-Altai. pp. 234–240.
- [22] Dikun (Dorofeeva), N., 2014. ‘Метафорическое поле соматического концепта печень в русской и английской языковых картинах мира [Metaphorical field of the somatic concept PECHEN’/LIVER in the Russian and English language pictures of the world]. *Vestnik PSLU*. 3, 27–31.
- [23] Davies, E.E., 2003. A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of Harry Potter book. *The Translator*. 9(1), 65–100. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146>
- [24] Schleirmacher, F., 2001. On the different method of translating, *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 28–30.
- [25] Herve, S., Higgins I., 1992. *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [26] Venuti, L., 2001. *Strategies of Translation*, Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. In: Baker, M., Malmkjaer, K. (Eds.). Routledge: London, UK. pp. 283–288.
- [27] Hatim, B., Mason, I., 2001. *Discourse and the Translator*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press: Shanghai, China.
- [28] De Pedro, R., 2000. Cultural misrepresentation. In: Classe, O. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*. Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers: London, UK; Chicago, IL, USA. pp. 321–322.
- [29] Baker, M., 1992. *In other words. A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge: London, UK. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203133590>
- [30] Cussel, M., 2021. Methodological nationalism in translation studies: A critique. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. 16(1), 1–18.
- [31] Tymoczko, M., 2014. *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Routledge: London, UK. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315759494>
- [32] Newmark, P., 2010. *Translation and culture, Meaning in Translation*. Peter Long GmbH: Lausanne, Switzerland. pp. 171–182.
- [33] Schäffner, C., Wiesemann, U., 2001. *Annotated texts for translation: English German. Functionalist approaches illustrated*, Multilingual Matters.
- [34] Bracaj, M., 2015. Procedures of Translating Culture-Specific Concepts. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Rome-Italy*. 6(S1), 476–480. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n1s1p476>
- [35] Harvey, M., 2003. A beginner’s course in legal translation: the case of culture-bound terms. *ASTTI/ETIL*. 2(24), 357–369.