

TIL BILIMI HÁM ÁDEBIYATTANÍW

Til bilimi

THE LINGUO-COGNITIVE PARADIGM OF KAZAKH AND UZBEK PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE
IN THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY: BASED ON THE WORKS OF M. ZHUMABAYEV AND A. AVLONI

Akimbekova Shyryn Adilkairovna – Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor

akimbekova.shyryn@gmail.com

Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai

Dosmailova Aigul Nurkeshovna – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

a.dosmailova@satbayev.university

Kazakh National Research Technical University named after K.I. Satpayev

XX ASR BOSHIDAGI QOZOQ VA O‘ZBEK PEDAGOGIK DISKURSINING LINGVO-KOGNITIV
PARADIGMASI: M. JUMABOEVA VA A. AVLONIY ASARLARI ASOSIDA

Akimbekova Shyryn Adilkairovna – pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

Abay nomidagi Qozoq milliy pedagogika universiteti

Dosmailova Aigul Nurkeshovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

K.I. Satpayev nomidagi Qozog‘iston milliy tadqiqot texnika universiteti

ЛИНГВОКОГНИТИВНАЯ ПАРАДИГМА КАЗАХСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОГО
ДИСКУРСА НАЧАЛА XX ВЕКА: НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ТРУДОВ М. ЖУМАБАЕВА И А. AVLONI

Акимубекова Шырин Адилкаировна – доктор философии по педагогическим наукам, доцент

Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая

Досмаилова Айгуль Нуркешовна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент

Казахский национальный исследовательский технический университет имени К.И. Сатпаева

Tayanch so‘zlar: M. Jumaboev, A. Avloniy, termin yaratish, pedagogika, milliy tafakkur, lingvo-kognitiv paradigma.

Rezyume. Maqolada XX asr boshidagi qozoq va o‘zbek ma’rifatparvarlik diskursining lingvo-kognitiv xususiyatlari M. Jumaboev va A. Avloniy asarlaridagi terminologik tizimlar asosida qiyosiy o‘rganiladi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi – har ikki muallif matnlaridagi pedagogik, psixologik va mantiqiy tushunchalarning semantik tabiatini ochib berish hamda ularning milliy maktabni shakllantirishdagi kognitiv rolini baholashdan iborat. Ishda konseptual tahlil, lingvo-kognitiv modellash va qiyosiy-tipologik metodlardan foydalanilgan.

Ключевые слова: М. Жумабаев, А. Авлони, терминообразование, педагогика, национальное сознание, лингвокогнитивная парадигма.

Резюме. В статье проводится сравнительное исследование лингвокогнитивных особенностей казахского и узбекского просветительского дискурса начала XX века на основе терминологических систем в трудах М. Жумабаева и А. Авлони. Цель исследования – раскрыть семантическую природу педагогических, психологических и логических понятий в текстах обоих авторов и оценить их когнитивную роль в формировании национальной педагогической школы. В работе использованы методы концептуального анализа, лингвокогнитивного моделирования и сравнительно-типологический метод.

Key words: M. Zhumabayev, A. Avloni, term creation, pedagogy, national cognition, linguo-cognitive paradigm.

Summary. The article provides a comparative study of the linguo-cognitive features of the Kazakh and Uzbek pedagogical discourse of the early 20th century, based on the terminological systems in the works of M. Zhumabayev and A. Avloni. The research aims to reveal the semantic nature of pedagogical, psychological, and logical concepts within the texts of both authors and to evaluate their cognitive role in the formation of national educational schools. The study employs conceptual analysis, linguo-cognitive modeling, and comparative-typological methods.

Introduction. The first quarter of the 20th century was a unique period in the intellectual history of Turkic peoples, characterized by the concurrent processes of preserving national identity and modernization, which subsequently necessitated the formation of distinct terminological systems and scientific-pedagogical discourse. During this era, the advancement of the Turkic press and the rise of enlightenment movements prioritized the establishment of a scientific and educational language, placing the issue of terminology at the forefront of intellectual inquiry. Furthermore, imperatives such as reforming the education system, establishing a model for national schools, and developing a new pedagogical lexicon became increasingly urgent. Within the framework of the Jadidist movement, Kazakh and Uzbek intellectuals sought to reimagine

pedagogy as a scientific discipline, driven by the aspiration to formulate scientific terminology within their respective native languages.

The magnitude of the requirements and the obligations placed upon the Alash intelligentsia during this period are clearly evidenced by the views of one of the era’s most prominent scholars, Khalel Dosmukhameduly. In the preface to his 1922 work *Animals*, published in Tashkent, he writes: "The lack of textbooks is a major shortcoming and a significant obstacle to public enlightenment. It is the duty of educated Kazakh intellectuals to eliminate this shortcoming and overcome this obstacle. The time has come for the educated within the Alash to fulfill their national debt. Those who are educated must either author textbooks themselves or translate them from other

languages" [1:5]. In his earlier work, *Natural Science*, published in 1921, he further noted: "This work was not written out of intellectual vanity, but out of necessity" [2:319].

The decolonization of linguistic consciousness and the reform of the education system, aimed at creating a new national school model, were fundamentally linked to the development of its conceptual apparatus – namely, its pedagogical language. In this historical context, Magzhan Zhumabayev's *Pedagogy* (1922) serves as the precedent text that laid the foundation for Kazakh scientific-pedagogical discourse, while Abdullah Avloni's *Turkiy Guliston yoxud Axloq* (1913) occupies a significant position within the Uzbek enlightenment tradition. These two works represent more than mere educational tools; they are linguistic treatises that demonstrated the internal potential of the Kazakh and Uzbek languages to articulate scientific concepts, multi-component structures, and analytical models. These works performed not only a didactic function but also established the scientific foundation for expressing fundamental concepts of natural science, psychology, and pedagogy in the native language.

Literature and Methodology. The primary objects of this study are the pedagogical textbook *Pedagogy* (1922) by the Kazakh intellectual Magzhan Zhumabayev and the treatise *Turkiy Guliston yoxud Axloq* (1913) by the Uzbek enlightener Abdullah Avloni. The methodological framework of this article is composed of comparative linguistic analysis, structural-semantic analysis, discourse analysis, as well as the theories of conceptual metaphor and cognitive modeling. These methods enable a profound exploration of the common typological features and national-specific nuances inherent in the scientific-pedagogical discourse of the two Turkic languages during the early 20th century. As a result of the research, it is statistically and textually demonstrated that Magzhan Zhumabayev adhered to a national-purist model, whereas Abdullah Avloni utilized a model focused on the modernization of the classical Arabic-Persian lexical corpus.

Discussion and Results. The work *Pedagogy* (1922) by Magzhan Zhumabayev – an intellectual of the Alash movement, poet, and educator – stands as an unparalleled contribution that laid the foundations of psychology, logic, and pedagogy in the Kazakh language [3]. In preparing this textbook, Zhumabayev drew upon the theoretical principles of Western European pedagogical and psychological thought, particularly the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Herbert Spencer, as well as the Russian pedagogical tradition represented by Konstantin Ushinsky and Vasily Vakhterov. However, his principal scholarly achievement lies in the fact that he did not simply reproduce or transliterate established international terminology. Adhering to a purist, language-based approach, he reconceptualized complex psychological and philosophical categories through the rich lexical resources of the Kazakh language, thereby adapting the conceptual apparatus of pedagogy and psychology to the national linguistic context. According to the terminologist Sh. Qurmanbayuly, approximately 300 terms have been identified in Zhumabayev's *Pedagogy* [4:142].

A structural-semantic analysis of the lexical and terminological corpus of *Pedagogy* demonstrates that the

author systematically employed three principal linguistic mechanisms of term formation – lexico-semantic, morphological, and syntactic methods – in the process of constructing a national pedagogical and psychological terminology. This finding confirms that Zhumabayev's terminological practice was not incidental but represented a conscious and scientifically grounded strategy aimed at establishing a coherent conceptual framework for the emerging fields of pedagogy and psychology in the Kazakh language.

Lexico-Semantic Method. Within the lexico-semantic approach, Zhumabayev employed the native lexical resources of the Kazakh language and commonly used vocabulary, narrowing their semantic scope through semantic derivation and transforming them into precise scientific, psychological, and logical concepts. A number of pedagogical terms were either adopted directly from the existing lexical stock of the language or endowed with specialized terminological meanings. Their semantic structures can be characterized as follows:

- **Añdau** ("perception") – denotes the cognitive process of perceiving external objects and phenomena through the senses as an integrated act of cognition.

- **Eles** ("mental representation") – functions as the Kazakh designation for the psychological concept of representation.

- **Qairat** ("willpower" or "volition") – corresponds to the psychological concept of will, describing an individual's internal motivational force and goal-directed dynamics.

Morphological Method. The Alash intellectual E. Omaruly, who actively contributed to the development of scientific language in the early twentieth century, argued that "it is preferable to create new words using native affixes rather than attaching foreign suffixes to roots". This principle is clearly reflected in Zhumabayev's terminological practice. At the level of morphological word formation, native derivational suffixes of the Kazakh language were productively employed to create nominations for abstract scientific concepts. The principal patterns may be classified into the following functional groups:

- **-lyq / -lik / -dyq / -dik:** *jylylyq* (warmth), *beigamdyq* (carelessness), *ozimshildik* (selfishness), *kopshildik* (sociability), *birturlilik* (peculiarity), *izgilik* (benevolence), *sauyqtyq* (recreation), and others.

- **-u:** A considerable proportion of one-word terms in *Pedagogy* are verbal nouns (infinitive forms), including *olsheu* (measurement), *aserlenu* (emotional response), *pysyqtau* (reinforcement), *sipau* (touching), *suretteu* (description), *tatu* (reconciliation), *umtylu* (aspiration), *uyalu* (shyness), and *shekteu* (limitation).

- **-ys / -is / -ysh:** These suffixes were used to form terms describing internal emotional states and experiences, such as *aityls* (utterance), *korinis* (appearance), *quanysh* (joy), and *okinish* (regret).

Syntactic Method. The most productive model in Zhumabayev's system of terminology formation is the syntactic method, namely the creation of terms through analytical combinations consisting of two or more lexical components. Such units constitute more than fifty percent of all terms recorded in the textbook. Most of them are two-component formations, whereas three-component terms occur less frequently.

According to terminology scholars, whether one examines the entire terminological lexicon of a language or the terminology of a specific discipline, the majority of terms tend to be multi-word constructions. As Sh.Qurmanbayuly notes, this phenomenon arises from the objective necessity of naming subordinate and derivative concepts that evolve from a core concept. The terminology of pedagogy provides a clear illustration of this process. For example, the central concept *minez* (“character”) generates a range of derivative designations such as *qairatty minez* (strong-willed character), *kushti minez* (strong character), *berik minez* (firm character), *jumsaq minez* (gentle character), and *tuma minez* (innate character). Likewise, the concept *aserlenu* (“emotional response”) gives rise to numerous related terms, including *the content of emotional response*, *the intensity of emotional response*, *the tone of emotional response*, *physical emotional responses*, *muscular emotional responses*, *nervous emotional responses*, *nutritional emotional responses*, *circulatory emotional responses*, *respiratory emotional responses*, *warmth-related emotional responses*, and *cold-related emotional responses*. All these designations originate from a single conceptual nucleus and represent its various manifestations and properties.

Rather than borrowing classical Greco-Latin terms such as *apperception*, *induction*, *sylogism*, *attention*, and *abstraction* in their original forms, Zhumabayev analyzed their semantic cores and proposed culturally and linguistically appropriate Kazakh equivalents, including *añdau* (“perception”), *kem induksiia* (“incomplete induction”), *tolyq sillogizm* (“complete syllogism”), *abai* (“attention”), and *jalangashtau* (“abstraction”). This approach demonstrates that language functions not merely as a passive recipient of scientific knowledge but as an autonomous cognitive system capable of processing and generating new conceptual structures.

From a linguo-cognitive perspective, one of the most productive aspects of Zhumabayev’s terminology is the formation of antonymic paradigms and conceptual oppositions. To ensure conceptual precision and categorical coherence, he systematically employed a dichotomous principle, generating paired terms such as *voluntary attention* – *involuntary attention*, *general concept* – *particular concept*, and *affirmative judgment* – *negative judgment*.

The fundamental work *Turkiy Gulistan yohud Axloq* (*Turkic Gulistan or Ethics*, 1913) by Abdullah Avloni, a prominent Uzbek educator and representative of the Jadid reform movement, occupies a unique place in the history of pedagogical, ethical, and psychological thought in Central Asia at the beginning of the twentieth century [5]. Drawing upon the intellectual legacy of classical Eastern philosophy, particularly the ideas of Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, and Al-Ghazali, while simultaneously responding to the pedagogical demands of the Jadid educational reform movement, Avloni developed a system of scientific terminology based on the Uzbek language during a transformative period in the evolution of the Chagatai written tradition.

The structural characteristics of the Jadid pedagogical paradigm have been further elucidated by the Uzbek scholar A. Asatulloev in his comparative studies. According to the researcher, Avloni, in systematizing classical ethical

principles, conceptualized human nature through a dualistic framework consisting of the external physical body (*badan*) and the internal spiritual essence (*ruh*), which can be apprehended only through intellect. Within this framework, human behavior is interpreted as the product of the interaction and harmony between these two dimensions [6:165].

A distinctive feature of Avloni’s terminological practice is his transformation of concepts inherited from the classical Eastern *Adab* tradition – associated with etiquette, morality, and ethical conduct – into systematic didactic categories suitable for the modern educational model of the *Usul-i Jadid* (“New Method”) schools. Terms such as *nafs* (self or soul), *fikr* (thought), and *idrok* (perception or cognition), which had previously functioned primarily within religious and mystical discourse, were reconceptualized in Avloni’s work and elevated to the status of analytical categories within the framework of empirical psychology.

Similar to Magzhan Zhumabayev’s pedagogical terminology, the terminological system presented in Avloni’s work was constructed through three principal linguistic mechanisms: the lexico-semantic, morphological, and syntactic methods of term formation.

Lexico-Semantic Method. Within the lexico-semantic approach, Avloni narrowed the semantic scope of common lexical items and religious-philosophical concepts, assigning them precise psychological and pedagogical meanings. Through this process, widely used words acquired specialized terminological status within the emerging discourse of modern education and psychology.

• **Tarbiya** (“education” or “upbringing”) is defined in the text as “*Pedagogiya, ya’ni bola tarbiyasining fani*” (“Pedagogy, that is, the science of child upbringing”). Through this definition, Avloni elevates the concept from an abstract process of education to the designation of an independent scientific discipline.

• **Ilm** (“knowledge” or “science”) functions as a gnoseological category referring to verified knowledge and organized systems of information. Described in the text as “*Zehnimizni, fikrimizni qilich kabi o’tkur qilur*” (“It sharpens our intellect and thought like a sword”), the term is conceptualized as an essential cognitive instrument for intellectual development.

Morphological Method. The morphological formation of terms in Avloni’s work reflects a synthesis of Turkic derivational suffixes and word-formation patterns inherited from the Arabic linguistic tradition. This hybrid structure demonstrates the transitional character of early twentieth-century Uzbek scientific language.

Among the most productive derivational markers is the suffix **-lik**, which is used to form abstract concepts and professional designations, including *muallimlik* (“teaching profession”), *yaxshilik* (“goodness”), *kuchlik* (“strength”), and *sharofatlik* (“virtuousness”). Another productive formant is the suffix **-sizlik**, employed to express the absence or negation of a particular quality, thereby contributing to the development of abstract ethical and psychological terminology.

Syntactic Method. As in Magzhan Zhumabayev’s pedagogical terminology, the majority of terms in Avloni’s work are formed through syntactic word-combination patterns. Multi-component terminological units constitute

the most productive layer of the text and are predominantly constructed according to the izafet model inherited from the classical Turkic-Persian literary tradition.

Representative examples include *badan tarbiyasi* (“physical education”), *fikr tarbiyasi* (“intellectual education”), *axloq tarbiyasi* (“moral education”), and *quvvai fikriya* (“intellectual power” or “mental capacity”). These analytical constructions enabled the author to represent complex pedagogical and psychological concepts with a high degree of semantic precision while preserving the linguistic and cultural continuity of the traditional written heritage.

Conclusion. In conclusion, both authors adapted externally acquired scientific ideas through the cognitive frameworks of their respective languages and integrated them into national pedagogical discourse. Rather than mechanically transferring foreign concepts, Magzhan Zhumabayev and Abdullah Avloni processed scientific knowledge through the conceptual and linguistic resources of their native cultures, thereby creating nationally grounded systems of educational terminology.

The comparative analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that both scholars conceptualized scientific notions within the framework of their national worldviews. The thematic distribution of terms in Zhumabayev’s work reveals a pronounced focus on cognitive psychology, logic, volition, and emotional processes. Terms such as *añdau* (perception), *eles* (representation), *abai* (attention), *ugym* (concept), *hükim* (judgment), *qairat* (willpower), *quanysh* (joy), and *okinish* (regret) collectively form an integrated conceptual system for describing human mental activity. In contrast, Avloni’s terminology is primarily centered on education, morality, cognition, and the spiritual development of the individual. Concepts such as *tarbiya*

(education), *axloq* (morality), *nafs* (self), *idrok* (cognition), *fikr* (thought), and *ilm* (knowledge) function as the core categories of his pedagogical framework. This distinction suggests that Kazakh educational thought placed greater emphasis on psychological and pedagogical issues, whereas Uzbek Jadid pedagogy devoted particular attention to moral and ethical education.

The comparative analysis also revealed differences in their strategies of terminological adaptation. Zhumabayev prioritized the creation of native Kazakh equivalents for international scientific concepts, thereby promoting the development of a distinctly national terminology. This approach reflects his commitment to a purist model of language planning. Avloni, on the other hand, combined Turkic linguistic resources with a substantial layer of Arabic-Persian scholarly vocabulary. As a result, his terminological system embodies the continuity between the classical Eastern intellectual heritage and modern pedagogical thought. It may therefore be concluded that while Kazakh terminology was characterized primarily by the principle of native lexical substitution, Uzbek terminology developed through a syncretic model grounded in historical and cultural continuity.

Overall, the works of Magzhan Zhumabayev and Abdullah Avloni constitute valuable sources for understanding the modernization of scientific thought among Turkic peoples in the early twentieth century, the emergence of national languages as languages of science, and the linguo-cognitive mechanisms underlying terminology formation. Their terminological legacy not only documents the historical experience of developing national scientific languages but also provides a theoretical foundation for understanding contemporary developments in Kazakh and Uzbek terminology.

References

1. Dosmukhameduly H. Zhanuarlar [Animals]. – Kyzylorda: Kazakhstan Memleket, 1927.
2. Dosmukhameduly H. Tandamaly enbekter [Selected Works]. – Astana: 2008.
3. Zhumabayev M. Pedagogika [Pedagogy]. – Orenburg: Kazakhstan: «Memleket», 1922.
4. Qurmanbayuly Sh. Alash zhane terimintanu [Alash and Terminology Studies]. – Almaty: «El-Shezhire», 2008.
5. Avloniy A. Turkiy Guliston yohud axloq [Turkic Gulistan or Ethics]. – Toshkent: «O‘qituvchi», 1992.
6. Asatulloev A. Commonality and specificity in the ethical concepts of modern 20th century enlightener Abdurakhman Tashkandi and Abdullah Avloni. *Oriens*, 4(21), 2024. – P. 162-170.

*Funding source:

This article was prepared within the framework of the scientific project AP26104267 “Subject terms (terminology) in textbooks up to the 1930s: national principles and the Eurocentric paradigm of the Soviet period,” funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.