

THE TEXT OF E.A. BUKETOV'S STORY SIX LETTERS TO A FRIEND AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Buketova N.I., Academician E.A. Buketov Karaganda University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Kosherova K.K., Academician K. Satpayev Ekibastuz Engineering and Technical Institute, Ekibastuz, Kazakhstan

Our history is but a few flashes in the steppe,” said the well-known poet Olzhas Suleimenov. Indeed, travelling through the steppes of Sary-Arka, one begins to understand that the space, traced by a line of low hills and strewn in some places with huge boulders polished by the waters of what was once the world ocean covering these places, is Eternity! Man has brought to these places his own dimension — Time — adding to the music of the Wind, the gentle whisper of grass, his own distinctive feature, his wealth — Language. Artefacts, carefully and painstakingly extracted from the earth in these places after several millennia, tell us of cities where life once flowed in measured harmony with nature [1].

The first among Kazakhstan's national scholars to pay attention to the study of inscriptions on stones — petroglyphs — was the President of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR, academician K.I. Satpayev, an inimitable and multifaceted personality, a true natural talent. In the context of the independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, with the active process of reviving the spirituality of society, the growth of its national self-awareness and pride, the restoration of an objective and truthful history of Kazakhstan from antiquity to the present has enormous significance for the further development of the country [2].

The anthropocentric paradigm has given a major impetus to integrative research in the humanities, where philosophy closely cooperates with philology, psychology, hermeneutics, cultural studies, intercultural communication, literary studies, translation studies, and many other disciplines united by one key theme — “Man” [3; 4]. Modern linguistics is moving away from purely structural-semantic and structural-grammatical characteristics in language systems toward the study of “man in language and language in man” [5] as the most complex, multidimensional object. As I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay observed, “Language exists only in individual brains, only in souls, only in the psyche of individuals who make up a given society.” Yu.S. Stepanov presented language as a number of images, among them “language as the space of thought” and as the “house of the spirit” [6].

In Kazakhstan, a movement has begun toward the just restoration of historically significant names of statesmen and members of the scientific intelligentsia, including those who perished innocently during the years of repression, as well as the names of people consigned to oblivion during the totalitarian policies of the Communist Party and other social upheavals [7]. A significant place in this process is occupied by interest in the lives, work, and written heritage of scholars of encyclopedic stature. In this regard, the times demand an objective and critical evaluation of the historical experience of the past, for it is in it that we find answers to many complex questions of the present. As noted above, one should mention the invaluable contribution to the development of modern science and industrial progress in Kazakhstan made by K.I. Satpayev — whose important place E.A. Buketov, his follower in scientific ideas, wrote about in his books *Six Letters to a Friend* and *Young Kanysh* with the greatest respect, vividly, truthfully, and sincerely. Knowledge of historical and cultural heritage is the foundation of our civic identity, which must be carefully preserved and passed down from generation to generation. E.A. Buketov often liked to repeat: “The big picture is seen from a distance...” It is as if he knew that much of what he said, did, and created would become clearer and more meaningful to people with time — including the personality of academician K.I. Satpayev, whose 125th anniversary was widely celebrated on both the national and international scale [8].

A relatively new scientific field — “personology of science” — within the framework of linguoculturological and cognitive text analysis, aims to study the written heritage of high-level scholars, who are most often multifaceted individuals leaving behind not only a rich scientific legacy but also creative works in the form of literary books, translations, letters, and other sources.

The books of academician E.A. Buketov, publications of his articles, and materials about him constitute a large corpus of sources of scholarly interest for readers, students, colleagues, specialists in chemistry and metallurgy, writers, journalists, public figures, and scholars from various fields — historians, literary critics, philosophers, linguists. Most publications and, in general, studies of this outstanding Kazakh scholar are predominantly regional in character. Nonetheless, it can be said with confidence that in the history of science and higher education in Kazakhstan, an independent trend within the “personology of science” has been developing — Buketov studies [2]. The multifaceted activity of academician E.A. Buketov has become the object of scientific research by chemists, professional historians, linguists, and literary critics [9]. In this regard, there is a pressing need to disseminate knowledge about academician E.A. Buketov both among the younger generation of the region and on the scale of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The first attempt at such research was the experimental intra-university project No. 22-VG-23 of the Non-Profit Joint Stock Company “Karaganda University named after academician E.A. Buketov” — *The Personality of E.A. Buketov in the History of the Karaganda Buketov University Brand*, headed by Doctor of Philology, Professor N.I. Buketova. An important factor is that the personality and written legacy of E.A. Buketov influence public consciousness, especially that of young researchers, which gives the “personology of science” new impetus for further development.

Academician E.A. Buketov achieved great success in the field of ferrous metallurgy. He devoted considerable attention to ferroalloy production from the perspective of using high-ash coal for ore-thermal smelting of off-balance manganese ores into complex ferroalloys. In the last years of his life, E.A. Buketov focused on producing liquid fuel from high-ash brown coals from various deposits of the Karaganda Basin, creating a special laboratory for this purpose. He was awarded the USSR State Prize in 1969 for his participation in the development and implementation of technology for the integrated processing of copper concentrates at the Balkhash Mining and Metallurgical Plant using oxygen at the converting stage, with the addition of granulated Dzhezkazgan concentrates in a shaft furnace with an inclined grate as a “cold charge.”

E.A. Buketov was not only a major scientist but also a literary critic, translator, publicist, poet, and writer. The texts of E.A. Buketov's story *Six Letters to a Friend* [10], his translations into Kazakh, and his journalistic articles make it possible to reveal the author's linguistic space from the standpoint of linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics, to analyze the semiotic space of transforming language signs into images of the characters in his works, and the process of coding and decoding units from one language into another in translation. In interpreting written texts according to Jacques Derrida's concept of "deconstruction," texts seem to speak about themselves, giving the reader the opportunity to hear the melody of these texts and to see their semantic structure from the inside through the means that Derrida identifies within the texts themselves [10].

Modern methods of analyzing works of fiction are based on the scientific concepts of scholars who propose an integrative approach to humanities research. The theoretical conclusions of F. de Saussure about the sign nature of language and the dichotomy of language and speech became foundational for linguistics, philosophy, and other disciplines. The introduction of the integrative concept of "discourse" became a stepping stone for constructing the linear framework of text analysis, expressed concisely by É. Benveniste: "Discourse is everything that lies between language and speech" [8].

The text of academician E.A. Buketov's story *Six Letters to a Friend*, as a vivid example of a bearer of intertextuality and intertextual meanings, is considered as a single intertext. Intertextuality is present already in the title, which implies a conversation, a dialogue, the author's intention. The image of academician K.I. Satpayev and other characters in the story appears "alive," humanly warm thanks to the information in discursive situations accumulated and conveyed by the author in dialogue with a "friend" and is close to a real speech situation. The writer's rich conceptual sphere makes it possible to depict expressive landscapes, the value dominants of the characters, and the distinctive cultural expressiveness of the Kazakh language.

There exists an original concept by N.K. Roerich, in which culture is regarded as a universal measure of human activity. N.K. Roerich develops the idea that one who dares in the name of Culture and Beauty is invincible, for he is nourished by the most powerful otherworldly and cosmic forces — the energy of fire and light. Human activity takes on a truly cultural character only when it is illuminated by the light of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, when it strives to affirm the humanistic meaning of human endeavor. In particular, he believed that a culture of spirit should be inherent in scientists engaged in science and technology, as they are most responsible for ensuring that the Earth does not become lifeless — that is, a scientist must bear ethical responsibility toward nature [10].

Ideas of humanism are clearly defined in E.A. Buketov's work and scientific concepts, especially in his final manuscript *Oil, Coal and Water in Chemistry and Energy* [1]. In this sense, the scientist's research and search for an environmentally harmless energy source are confirmation of his high culture and humane attitude toward the environment in light of today's prospects for the country and the world. E.A. Buketov writes:

"In order to cook food and heat his dwelling, man initially used what was at hand and easy to obtain: plant fuel... The latter predominated in man's natural activity until the middle of the last century, when people gradually began to switch to coal and oil, and later still — to gas. This transition occurred in time: the beginning of the terrible devastation of the Earth — the felling of forest massifs in vast territories — was halted... Nature is unable to quickly replenish stocks of fossil fuels, and coal, oil, and gas belong to non-renewable types of fuel."

He then writes that energy is taken from nature, and that man, boasting of his abilities and skills in using nature's gifts, proudly calling this a victory over the forces of nature, failed to realize that he simply remained a dependent of nature — and, unfortunately, not a particularly grateful one [1]. These lines were written about half a century ago, yet it seems that E.A. Buketov is speaking today about the catastrophically growing pollution of the Earth and the threatening disruption of natural balance.

As is known, E.A. Buketov's life (1925–1983) was bound up with the events of the Soviet Union. This included the establishment of Soviet power, mass famine, the collapse of the social order and way of life of the Kazakhs and other peoples, industrialization and collectivization, waves of repression, World War II, the hardships of postwar reconstruction, the development of large-scale industry and, at the same time, the rise of science and education. For students, this was a time of semi-starvation, when a stipend and state-provided meals were an important factor in choosing a university and specialty — and this could not but influence the choice of profession. This factor played a decisive role in the life of E.A. Buketov, who, arriving to apply to the Faculty of Philology, learned that the Mining and Metallurgical Institute provided meals, and so enrolled there instead. Life showed that he had in fact chosen the right field — the technical sciences were his element; they were also not subject to censorship and ideological pressure, leaving room for free thought. At the same time, all works of fiction, journalism, and the entire humanities curriculum were subject to strict ideological control.

From these positions, even the titles of articles and books were subject to corresponding semantic and social analysis. For this reason, the first journal version of *Six Letters to a Friend* was published under the title recommended by the journal's editorial board, *The Time of a Bright Fate*, although the working title was *Notes of a Researcher* [10].

The literary scholar T.T. Savchenko writes about this period: "E.A. Buketov's story *Six Letters to a Friend* was written in the late 1970s. These were years when both writers and readers were weary of the officially sanctioned literature available for reading and study. The extreme limitation of the sphere from which artistic reflection could draw, and the impossibility of addressing critical depictions of many sides of reality, brought documentary and memoir literature to the forefront of literary life. E.A. Buketov caught this spirit and created a work in which interest in the document shines through. The story contains the paths of affirming and glorifying the social conditions of human formation... However, in the last two letters of the narrative, a strong critical pathos emerges... In those years such pathos was regarded as daring, an unforgivable breaking out of the system. For such impermissible boldness the writer paid with a break in his career: vilification, accusations of nonexistent crimes, distortion of facts, and removal from the most important cause of his life — the building of the university — all this was the result of his attempt to speak about the times not in the language of a panegyric but in the language of objective depiction" [10].

E.A. Buketov's personality is marked by a parallel belonging to several linguistic, semantic, and semiotic spaces. His main written texts belong to two different language systems — Kazakh and Russian; at the same time, when translating English-language literature, there is not only work with the metalanguage (Russian) but also direct reference to the original (English) [17]. Based on this, the conceptual space of E.A. Buketov's worldview and self-expression as a linguistic personality is characterized by a special combination of individually and nationally formed concepts as an object of scholarly linguistic study.

For example, in analyzing the translation of William Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar*, A.S. Amrenova, in her dissertation, notes that E.A. Buketov, having before him the Russian translation, would refer to the original English text to clarify the meaning of the translated text. This allowed him to refine the interpretation of grammatical phenomena and semantic nuances in the translation of the play, making the process of decoding from Russian and English and encoding into Kazakh more precise, as evidenced by examples from the translated texts [6].

Considering the body of the author's written texts — with the artistic one as primary — places him at a new conceptual level of analysis within the “Culture–Thinking–Language” paradigm. The literary text became the object of linguoculturological analysis in the works of G.V. Stepanov, D.S. Likhachyov, and philosopher–cultural scholar Yu.M. Lotman, aimed primarily at identifying the specificity and function of the “culturally marked word,” which, according to S.V. Lur'e, defines “the system of coordinates in which a person lives and in which his image of the world is formed” [2].

For such research, it is important not only to study a single word carrying specific shades of culture but also the very language of the literary work as such. Yu.M. Lotman notes that the language, which is both the necessary condition and material for producing literary texts, is characterized by a certain mentality. In this sense, it “represents a special material, marked by social activity even before the artist's hand touches it,” and thus the writer “appeals to material in which the results of centuries of human activity aimed at understanding life have been condensed” [2]. According to T.V. Chernigovskaya, considering a literary text as a cultural phenomenon provides wide opportunities for the expression and interpretation of meanings — that is, it goes beyond cognitive science into the sphere of consciousness [7].

In the text of E.A. Buketov's story, the main character reflects:

“In the natural sciences we have what is called the statistical method of deriving regularities, when from numerous data on the same property, or, as we say, parameter, something mathematically averaged is derived. This is probably a crude analogy for artistic typification, for the realm of thinking in images (emphasis added — N.I. Buketova) requires, as you yourself said, a special perception, a departure from crude realism into the realm of the music of life, of harmony with the surrounding world. And yet such an analogy can apparently be made” [7].

Linguoculturology provides opportunities for studying a literary text as a “formal unit of culture,” where, as L.N. Murzin believes, “culture ‘disintegrates’ into texts, consists of texts, although qualitatively it is not reducible to them” [10].

To the scientific paradigm “language–word,” V.N. Telia adds another component — “discourse” — and substantiates the need to study not only the language but also the discourse, in which various linguistic and discursive units present the corresponding image of the world [10]. All this makes it possible to close the chain within which linguoculturological analysis of a literary text should be conducted: culture–thinking–language–word–discourse. According to S.V. Ivanova, all this makes the text “the brightest product of the symbiosis of language and culture, actualizing and manifesting the features of the linguocultural code, and creating a foundation for the ‘polyphony’ of the literary text” [10].

From this perspective, the linguoculturological approach appears effective and promising for our study, since the author E.A. Buketov, as the “creator” of the literary text, is both original and typical in his creative and linguistic manifestations. He is a representative of a particular nation, involved in a specific cultural context and linguistic discourse, and thus his linguistic consciousness is characterized by features of the Kazakh national mentality. The analysis of E.A. Buketov's literary text/discourse is of scholarly interest as interpretation in the discursive sense.

As a representative of Kazakh ethnoculture, the author brings into the events of the story a national-cultural specificity. Moreover, as a bilingual who writes in both his native Kazakh and in Russian, he introduces other associative-verbal features into the dialogues. Based on W. von Humboldt's assertion that every national language has its own “inner form” — a specific structure determined by the uniqueness of a people's spirit — the same can be said of the writer's language [9]. At the same time, the language of each writer's literary creativity also has its own original “inner form” and specific structure, determined by the uniqueness of the creator — the features of his personality and thinking.

This idea is confirmed in E.A. Buketov's story already in the first letter, where the formation of the image of the “friend” does not occur without the participation of the author's critical “I.” Linguistic and stylistic analysis of the discourse context makes it possible to determine the genre of the book, already suggested by the word “letters” and the addition of “to a friend,” implying a confidential, positive authorial position in the form of a “dialogue,” i.e., an act of communication. At the same time, the use of the numeral “six” specifies the semantic scope without narrowing it — on the contrary, it acts as an external impulse, prompting the reading of “letter number one” and serving as a sign of intertextuality.

In searching for the narrative genre of his story, the writer developed his idiostyle. E.A. Buketov came to the conclusion that presenting it in the form of letters would allow him to preserve a certain personal intimacy of confession and, at the same time, maintain the protagonist's internal monologue in dialogue with the “friend” and the reader. The “friend” writes to the main character of the story, Mazhit Nurbaev:

“Listen, why don't you write about yourself, about your work, about your colleagues? This is a living history of the creation of great science in what was once a ‘foreign’ outskirts, and to be silent about it, it seems to me, is criminal, shameful!”

When the narrator hesitated, fearing to appear self-important, the “friend” replied:

“I'm not forcing you to do that. You are not only yourself, but dozens — hundreds — of your colleagues who have roughly the same fate. Look more closely at your colleagues, add a bit of imagination, and you will detach from yourself, but this will not mean that you detach from the truth of life. You will simply have the opportunity to select the most characteristic traits of your contemporaries. The same will apply to the people you want to describe — there are many of

them, they will not all fit into your narrative, so you will have to make one from several, selecting only the characteristic, the memorable features. Then your imagination will be closest to surrounding reality. Naturally, while maintaining a certain measure suggested by experience and instinct. So write, brother, more boldly — and don't be shy. You are writing me a letter. Your epistles are good in their confessional tone. But they contain many salty, sometimes even over-salted jokes, to which we are accustomed; this knocks you off a serious tone. Better imagine a younger writer, very interested in your life and work, and confess to him as an elder in life experience and age, perhaps a bit didactically. I am sure it will work. Remember that what you write is needed, very much needed" [10, pp. 6–7].

The well-known writer A. Seidimbekov, after reading the story, suggested that E.A. Buketov change the title, increase the number of letters to nine, and in general, since the story resembled a documentary, write it in his own name [5]. The author disagreed and left the text unchanged.

The final, sixth letter is dated 1982 and was written by E.A. Buketov in the city of Karaganda while in the hospital after an nth heart attack, which is reflected in the text, where the protagonist Mazhit writes:

"I am finishing, dear friend, this last letter. I fear that I have not greatly added to your already large store of knowledge about the toilers of science. In my letters to you, I have remained the same as I am in scientific reflection: I wanted to write about the main things you asked for, but what came onto the page was secondary, lying beside the main things. I could not overcome myself. Please forgive me... I am still quite certain of this, and every word about the so-called achievements of academician Nurbaev continues to evoke anxious thoughts about something unthought and unfinished... And in this anxiety, perhaps, dear friend, lies the meaning of life" [10, p. 286].

The analysis of the story's text leads to the conclusion that E.A. Buketov's reflections, placed in the mouth of the protagonist, and his desire to weave life events into the work, have organically merged into the network model of the literary text.

Concluding generalizations from the linguoculturological analysis of E.A. Buketov's Six Letters to a Friend:

1. The story, as a cultural-linguistic phenomenon, represents a synthesis of literary, documentary, and philosophical discourses. It reflects the author's individual experience in the context of the cultural and historical environment of 20th-century Kazakhstan, integrating elements of national and universal culture into the text.

2. E.A. Buketov's linguistic personality is manifested in the text through a combination of ethnocultural affiliation, bilingualism, moral stance, and scientific thinking. His idiostyle is based on linguistic diversity, interlingual flexibility, and a deep humanistic worldview.

3. The linguoculturological analysis shows that the text serves as a form of cultural memory and representation of identity. It shapes value orientations through metaphors, intertextual references, and symbolic images.

References

1. Kasenova, M.D., & Istomina, A.A. Perspectives and New Trends in the Development of Foreign Language Education. In Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference, Karaganda, 2023. Electronic edition, pp. 9–12.
2. Available at: <https://articlekz.com/article/20257>
3. Buketova, N.I. The Relict Root Morpheme as a Language Universal. Monograph. (Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1994) – 2nd ed., revised and expanded. Karaganda: Tengri Ltd., 2018, pp. 26–29. 292 p.
4. Shaimerdinova, N.G. The Root Morpheme in the Old Turkic Language. Turkic Studies Journal, 2022, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 95–108.
5. Maslova, V.A. Linguoculturology: A Textbook for University Students. Moscow: Akademiya Publishing Center, 2001. 208 p.
6. Stepanov, Yu.S. Semiotics. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 168 p.
7. Repressions in Central Kazakhstan in 1920–1950: A Collection of Archival Documents / Comp. D.A. Dzhumabekov, S.V. Yeleukhanova, V.V. Kozina et al.; ed. N.O. Dulatbekov. Karaganda: E.A. Buketov Karaganda University Press, 2023. 480 p.
8. Satpaev, Kanysh. Literary and Cognitive Collection. First edition / Comp., foreword and comments by A. Nukhuly, S. Zhumagul, A. Zhumagul. Karaganda: Tengri Ltd. Press, 2024. 550 p.
9. Asanuly, K. Evney Buketov – Publicist. Textbook. Karaganda: KarMU Press, 2005. 196 p.
10. Buketov, E.A. Six Letters to a Friend. Alma-Ata: Zhalyn, 1989. 288 p.

УДК 808.1.

Е.А.БУКЕТОВ: УРОКИ ПРАВСТВЕННОСТИ

Байжигитова Г.Б., НАО «Атырауский университет нефти и газа им.С.Утебаева», Атырау, Казахстан

В настоящем докладе сделана попытка осмысления значения жизни и творческой деятельности Е.А.Букетова. Сама идея доклада подсказана благодаря книге Медеу Сарсекеева «Евней Букетов», давшей автору доклада начало заочному знакомству с таким неординарным человеком, каким был и остался в памяти его современников и нынешнего поколения Евней Арстанович Букетов. Трудно переоценить тот мощный настрой, откровенность, с какой М.Сарсекеев обращается к своему читателю, впервые оказавшемуся наедине с этой книгой-откровением, книгой-воспоминанием, позволившей увидеть главного героя книги – Евнея